

Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships
in a Community College Setting

Karen Jean Gilbert

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Higher Education

Claire K. Robbins, Chair

Susan E. Short

Jennifer M. Bondy

David J. Kniola

July 30, 2020

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Higher Education; Leader Perceptions; Cross-sector Partnerships; Campus
Community Partnerships; Community Colleges

Copyright 2020, Karen Gilbert

Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships in a Community College Setting

Karen Jean Gilbert

Abstract

Given the mission of community colleges, their leaders are often responsible for developing resources to support student success and improve relationships with surrounding communities. To accomplish these goals, community college leaders sometimes participate in cross-sector partnerships (CSPs) since CSPs can strengthen relationships and develop resources across sectors. However, little is known about campus and community leaders' perceptions of forming CSPs and the value they generate. This study examined campus and community leaders' perceptions of CSP participation, specifically the formation process and the value created. Guided by the Collaborative Value Framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a), I conducted a multi-site case study of four community colleges in western rural North Carolina, with each college participating in a CSP designed to support adult students through a workforce development program. Findings revealed intricacies of the CSP formation process and the rich array of value created from CSP participation. Further, each case held a distinct personality, represented by a metaphor to highlight its unique findings: The Phoenix, The Beehive, The Compass, and The Treasure. Finally, leaders perceived CSP participation to be so enriching that each organization planned to continue, expand, or create new CSPs to meet additional shared needs. Leaders revealed a learning process connected to CSP participation that resulted in continual refinement and enhanced plans for future CSPs, illustrating the benefits of CSPs for addressing shared campus and community goals. Findings offer several implications for campus and community leaders, as well as future research and policymaking related to campus and community CSP participation.

Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships in a Community College Setting

Karen Jean Gilbert

General Audience Abstract

Given the mission of community colleges, their leaders are often responsible for developing resources to support student success and improve relationships with surrounding communities. To accomplish these goals, community college leaders sometimes participate in cross-sector partnerships (CSPs) between organizations. However, little is known about campus and community leaders' perceptions of forming CSPs and the value they generate. This study examined campus and community leaders' perceptions of CSP participation, specifically the formation process and the value created. I conducted a multi-site case study of four community colleges in western rural North Carolina, with each college participating in a CSP designed to support adult students through a workforce development program. Findings revealed the importance of establishing solid practices when initially forming a CSP to strengthen the collaboration. A wide variety of rich types of value creation was developed over the course of these CSPs, going well beyond the traditional expectations of simply sharing basic resources between organizations. Further, each case held a distinct and insightful personality, represented by a metaphor to highlight its uniqueness: The Phoenix, The Beehive, The Compass, and The Treasure. Finally, leaders perceived CSP participation to be so enriching that each organization planned to continue, expand, or create new CSPs to meet additional shared needs. Leaders learned new ways to improve current and future CSPs. This study can help campus and community leaders make decisions about the feasibility of participating in a CSP to address a shared goal more effectively rather than tackling a more complex problem single handedly.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I thank God for the gifts and talents given to me to enable me to complete this major life goal. In return, I will use my PhD to make a difference in this world. Next, I would like to thank Kurt, Scot, Katie, and Genevieve Gilbert for their generous and constant love and support. They all inspire me to do my best and their encouragement throughout the process of earning my PhD was priceless. Thank you for always, always being there for me. I appreciate my dear sister Nancy's ongoing interest and enthusiasm in my going back to school to better myself and your belief in exploring new ideas. I would also like to thank my Mom and Dad for always believing in me and cheering me on. Yes, Mom, I got a 100! Thank you for believing in my dreams and making it possible for me to college early on. I appreciate that you have always supported my continuing education. It has been a pleasure to go through this journey with Venice, my true friend and cohort member. To Nicole, Ann, and Robin, and all of my other family and friends, thank you for your love and support.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to my Advisor, Dr. Claire Robbins. Thank you for traveling on this exciting and challenging journey with me. Your role in my PhD process cannot be understated. I value that you treated me as a unique student with great potential traveling on a unique journey, as no two journeys of this magnitude are alike. Your responsiveness and attentiveness made a difference every step of the way. You are a true advocate for students which I highly admire. Thank you for your expert leadership of the Higher Education program at Virginia Tech, which has been critical towards its sustainability and progress. You mean a great deal to me and I will always treasure your support and wisdom. Words can't express!

To my other committee members, Dr. Susan Short, Dr. Jennifer Bondy, and Dr. David Kniola, I fully realize the time, effort, and dedication it takes to serve on a dissertation committee

and I sincerely appreciate your willingness to do so. Each of you brought a special perspective to the review of my work as well as the highly valuable guidance you provided to me in order to improve and advance my research. I always knew my work was in good hands with each of you serving on my committee. The incredible work that each of you are doing to advance higher education and the world in which we live is beyond inspirational to me.

I appreciate the opportunity to serve as a Graduate Assistant to Dr. Rachel Holloway while earning my PhD. Thank you for your guidance and wisdom all along the way. Your undying support for students, faculty, and staff, and your love of higher education and Virginia Tech is evident in everything you do. What I learned about professionalism in higher education administration from you and student success through my research work for you will always stay with me and will be forever woven into my work in higher education.

To Dr. Holly Matusovich, what a difference you made in my development as a scholar during my final year, serving as your Graduate Assistant. Thank you for your constant support. Observing your leadership of the SMILE research group and benefiting from your tireless support of higher education and the role of research to advance higher education will have a lasting impact on me. I have learned more from you than you will ever know. Thank you, SMILERs for your incredible support of my PhD progress and your generosity of your time and wisdom to improve my work. Your collective willingness to help each member of the team made the experience of finishing the final leg of my journey especially enriching.

Let's Go Hokies!

Ut Prosim—That I May Serve

Table of Contents

List of Tables	x
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION.....	1
Community Colleges in the United States	2
History of Community Colleges in the United States.....	2
Student Population Changes	5
Emerging Education and Training Needs of the Adult Student Population	7
Financial Climate of Higher Education	8
The Importance of Studying Leader Perceptions of Cross-sector Partnerships.....	10
Leaders' Roles and Influence on Cross-sector Partnership Participation	10
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose and Overview of Study.....	12
Research Questions.....	14
Significance of the Study	14
Potential Future Studies	15
Organization of the Study	16
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	17
The Evolving Role of Community Colleges	17
Background of the Community College Role.....	18
Expansion of the Role of Community Colleges.....	18
Cross-Sector Partnerships	19
Evolution of CSPs and Prevailing CSP Definitions.....	19
Cross-Sector Partnerships in Higher Education.....	21
Leadership of Cross-Sector Partnerships	23
Components of Cross-Sector Partnership Leadership.....	23
Leader Perceptions of Cross-Sector Partnerships	24
Formation and Implementation of Cross-Sector Partnerships	35
Partnership Formation.....	36
Partnership Implementation	38
Cross-Sector Partnership Value Creation.....	39
Types of Value.....	40
Evaluation of Campus Community Partnership Value	41
Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships: Gaps in the Literature.....	45
Emerging Motives for Forming Cross-Sector Partnerships in Higher Education.....	48
Workforce Development Needs.....	49
Changing Role of Community Colleges	49

Meeting the Education and Training Needs of the Older Student	50
Conceptual Framework	50
Collaborative Value Creation Framework	50
Summary	53
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	55
Research Paradigm and Conceptual Framework.....	56
Research Paradigm: Constructivism	56
Conceptual Framework: Collaborative Value Creation Framework.....	58
Methodological Approach.....	59
Case Study	60
Sampling	61
Data Collection and Analysis Overview.....	69
Data Collection	70
Data Analysis	74
Study Delimitations	79
Study Limitations.....	81
Trustworthiness.....	82
Positionality Statement.....	84
Summary	88
CHAPTER FOUR STUDY FINDINGS.....	90
Case Descriptions and Key Elements of the Formation Process	92
Comparison of Case Features	93
Document Highlights	94
Case 1: The Phoenix – Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process.....	95
Distinctive Features of the Case.....	98
Metaphorical Description.....	99
Case 2: The Beehive - Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process.....	100
Distinctive Features of the Case.....	103
Metaphorical Description.....	104
Case 3: The Compass – Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process	105
Distinctive Features of the Case.....	107
Metaphorical Description.....	110
Case 4: The Treasure - Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process.....	110
Distinctive Features of the Case.....	113
Metaphorical Description.....	115
Cross-Case Comparison of Leaders' Perceptions of the Formation Process	116

Leader Expectations and Perceptions of the Value Created	118
Case 1: The Phoenix – Findings about Value Created.....	119
Case 2: The Beehive – Findings about Value Created.....	122
Case 3: The Compass – Findings about Value Created.....	126
Case 4: The Treasure – Findings about Value Created.....	130
How the CSP Results Differed from Leader Expectations	133
Case 1 The Phoenix—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations	133
Case 2 The Beehive—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations	134
Case 3 The Compass—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations.....	135
Case 4 The Treasure—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations	136
Learning Experiences of the CSP Leaders	136
Documenting the CSP.....	137
Leader Roles, Planning, and Process Improvement.....	137
Leaders' Plans for Future CSPs	141
Modeling After an Existing CSP	141
Creating a Higher-level CSP	142
Expansions of Current CSPs and Summary of Future CSP Plans	142
Conclusion.....	144
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	146
Summary of Findings	146
Campus and Community Leaders' Perceptions of the Formation Process	147
Campus and Community Leaders' Perceptions of Value Created.....	149
Relationship to Prior Research	154
Relationship to the CVC Framework.....	154
Relationship to Other CSP Research	157
Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research.....	160
Implications for Practice	160
Implications for Policy.....	162
Suggestions for Future Research.....	163
Limitations of the Study.....	166
Conclusion.....	166
References	171
Appendix A Preliminary Organization Contact Phone Script	191
Appendix B Introductory CSP Leader Phone Call Script	192
Appendix C Email Script Requesting CSP Leader Research Study Participation.....	193
Appendix D Follow-up Email to CSP Leaders	195

Appendix E CSP Leader Interview Questions	197
Appendix F IRB Approval Form	199
Appendix G CSP Leader Interview Reminder Scripts.....	200
Appendix H Participant Consent Form	201
Appendix I CSP Leader Interview Thank You Email.....	204
Appendix J CSP Leader Transcript Review Email Script.....	205
Appendix K Document Analysis Summary.....	206
Appendix L Summary of Leader Perceptions of Key Elements of the Formation Process	210
Appendix M Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 1: The Phoenix.....	211
Appendix N Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 2: The Beehive.....	214
Appendix O Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 3: The Compass	217
Appendix P Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 4: The Treasure.....	220

List of Tables

Table 1: Preliminary North Carolina Colleges and Organizations Eligible for Sample Inclusion.....	66
Table 2: Summary of Case Features.....	92
Table 3: CSP Leaders' Plans for Future CSPs.....	142

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Chapter One introduces this qualitative study about campus and community leaders' perceptions of cross-sector partnerships (CSPs) in higher education. Participating in collaborative practices such as CSPs reveals an expanding role for higher education which can result in the creation of a wide range of values beyond the usual expected gains and can contribute to the overall strength of the organizations involved (Murphy, Arenas, and Barista, 2015). CSPs provide an alternative practice for leaders seeking to solve complex issues related to higher education.

The benefits to each participating sector of a CSP are rich and broad. Aspects of CSPs such as relationship-building and having a shared mission make CSPs a meaningful tool for solving complex social issues and adding to the strength and sustainability of participating organizations and the communities in which they operate. Creating CSPs is also a viable albeit underutilized method for many types of resource and program development in sectors such as higher education. Particularly during times of economic constraint, it is important for campus and community leaders to have a solid understanding about alternative resource development methods, such as CSPs, in order to make informed decisions about the use of such practices to be able to take full advantage of their overall potential.

The specific campus and community leader population for my study was derived from four community college cases, so this chapter begins with background information about the history and evolving mission of community colleges in the United States. To serve as a backdrop about the need for new approaches to expanding collaboration efforts with other sectors and resource development in higher education, the community college section also includes information about the changing demographics of the student population, the education and

training needs of the adult student, and challenges facing community colleges based on the trending financial climate in higher education. Next, I provide background information about the importance of studying campus and community leaders' perceptions about participating in CSPs in a higher education setting. Finally, I review the design of my study, including my two research questions about campus and community leaders' perceptions about CSPs and my selected framework.

Community Colleges in the United States

By original design, community colleges are situated within their home communities and are tasked with meeting the education and training the needs of the residents of their service districts. Collaborating with other sectors in their service districts in order to meet this mission has historically been essential to the effectiveness of community colleges, especially since they are so local in nature. Thus, the community college setting was an appropriate selection to increase our understanding of the use of CSPs in higher education in order to inform campus and community leaders considering the use of this practice. "Community colleges in particular craft a compelling educational vision through their collaborative relationships with schools, colleges, and public and private sector corporations and organizations" (Mellow, 2000, p. 6). The following review of the origins of community colleges and factors influencing their current status sets the stage for my study.

History of Community Colleges in the United States

The origins of today's community colleges trace back as far as the Revolutionary War when Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours first published a writing on the concept of a junior college (Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattschook, & Suppiger, 1994). In the 1800s, there was a limited number of junior colleges in operation. They originally served as exclusive finishing schools for

women, so their access and scope were quite limited (Witt et al., 1994). In 1851, Henry Tappan, president of the University of Michigan, was the first educator to develop a lower division of college for teaching general studies (Drummond, 2002).

An early president of the University of Chicago, William Harper, played an integral role in the development of the first public two-year college. The college was started in Joliet, Illinois in 1901. He and David Jordan from Stanford University incorporated the European model of universities offering higher level education and junior colleges providing lower level education and vocational training, in the design of their junior college (Drummond, 2002). Harper later founded a network of junior colleges, which was designed to prepare students to be ready to transfer to four-year universities (Witt et al., 1994).

As industry advanced in the United States in the 1920s, the demand for more professional job training also grew as a way to prepare workers to enter the growing labor market (Witt et al., 1994). The number of public and private two-year colleges increased to over 200 colleges by 1921 (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Community colleges started to offer job training programs in the 1930s during the Depression as a way to mitigate the extreme levels of unemployment, leading to rapid growth in the number of community colleges (Kasper, 2003). This growth was aided by the construction of many more community colleges funded by the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration, creating a national infrastructure of junior colleges. The practice of combining job-related coursework at junior colleges with apprenticeships started in the 1940s (Witt et al., 1994). This is an example of very early evidence of CSPs between higher education and local employers to address a shared issue.

Following World War II, vocational training was offered to returning veterans through the GI Bill of 1944, which accelerated the growth of junior colleges through public education

made available to millions of people who previously did not have this opportunity (Mellow, 2000). The Truman Commission report in 1947 also played a key role in encouraging all states to develop more junior colleges (Boggs, 2010). During the Cold War period of 1949-1958, junior colleges filled the need for technical and innovative training to advance science (Witt et al., 1994).

In the 1960s, the term used for junior college was changed to “community college,” reflecting the shift of these institutions toward offering job training for local employment and beginning academic courses to residents of a community (Drummond, 2002). Community colleges were designed to be accessible and affordable to the general population. In major urban areas, community colleges experienced massive growth in the 1960s, related to having open access policies for all students (Witt et al., 1994). Baby boomers, a major segment of the population, were demanding access to public education in order to qualify for employment (AACC, 2001). Community colleges became a major contributor to the American higher education system during the 1970s, as enrollment in community colleges grew to 4.3 million students (Kasper, 2003). The role of the community college to meet occupational and transfer educational needs became well established at this time.

During the 1980s, high schools became formally connected to community colleges to offer technical training to students to meet a growing need to fill jobs (Witt et al., 1994). A new role was carved out for community colleges in 1988, when the Nationwide Commission on the Future of Community Colleges encouraged community colleges to support their local communities by creating cross-sector partnerships, such as with local employers, in order to promote workforce development. This practice continues as the need for workforce development remains. Such CSPs have a mutual benefit. “Alliances between local companies and community

colleges not only serve local businesses but also ease the financial burdens that community colleges may bear” (Kasper, 2003, p. 16).

Community colleges’ missions and operations continued to evolve over the following decades to meet the needs of local communities. There are now 942 public, 35 tribal, and 73 independent community colleges located across the United States in both urban and rural settings (AACC, 2020). Related to my study, almost half of all community colleges are located in rural areas and they support communities with small populations and/or larger less populated geographic areas (Swanger, 2016). Community colleges in rural areas can serve as the center of activity within their service districts (Swanger, 2016). “When we consider the history of community colleges in this country, we see them constantly evolving and managing change and responding creatively to new community needs” (Mellow, 2000, p. 3). The potential for the increased use of CSPs could be considered an integral part of that creative response by community colleges to meet evolving community needs.

Student Population Changes

The non-traditional segment of the student population, which includes older students, is growing, even though the number of traditional students enrolled in higher education is on the decline (Melchiorre & Johnson, 2017). Information from the Lumina Foundation (2015) revealed that 38% of all undergraduate students are now older than 25, about a quarter of which are also raising children and more than half continue to work while attending school. People over the age of 25 comprise a sector of the student population which was previously ignored to a certain degree in regard to specific recruitment and programmatic needs (Jepsen & Montgomery, 2012). Another change facing community colleges is that overall community college enrollment declined by 3.4% between 2018 and 2019 (Fain, 2019). Thus, changes in the student population

are causing enrollment shifts at community colleges and are driving program changes. There is a growing demand for resources to meet the different needs of new student populations, such as the growing adult student population.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) annual report (McFarland, Hussar, Wang, Zhang, Wang, Rathbun, & Mann, 2018), students aged 25 and older comprised almost half of all students currently enrolled in colleges and universities. Thirty three percent of students attending a public two-year college in 2017 were age 25 or older (McFarland et al., 2018). The enrollment of undergraduate students between the ages of 25 and 34 years old increased by a large amount, 35%, between 2000 and 2014 (McFarland, Hussar, De Brey, Snyder, Wang, Wilkinson-Flicker, & Bullock Mann, 2017). Moving on to the next age group, students who are 35 and older, enrollment increased 23% between 2000 and 2014 (McFarland et al., 2017). As another example of how the older student population is growing quickly, the number of students age 35 and older is expected to increase again by 20% between 2014 and 2025 (McFarland et al., 2017). Overall, the adult student population consistently grew between 1970 and 2010 (McFarland, Hussar, Zhang, Wang, Wang, K., Hein, & Barmer, 2019).

Another factor impacting the adult student population is that the age structure of the U.S. labor force has also experienced dramatic changes (Colby & Ortman, 2014). This is a result of the aging of the massive baby boomer sector, which includes 77 million people born between 1946 and 1964 (Colby & Ortman, 2014). By 2022, 44.9% of the labor force will be age 45 and older (Cummins, Kunkel, & Walker, 2015). Critical factors with the baby boomer population include longer life expectancies and improved health, as compared to earlier generations (American Council on Education, 2008). Thus, baby boomers are predicted to continue working and engaging in new educational opportunities well past the traditional retirement age of 65,

because of financial need and to improve their personal well-being (American Council on Education, 2008). Many older workers lack the skills that are currently in demand (AARP, 2018). The population increase of this age group, particularly those seeking supplemental income sources, has major implications for service providers to older adults, including the higher education sector. This segment of the population will require education and training to prepare for new careers in order to be able to earn income and to experience their desired quality of life during their extended lifetimes.

Emerging Education and Training Needs of the Adult Student Population

Given the growing adult student population, the plea to respond to the education and training needs of older students is crucial (Hannon, 2015). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010) indicated that from 2012-2022, occupations that usually require a post-secondary certificate or associate degree are expected to account for almost 44% of all job growth and over one third of all job openings. From the employer standpoint, members of the adult student population are needed to fill a looming worker shortage created by the massive numbers of baby boomers retiring. With community colleges typically experiencing enrollment declines, the adult student population in need of education and training for employment is a viable and growing source of new student enrollments (Fernandez, 2009).

It is an increasing trend for older workers to return to school and extend their careers and ignoring this trend can result in the education and training needs of this group not being met (Jepsen & Montgomery, 2012). This shift in demographics has major policy implications regarding national financial and medical program planning and is expected to have an impact on higher education realigning itself to meet these education and training needs of the adult student population (Cruce & Hillman, 2012).

Financial Climate of Higher Education

Contemporary community colleges face myriad challenges that influence their ability to honor their historic mission to meet the needs of their service districts, particularly the financial climate for higher education. Looking at trends in higher education funding since 1980, the state fiscal support for higher education is predicted to be non-existent by 2059 or sooner (Mortenson, 2012). Some states already reduced their funding of education between 1980 and 2011 by as much as 60% (Mortenson, 2012). Many states have yet to even reinstate their funding levels of higher education from before the Great Recession of 2008 (St. Amour, 2020, March).

Government spending on higher education nationwide has declined by 20% over the past five years (Mitchell, Leachman, Masterson, & Waxman, 2018). There are factors in the higher education landscape that are known to influence state support, such as politics, state higher education governance structures; and key individual actors in related leadership roles (Tandberg & Laderman, 2018). Competing demands on state budgets also disrupt the flow of support to higher education, such as financing major programs like Medicaid or pension funds, and issues specific to each state (Tandberg & Laderman, 2018). The cost to provide higher education has also risen, which compounds the issue of decreased state funding. Rising costs result in higher tuition and fee rates. Between 1989 and 2016, the cost to attend a university increased eight times faster than wages, causing a hardship for students (Maldonado, 2018).

Community colleges are particularly impacted by such drastic funding reductions because state funding normally encompasses a significant portion of their revenues (Crookston & Hookes, 2012). They also do not typically receive large private donations like four-year colleges or have major fundraising campaigns in place. State and local funding levels vary somewhat by state. Increasing tuition and fees significantly at community colleges to compensate for reduced

state funding is not a viable option because community college students are more likely than students at four-year colleges to be price-sensitive based on their income levels (Crookston & Hookes, 2012). Thus, it is challenging for community colleges to compensate for continual reductions in state funding using traditional funding mechanisms available to four-year colleges (Hebel, 2003). The underinvestment in higher education by states weakens the capacity of community colleges to serve students and their communities (Jenkins & Belfield, 2014). The result is the threat of diminished capacity to both the community college and its service district, leaving community colleges with the task of changing operations and developing new resources in order to maintain their financial health and program delivery levels.

Community colleges that are dealing with issues related to financial scarcity have responded to these challenges in myriad ways. One option is to cut costs, such as relying on a majority of part-time instructors to teach classes instead of full-time faculty (Jenkins & Belfield, 2014). Another response is to cut programs that have low enrollment. Such program reductions decrease the program options available to students, so this response can have a negative impact on education and training opportunities for students. The required shift in focus towards developing new resources can distract from serving the public good as the central element of the historic character of the community college to serve the community (Bohn, Reyes, & Johnson, 2013).

An emerging alternative to enhance the fiscal strength and capacity of community colleges is the formation of partnerships with organizations in other sectors, such as community organizations. Such CSPs have the potential of generating income, reducing program costs, expanding services, and allowing for the sharing of resources for the benefit of both participating

organizations and the populations they serve. The use of CSPs in higher education is an emerging trend in need of further study.

The Importance of Studying Leader Perceptions of Cross-sector Partnerships

In response to state and federal disinvestment, strategies for community college sustainability include innovative ways for leaders to maximize available resources and generate new resources, which can include leaders forming strategic cross-sector alliances. These initiatives involve increased collaboration, cooperation, consolidation, and partnering with other sectors such as business and industry, local school systems, and area non-profits, so outreach and innovation play a role (Roueche & Jones, 2005). Leaders play an active role in all aspects of CSPs, including partnership formation and value creation. Of particular importance to this study are leader perceptions of CSPs because how a leader perceives a partnership could directly influence whether institutions of higher education choose to participate in CSPs, their direction, and eventual outcomes.

Leaders' Roles and Influence on Cross-sector Partnership Participation

Driven in part by financial need and complex social problems, campus and community leaders increasingly realize the value of developing resources and collaborating on shared issues. Postsecondary institutions and community organizations have not always benefited from effective partnerships due to “opposing philosophies and practices” (Martin, Smith, & Phillips, 2005, p. 2). Campus-community partnerships necessitate the involvement of leaders from each sector, contributing through both formal and informal roles. Formal CSP leadership positions can include university administrators and program directors, executive directors of non-profits, co-chairs of a steering committee, local school officials, government administrators, and related project managers (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Informal leaders of CSPs tend to be the staff who

carry out the day-to-day activities of the partnership and those who coordinate ongoing communication between the two partners (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a).

With more information about how campus and community leaders perceive CSPs, leaders can develop effective new approaches to support CSP participation in order to benefit all participating sectors. When campus and community leaders understand the risks and benefits of the various processes related to participating in a CSP, they can enter into the partnership with more awareness of what actions help to increase the value of participation and contribute towards the sustainability of the CSP.

Decreased funding and ongoing economic challenges, combined with the changing needs of various student populations and the evolving workforce needs of employers, contribute to an increased need for higher education leaders to look for innovative ways to support the education and training demands of their local communities (Swanger, 2016). Community colleges serve a diverse population of students based on their age, race and ethnicity, and socioeconomic background, by offering an accessible pathway to attend college (Ma & Braum, 2016). Campus and community leaders together play a critical role in utilizing the best tools available, including CSPs, to continue to provide this pathway in an effective and efficient manner and to meet the education and training needs of the community.

Statement of the Problem

“Community colleges, with their open access and low-tuition missions, are and will continue to be vitally important in helping individuals achieve their education goals and in meeting the labor-market needs of our nation” (Turk, 2017, p. 6). This is especially the case given the growing trend toward an adult student population, and the rise in the workforce development needs of local employers based on advances in technology and an aging workforce.

Between 2016 and 2019, enrollment at public community colleges remained fairly steady comprising 30% of the enrollment in undergraduate education (Juszkiewicz, 2020). The services provided by community colleges involving education and local job training make an essential contribution to the vitality of their surrounding service districts.

Meanwhile, community college leaders are under pressure to find better ways to develop many necessary types of resources, expand program offerings, serve changing student populations, and continue to foster strong relationships with the communities they serve and better meet their needs while at the same time strengthening their own organizations from within. Typically, leaders have responded to the decline in government funding and population changes by making reductions in key cost areas, adding new programs, recruiting new populations of students, and using new forms of fundraising (AARP, 2015). An emerging alternative method in higher education for resource development and addressing complex social issues, such as workforce development needs, poverty, and the needs of the growing adult student population, is to form CSPs. CSPs utilize the knowledge and capabilities of all partners by creating new opportunities that result in increased resources and higher service levels of target populations (Rondinelli & London, 2003). Previously, the types of CSPs studied more extensively included for-profit/non-profit and government/non-profit partnerships. In contrast, there is limited research available about partnerships between higher education institutions and for-profit and non-profit organizations located in their surrounding communities and the resulting impact. Leaders of higher education institutions need much more information about other campus leaders' CSP experiences on which to base their decisions about whether or not to form CSPs so that they can act in the best interest of their institutions and service districts.

Purpose and Overview of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine campus and community leaders' perceptions of CSPs to increase the understanding of the practice of participating in CSPs for the higher education sector. This study involved an exploration of campus and community leaders' perceptions of the initial process of CSP formation and the end result of value creation, allowing for the examination of the two ends of the spectrum of participating in a CSP.

For this study, a CSP is defined as a partnership between a community college and a community organization. A community college is defined as a public two-year college with a defined service district. A community organization is defined as an organization operating at a local or regional level. A Campus Leader is a person serving as a CSP leader at a community college. A Community Leader is a person serving as a CSP leader at a community organization.

Austin and Seitanidi's (2012a) Collaborative Value Creation (CVC) framework was used as the guiding framework for this study. The basis of the CVC is that co-creating value is the central reason to form CSPs (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). "The goal of the CVC framework is to improve the understanding of the value creation spectrum, collaboration stages, partnering processes, and outcomes to facilitate the consideration of CSPs as value creation mechanisms" (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 729). Components of the CVC were used to develop my two research questions and to analyze the data collected for this study. This is the first known application of the CVC framework to the study of this particular type of CSP, campus community partnerships.

The institutional sample for this study consisted of four community colleges from one selected state sample that were involved with at least one CSP to support the adult student population. The individuals who participated in this study were campus and community leaders of the CSP in each of the four cases. The primary data sources were transcripts from personal

interviews with CSP leaders conducted either in-person or via Zoom. The interviews were audio recorded to facilitate accurate transcription, coding, and thorough analysis. Case studies should incorporate the use of more than one data source in order to examine a phenomenon of interest (Yin, 2017). As such, data were also collected from a secondary source, which was documents related to each partnership, such as partnership apprenticeship agreements, CSP progress reports, and marketing materials, when available. The text of the documents in the sample was also coded and analyzed, as well as triangulated with the interview data.

Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate campus and community leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process and the value created from CSPs. My research questions were as follows:

1. How do campus and community leaders perceive the CSP formation process?
2. How do campus and community leaders perceive the value created from CSPs?

Significance of the Study

My study is significant for future practice, research, and policy within higher education, in particular for the community college sector. This study has significance because it provides information about a type of CSP, campus community partnerships, which has not been a common research focus. Campus and community leaders may benefit from this study because it describes the practical experiences of a sample of four cases of campus and community CSP leaders. Specifically, this study provides campus and community leaders with information about a sample of CSP leaders' perceptions of the formation process and the value created from CSPs. How CSP leaders perceive and learn from the practice of forming campus community CSPs and the value created could directly impact the sustainability of this practice in higher education.

Campus and community leaders can utilize the information from this study when considering whether it is beneficial for their organizations to participate in CSPs and to strengthen their capabilities to utilize this potentially valuable tool in response to the changing needs of the populations they serve and to strengthen their organizations for the purpose of sustainability..

Potential Future Studies

A potential future study about campus and community leaders' perceptions of CSPs could employ a quantitative methodology by changing the data collection method to an online questionnaire about the perceptions of campus and community CSP leaders, perhaps drawing on questions similar to the in-person interviews in my study. Delivering an online survey to campus and community CSP leaders could allow for the use of a larger sample size and result in broader responses. Assuming an appropriate design, the results of such a study could potentially be generalized since the sample would be larger and broader in scope. Using an online survey could result in high participation levels of leaders of CSPs since it would allow for more flexible and convenient response times for participants who typically have high responsibility levels and demanding schedules. However, the use of the online survey would not allow for the collection of rich data that is afforded by in-person and Zoom interviews.

Another future study about leader perceptions of CSPs could involve changing the institutional sample to urban community colleges or public four-year colleges. In particular, the use of CSPs is less prevalent in the four-year college setting, so it would be valuable to learn about the perceptions of campus and community leaders involved in the early stage of the use of this approach to shared problem solving. A third recommendation is a study resulting in the creation of a new model or framework about which campus community CSP factors, such as shared mission and leader relationships, lead to CSP sustainability. There is ample room in this

field of study for additional models and frameworks to guide the research and practice of participating in CSPs in higher education.

Finally, it would be of interest to conduct a study about the attributes of communities which tend to be more amenable to forming campus community CSPs to solve shared issues. Factors such as leader traits, organization types, economic considerations, and population size could be examined, as well as emerging factors. Since this is a relatively new field of study, there is a considerable amount of research yet to be conducted to inform the body of research about the use of CSPs in higher education.

Organization of the Study

I organized my study around five chapters. Chapter One introduced the topic of the study, the research questions, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two provides a review the literature relevant to this study, including the literature about the evolving role of community colleges, CSPs in general, campus and community CSPs in particular, the leadership of CSPs, and CSP formation, implementation, and value creation. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the study, including the case study design, sampling approach, and procedures used to collect and analyze the data. Chapter Four describes the results of this study in detail from my two data sources, personal interviews and partnership-related documents. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the results of this study and their implications for future practice, research, and policy in higher education.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to investigate campus and community leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process and the value created by CSPs in higher education. This study examined CSPs in multiple cases in a community college setting associated largely with local and state workforce development programs designed to support the education and training needs of the adult student population.

To guide the conceptualization and design of this study, I conducted a critical synthesis of literature pertaining to CSPs with an emphasis on higher education. The first body of literature pertains to the role of community colleges, which relates to the section in Chapter One about the history of community colleges. The second body of literature explores CSPs, including CSPs in higher education. The third body of literature looks at CSP leadership, focusing on campus community partnership leader perceptions of CSPs. Next, I examine the literature on CSP processes, emphasizing the formation and implementation processes. The fifth body of literature explores the value created by CSPs and existing methods for measuring this value. Then, I present my rationale for employing the CVC framework offered by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) as the theoretical framework guiding this study. The final section pertains to gaps in the literature about campus community CSPs. This chapter concludes with a summary and critique of the literature to support the rationale for this study about leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and the value created by participating in CSPs in higher education.

The Evolving Role of Community Colleges

In fall 2019, 5.3 million full and part-time students were enrolled in public, two-year colleges in the U.S. (Bustamante, 2019). It is clear that community colleges play an extremely vital role in the community in many ways. This role is constantly evolving in response to

community needs. The ability of community colleges to be flexible and make relatively quick program delivery and process changes adds to their significance in the provision of higher education. Part of that flexibility could include the increased use of resource development practices such as CSPs. This section covers the changing roles of community colleges and what factors are influencing this change.

Background of the Community College Role

The basic community college mission of meeting beginning academic needs, preparation for transfer to a university, and occupational training provided in an accessible manner has continued on as general practice. Currently, half of all first-year college students are enrolled in community colleges, so it is evident that community colleges continue to meet the vital need of providing access to affordable education for residents in their service districts (AACC, 2017). Community colleges are typically as diverse as the towns, cities, and neighborhoods they serve, making them each unique (Callan, 1997). “Throughout its history, the community college has maintained its curricular mission of responsiveness to changing patterns in student aspiration and the local economy” (Schuyler, 1999, p. 3).

Expansion of the Role of Community Colleges

With one option for community college students being following a certain career pathway, even if a student is going on to further education, “community colleges need to collaborate with other sectors of the community, such as business, industry, and economic development organizations, to define skill requirements, determine labor demand levels, and allocate resources for training effectively” (Dougherty, Laher, & Morest, 2017, p. 15). Kasper (2003) noted that community colleges were the most responsive to community workforce needs compared to all other types of higher education providers. Students of all ages enjoy the benefits

of learning as it fits into their lives, paying relatively low tuition, benefiting from the convenience of local campuses, and a vast array of program offerings.

Community colleges have expanded on their mission by providing small business centers to encourage entrepreneurship and offering new options for training programs of various durations for the purpose of meeting their communities' specific workforce development needs (AACC, 2017). Workforce development is no longer a solo effort by community colleges, which is part of their changing role to operate using CSPs. In a project the Business Higher Education Forum (2010) conducted in Louisville, Kentucky, the firm's consultants found that "a community's economic vitality no longer hinges as much on its geographic location as on its human capital. That is to say that today, a community's workforce is its key economic driver" (BHEF, 2010, p. 8). The consultants found that business leaders in search of a skilled workforce became catalysts for improving educational outcomes by engaging in partnerships with area colleges (BHEF, 2010).

Cross-Sector Partnerships

Due to funding shortfalls and changing societal demands, higher education leaders are increasingly seeking methods to create new and varied resources to support operations. One such method is to collaborate with non-profit, government, and industry stakeholders to form CSPs. As a starting point for the literature about CSPs, I discuss the evolution of partnerships and prevailing partnership definitions. Next, I provide background information about CSPs in the higher education context.

Evolution of CSPs and Prevailing CSP Definitions

Prior to 2000, research suggests that most organizational partnerships occurred within the same sector since this arrangement appeared to meet the needs of organizations at the time.

Same-sector partnerships are typically easier to establish due to similarities and common knowledge between same-sector organizations. More recently, the literature on organizational partnerships reflects the emergence of partnerships bridging across different sectors (Austin & Seitanidi, 2014). One of the original incentives for the establishment of CSPs was the desire of the business sector to partner with non-profit organizations to meet their ethical and social obligations (Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010). Corporate leaders realized that such partnerships could strengthen their reputation and increase their social capital (Millar, 2004). The other member of the partnership, frequently a non-profit partner, also benefited from new resources and knowledge gained from participating in the partnership (Austin, 2000).

Awareness of the benefits of participating in a CSP increased over time, resulting in members of additional sectors becoming interested in this method of resource building (Rondinelli & London, 2003). Partnerships that bring together different sectors, such as business, industry, and non-profit, are currently experiencing success at many locations around the world (van Tulder, Seitanidi, & Crane, 2016). Successful efforts to form partnerships across multiple sectors for a wide variety of purposes both locally and globally serve as an ongoing example for higher education leaders of the potential for using this practice. “The 21st century will be an age of accelerated interdependence” (Austin, 2000, p. 69).

As more partnership forms emerged, so did the need for definitional clarity. Brinkerhoff (2002) provided a working definition of the term *partnership* that specified fundamental aspects of a partnership relationship:

A partnership is a dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labor based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner. Partnership encompasses

mutual influence, with a careful balance between synergy and respective autonomy, which incorporates mutual respect, equal participation in decision-making, mutual accountability, and transparency (p. 216).

With this definition in mind, a CSP is defined as “a specific type of partnership involving a commitment between or among public, private, and/or non-profit institutions in which individuals from partner organizations commit various resources and agree to work cooperatively toward common goals” (Kindornay, Tissot, & Sheiban, 2014, p. 4). CSPs have the potential to deliver greater results than what a same-sector might and to provide an opportunity for the partners from each sector to channel their different interests into collaborations which utilize their unique capabilities and resources. (Austin, 2000). Recognizing these advantages, campus and community leaders increasingly seek to explore forming CSPs. Bringle and Hatcher (2002) specifically defined a campus community partnership as “a series of interpersonal relationships between (a) campus administrators, faculty, staff, and students and (b) community leaders, agency personnel, and members of communities” (p. 503).

Cross-Sector Partnerships in Higher Education

Partnerships between campus and community greatly increased during the 1990s, arising out of campus and community leaders’ interests in increasing the engagement level between these two entities (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002). Relationships between campus and community were previously designed to be narrow in scope and centered around students participating in service learning or faculty participating in community research. Community partners grew to resent these types of one-sided relationships, which treated the community organization more like an experimental laboratory to benefit higher education (Gelmon, Holland, Seifer, Shinnamom, & Connors, 1998). For many institutions of higher education, CSPs became a

way to build relationships with the surrounding communities, improve their image, garner support, increase resources, and attract and retain students (Gellman et al., 1998). The contemporary challenge for higher education is how to make changes to the practice of forming CSPs in order for campus community partnerships to be mutually beneficial and sustainable.

A first-of-its-kind report published in *Education Week* (March, 2016), *Collective Impact and the New Generation of Cross-Sector Collaborations for Education: A Nationwide Scan*, provided a description of the new cohort of CSPs for education emerging as well as the history of these collaborations. The report by Henig, Riehl, Houston, Rebell, and Wolf (2016) provided a foundation for this study because of the size and scope of their sample, which involved 182 public and private partnerships created before 2011. Their findings revealed patterns showing an increased level of attention emerging about the political, operational, and educational dynamics that influence the success of CSPs (Henig et al., 2016). Henig et al. (2016) found that 60% of the CSPs in their study were established before 2011 when the idea of collective impact became a main focus, revealing that collaboration remained a feasible method to develop the resources of both partners. Almost 40% of the CSPs studied were located in the Midwest, which is double the proportion of the Midwest's share of the U.S. population and number of large cities (Heinig et al., 2016). The target area of service for a CSP was typically larger than a city, showing how collaborations were being used to provide access to a wider range of resources utilizing large-scale efforts. Of specific relevance to this study, about 50% of the collaborations were associated with some type of national education network. Such networks provide the opportunity for cross-program learning, shared resources, national visibility, and possible political influence (Heinig et al., 2016). Cities having CSPs in education had higher levels of poverty, concentrated areas of high-income levels, and were experiencing slow growth in local revenue and federal support.

More than half of the CSPs occurred in areas where there was at least one other education CSP, raising some concern about programs possibly overlapping. The work of Henig et al. (2016) highlights the increasing prevalence and accepted value of CSPs in education across the U.S.

Leadership of Cross-Sector Partnerships

At institutions of higher education, it became clear that leadership played a critical role in determining and facilitating institutional involvement in engagement practices, such as forming partnerships (Maurrasse, 2002a). The leaders of participating partner organizations influence the CSP formation process significantly because they initiate and organize the components of the eventual collaboration. Central to the foundation of my study is an exploration of what is presently known about how campus and community leaders perceive CSP impacts such as effectiveness, benefits, and risks and how these perceptions might also potentially influence the CSP formation process and value created.

Components of Cross-Sector Partnership Leadership

Leader selection is a crucial part of the CSP formation process. Rondinelli and London (2003) emphasized the significance of the selection of leaders they referred to as “pre-alliance” champions (p. 73). Such leaders were identified by Rondinelli and London (2003) as “senior-level leaders who play a key role in team-building to increase trust and familiarity” (p. 73). Leaders set the initial tone of the CSP and determine its direction as it progresses (Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Community partners pay close attention to the level of leadership appointed to a CSP by a university, as it can reflect how much the university values the partnership and how invested it intends to become in the relationship (Leiderman et al., 2002).

Crosby and Bryson (2005) developed the Leadership for the Common Good framework, which emphasizes the vital role leaders play in CSPs. This framework was developed from the

results of a case study on the African American Men Project, in which elected local government policy makers and public administrators created a CSP that included many different stakeholders in the process of redefining community needs and creating related solutions (Crosby & Bryson, 2005). The study by Crosby and Bryson (2005) revealed that active participation of leaders from the affected community and input from community members contributed to the success of the partnership. Community members found value in being personally included in the process of redefining community needs and developing ways to meet those needs (Crosby & Bryson, 2005).

The leadership framework that emerged from Crosby and Bryson's study included key elements, such as "attention to the dynamics of a shared-power world; the design and use of forums, arenas, and courts which are the main settings in which leaders and constituents foster policy change in a shared-power world; effective navigation of the change cycle; and the exercise of a range of leadership capabilities" (Crosby & Bryson, 2005, p. 374). This framework serves as a guide for campus and community leaders who are seeking to work together to meet a complex social need by stressing the importance of involving directly affected community leaders and members in partnership processes.

Leader Perceptions of Cross-Sector Partnerships

Crosby (2010) found that leaders are more likely to engage in CSPs if individual attempts by one or more sectors to solve a public issue was previously unsuccessful, resulting in leaders believing the problem could not be solved by only one sector. Therefore, perceptions of both campus and community partner leaders are included in this literature review. The next section discusses leader perceptions about the value of collaborating as well as perceptions about partnership effectiveness, benefits, risks, and parity. These leader perceptions lay the

groundwork for my study about campus and community leaders' perceptions, specifically about CSP formation and value creation.

Community leader perceptions. The perceptions of community leaders are typically under-valued in campus community partnerships and studies about them. The Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE) sponsored a national summit in 2002 that generated a foundational study of community leader perceptions of CSPs. Twenty-one community leaders participated in the summit, each having an involvement in a campus community partnership with an institution of higher education. The purpose of this summit was two-fold. The first purpose of the summit was to bring attention to community perspectives by documenting the lived experiences of long-standing community partners pertaining to the creation and continuation of their campus community partnerships. The second purpose was to seek insight about typical struggles and potential opportunities that result in more positive campus community partnerships (Leiderman et al., 2002). The results of this summit provided increased awareness of the community partner voice, offering input from the equally vital other half of campus community CSPs.

Following up on similar concerns about the lack of understanding of community leader perceptions, Weerts (2005) performed a multi-case study of three land-grant universities: the University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Georgia. This was a major study comprising 50 interviews of campus and community leaders involved in Extension and Outreach in the host states of these universities. The study revealed that that community partner leaders based their impressions about campus commitment to engagement on a combination of these three elements: "the language and symbolic actions of campus leadership, personal experiences with faculty and staff, and success in navigating the complex structures of

the university” (Weerts, 2005, p. 23). This research also showed that community partners found institutions of higher education to be very complex and hard to navigate from the outside. At the University of Illinois, it became easier for community partners to connect with the university after the creation of a formal partnership program, Partnership Illinois, which was directed by a newly created position, Vice Chancellor for Public Engagement. This change revealed that providing a direct point of contact could increase community partners’ perception of the willingness of campus partners to work together (Weerts, 2005). Having a direct contact also helped to reduce the perception of risk of participation with a university because of the lack of a direct connection. Overall, the voices of community partners were frequently absent from the CSP evaluation process and not considered when universities considered policies and strategies to promote community engagement (Weerts, 2005).

Community leader perceptions of partnership effectiveness. In their examination of the findings of the 2002 CAPHE summit, Leiderman et al. (2002) found three issues community partners shared that related to the idea of campus community partnerships being mutually beneficial. The first issue was the importance of follow-through for fostering sustainable partnerships. Creating a campus community partnership was found to be inherently challenging enough without having to deal with the issue of partners not following through with plans they committed to, causing disruptions to partnership management. Another issue was how the community leaders evaluated the costs and benefits of participating in a partnership with a local college or university. If the costs outweighed the benefits of participating in a CSP with a local university, the community partner was less likely to choose to participate or would do so with hesitation (Leiderman et al., 2002). The impact of parity on community leaders’ attitudes toward their campus partners was considered to be significant. Since campus partners were larger and

contributed more resources than their community partners, community partners (for example, those associated with small non-profits) found it challenging to feel like equal players in the partnership. Community leaders also shared that they placed value on efforts made by campus partners to treat them as equals, which had not historically always been the case due to the power imbalance. In conclusion, community leaders reported that a positive partnership met certain criteria. These included:

being effective in meeting short-term goals, contributed to long-term goals, developed relationships with higher education institutions with the promise of benefits beyond the results of a given partnership activity, and led to the formation of additional partnerships to meet other needs (Leiderman et al., 2002, p. 6).

Throughout the CAPHE summit, the community leaders identified seven elements as being critical to effective campus community partnerships (Leiderman et al., 2002). First, the leaders confirmed the importance of having a set of mutually defined goals and processes. These processes included selecting and training campus representatives who would be working with a community organization or community residents so that they would be properly prepared for this role in terms of communication and displaying a positive attitude towards working together (Leiderman et al., 2002). Leiderman et al.(2002) found that elements such as resources, rewards, and risks should be shared between all partners, and roles and responsibilities for each partner should be determined by their actual capacity in order to not overwhelm any partner. The benefits of participating in the CSP should outweigh the costs, the effort involved, and the perceived risks. Leiderman et al. (2002) also found that community leaders believed it was the responsibility of each partner to ensure that both partners benefited from the partnership. Parity was crucial to the partnership to facilitate respecting the expertise and experience of each

partner. Shared vision and a passion for the issue being addressed were also valued by community leaders. Lastly, Leiderman et al. (2002) discovered that community leaders expected a system of accountability including taking responsibility for implementing shared plans, ensuring that high-quality work is delivered, so that the time and effort of each partner is respected.

Based on my review of more recent literature about partnership effectiveness, these seven elements remain at the forefront of the ongoing study of the effectiveness of campus community CSPs. An effective partnership can yield many positive benefits. Whether the leader of a community organization decides to participate in a CSP with a campus partner can depend in large part on the community leader's perceptions of such benefits.

Community leader perceptions of partnership benefits. Community partners participating in the 2002 CAPHE summit suggested that CSPs with colleges and universities offered a range of benefits. Such benefits included:

further advancement of the community organization's mission; new perspectives and insights sparked by interactions with students, faculty members, and other campus partners; access to knowledge and research on campus and from campus partners; the development of an expanded resource base; an increase in the number of grant opportunities; credibility for their own efforts; and exposure to the culture of participating in higher education (Leiderman et al., 2002, p. 8).

For example, exposure to the culture of participating in higher education for high school students in the community can result in an increased interest in enrollment in a local college. The wide range of benefits listed by community leaders shows the depth of the potential value to a community partner in participating in a CSP with a higher education organization.

A 2002 study by Sink and Jackson further illustrated the significance of understanding community leaders' perceptions of the benefits of CSPs. They conducted a qualitative study of 12 CSPs associated with Blue Ridge Community College (BRCC) in North Carolina. Community leaders of each CSP were asked to complete a survey with open-ended questions and rank the top five factors contributing to partnership success from a list of 10 factors identified by Mattessich and Monsey (1992) from the non-profit partnership literature. The 24 leaders also participated in a series of three focus groups to further define the top five factors contributing to CSP success. The study revealed that community leaders of CSPs perceived the factors related to partnership success as belonging to four main categories: economics, leadership, relationships, and mutual benefits. The top five factors that community leaders of CSPs perceived as relating the most to partnership success included: "having a favorable political/social climate; viewing the college as a leader in the community; sharing a vision; enjoying mutual respect, understanding, and trust; and having a unique purpose for partnering" (Sink & Jackson, 2002, p. 41). Community leaders of CSPs reported specific benefits of participating in the twelve CSPs, such as:

increased numbers of literacy council students enrolling in programs, direct access to a national honorary society, enhanced incentives for BRCC students to achieve academically, developmental daycare for children of BRCC students and employees, additional clinical sites, and increased exposure of the college to the public (Sink & Jackson, 2002, p. 44).

These results revealed some key factors that community leaders perceived as contributing to the success of CSPs.

Community leader perceptions of partnership risks. According to community leaders, entering into partnerships with institutions of higher education involves certain risks (Sandy & Holland, 2006). For example, 2002 CAPHE summit participants noted that for community partners, associating themselves with campus leaders' views and actions poses a risk to their credibility with their constituents in the communities they serve. This association is particularly risky if the campus leaders' expressed views and actions conflict with the mission and values of the community partner (Leiderman et al. 2002). In addition, considering the shortage of available organizational resources such as staff and scheduling at community organizations, allowing for the time to participate in community engagement work with one partner can result in foregoing the chance to benefit from other potential partnerships (Leiderman et al., 2002).

Summit participants also identified direct partnership participation costs to their organizations. These costs included:

the time it took to create tasks for volunteers, supervise student volunteers, or participate in research; the opportunity cost of not doing funded or billable work using these same staff resources; the time lost that could be spent working with other constituencies like donors or different partners; and the loss of organizational identity and privacy (Leiderman et al., 2002, p. 8).

In addition, participants identified the "irritation factor," which happened when community partner members were not respected as experts and peers by campus partner members (Leiderman et al., 2002).

Finally, it makes an important difference to community partner leaders related to the issue of parity, for equity to be shown by the way the CSP formation and implementation processes are coordinated (Leiderman et al., 2002). Afshar (2005) found that campus partners

who displayed a commitment to mutual respect and treated the community partners as peers with valuable skills, knowledge, and experience to contribute to the partnership were the most effective in resolving issues of parity. This finding suggests that community leader perceptions of parity may influence the sustainability of CSPs in higher education. When a university establishes a partnership to solely meet its needs, community partners lose faith and trust in the CSP process based on a perception of a lack of mutuality (Leiderman et al., 2002). In addition, the perceptions of campus CSP leaders are of equal relevance. The findings in the literature about the perceptions of campus leaders regarding partnership effectiveness, benefits, and risks are covered in the following sections.

Campus leader perceptions. The pivotal role campus leaders play in campus community CSPs adds to the significance of studying their perceptions, along with the perceptions of community leaders. Leadership involvement has been determined to be a predictor of campus partners' commitment to engaging in outreach practices such as CSPs (Maurrasse, 2002a). For institutions of higher education, CSPs can be considered an advanced form of outreach and engagement that involves working directly with community organization leaders to address a social issue (Sink & Jackson, 2002). In his model of scholarship utilizing discovery, integration, teaching, and application, Boyer (1990) contributed to changing campus perceptions about partnerships by providing a combined mechanism for campus leaders and scholars to achieve progress in their scholarly activities while at the same time meeting authentic community needs, thereby avoiding the tendency of the relationship being one-sided in favor of the university. If these efforts can be accomplished in a mutually beneficial manner, campus leaders are more likely to find community counterparts who are receptive to the idea of working together on a shared issue (Boyer, 1996). The rise in interest of forming campus community

CSPs to expand resources and solve social issues collaboratively makes the study of campus leader perceptions even more relevant.

Campus leader perceptions of partnership effectiveness. It is a complex task for a university to form a partnership with a community organization due to the size and multi-layered structure of universities and their relative lack of experience with this process. Historically, campus community partnerships tended to be more one-sided and did not factor in the needs of both partners (Maurrasse, 2002b). Leader perceptions about the purpose of a CSP can vary between campus and community partners. As an example, Strier (2011) studied campus leader perceptions of a campus community CSP in Israel aimed at combatting poverty, the Haifa Partnership for the Eradication of Poverty. Qualitative data was collected through interviews of the CSP leaders, students, community activists, social workers, and steering committee members and at annual reflective sessions with program participants. The study revealed that leaders and the participants perceived the CSP and the problem it was designed to solve quite differently based on their own frames of reference (Strier, 2011).

Consequently, senior leadership involvement in campus community partnerships can be crucial for fostering community buy-in. Murphy et al. (2015) studied partnership leaders whose main function was leading the formation process of CSPs and managing the partnerships. This study explored how the role of high-level leadership in partnerships and the purpose of partnerships impacted the impression of the university within its community. An important finding was that campus community partnerships were sometimes based on a university leader's attempt to make their institution's mission tangible, particularly for public universities in urban settings (Murphy et al., 2015). This research suggests that CSPs are sometimes formed around

the specific needs of campus leader roles and perceptions of what would benefit the university without fully taking the needs of the community partner into account.

Campus leader perceptions of partnership benefits. Partnerships with community organizations can offer many different types of benefits to institutions of higher education. Campus leaders participating in the 2002 CAPHE summit shared the following benefits of partnering with community organizations:

exposure of potential students in the region to the educational offerings and unique programs at their institution; further advancement of their university's civic mission; growth in student understanding and potential for informed citizenship; opportunities to learn new skills and acquire new tools; and long term civic engagement by students throughout their lifetime, which is also a direct benefit to society at large (Leiderman et al., 2002).

Expanding on Strier's (2011) case study discussed previously about the poverty-related CSP in Israel, university leaders perceived a positive change in the social work clients' attitudes toward the university, seeing this change as a major benefit of the university's participation in this partnership. University leaders also realized the potential for such partnerships to be learning experiences for students and faculty while connecting with the community. This project afforded campus and community participants opportunities to share opinions even on sensitive issues, which was an added benefit resulting from this partnership (Strier, 2011).

Campus leader perceptions of partnership risks. The power imbalance between campus and community can lead to a one-sided motivation for a university to promote its own interests at the expense of others, leading to unwanted tension and conflict (Strier, 2011). In contrast, a critical and reflective campus organizational culture can result in practices and processes that

allow for open dialogue with community partners to better address social issues, define goals, and assess results together, despite unequal power distributions between the two sectors (Schön, 1992). It is through this process of open communication that leader perceptions about partnerships can be formed and trust can be built (Schön, 1992).

Participating in CSPs poses a unique risk to universities. In practice, community organizations may come to a partnership with unresolved issues which tend to unexpectedly surface later in the partnership (Stewart & Alrutz, 2009). These issues are rarely openly discussed during the formation process, so they can result in a negative perception of the partnership by campus leaders who are caught unaware later and must deal with unexpected problems as the partnership progresses (Stewart & Alrutz, 2009). Stewart and Alrutz (2009) provided examples of such hidden issues: budget constraints, burnt-out staff with low capacity to deal with change resulting from a partnership, and challenging internal and external politics and policies. It is difficult for a large university to quickly change course during a partnership, so hidden issues can be perceived quite negatively by campus leaders (Stewart & Alrutz, 2009) . Guskey (2000) recommended for universities to work with community partners using an asset-based model instead of only considering deficits. This approach can help to lessen the consequences of hidden issues by focusing on the value a community partner can add to the relationship overall. Risks can be better managed if there is an awareness about them. A lack of university leader experience working with non-profits increases the element of surprise and the knowledge of how to respond when a hidden issue does surface (Guskey, 2000).

Campus partners who understand the importance of partnership parity tend to show an understanding of their potential community partners' strengths and available assets to share, not just the needs they bring to the partnership (Leiderman et al., 2002). They also value their

relationships with community organizations, leaders, and residents, showing how they respect the community partners and strive for equity by not focusing on the level of quantifiable resource sharing happening in practice. Community groups offered an example of a practical way for institutions of higher learning to show proof of their commitment to fairness and mutual respect is to welcome community leaders into the classroom as guest speakers to share their expertise with faculty and students (Afshar, 2005). According to Afshar (2005), “Bridging the two worlds of community and academic institution also requires an ongoing examination of how differences in race, community, class, power, and institutional cultures affect the relationships between the partners” (p. 17). Afshar’s (2005) findings about parity in campus community CSPs concurred with the findings of Leiderman et al.’s (2002) research showing that leaders’ perceptions of parity play a vital role in CSPs.

Existing research suggests that when campus leaders understand the benefits and risks of participating in a CSP, they can enter into the partnership with more awareness of what actions help to increase the impact of their participation. However, more research about how campus leaders perceive CSPs could contribute to improved approaches to facilitating campus participation in CSPs in order to benefit institutions of higher education and the sectors with which they choose to partner.

To summarize, this section synthesized research on leader perceptions of CSPs. The following section reviews literature on the formation and implementation of CSPs.

Formation and Implementation of Cross-Sector Partnerships

There are multiple processes involved in the establishment and maintenance of a CSP. The formation process occurs first. Next, the implementation process may either be distinct, or it may overlap the formation process. This section synthesizes research about both the CSP

formation and implementation processes and their potential for impact on campus and community leader participation.

Partnership Formation

The formation process is a central component of CSPs, including campus community CSPs. This study focuses on the initial CSP process of partnership formation. Some researchers have suggested that the partnership formation process consists of a distinct phase while others found that formation tends to overlap with implementation (McCann, 1983). Crosby and Bryson (2005) chose to focus on the formation process in their research about partnership leadership since this process is essential to the partnership and provides early opportunities to make necessary adjustments. The formation process is also critical for initial relationship building and establishing trust between partners (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011).

Crosby and Bryson's (2005) research on the formation process aligns with a major report prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), *Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches* (2000). The report authors agreed with the significance of the formation process in that it is during this beginning stage that assessment can occur to compare expectations with how the CSP actually started, allowing for early changes to be made more easily than once the CSP is firmly established (HUD, 2000). Adding to the significance of the formation process, the HUD report (2000) elaborated, "This is also a period when relatively new alliances can be strengthened through a frank examination of what has worked and what needs improvement" (p. 6). The reasons why campus and community leaders choose to form CSPs are an integral part of the formation process. These reasons are discussed next.

Purposes for the formation of cross-sector partnerships. CSPs are formed for a variety of evolving purposes in higher education. Exploring the motivations for community organizations to participate in CSPs with institutions of higher education can reveal shared interests and offer insight into the community partner's intentions and what they expect to gain (Seitanidi, 2010).

Based on their study of public-private partnership purposes, Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2011) developed the Purpose-based Partnership framework centered on the concept that such partnerships form for specific purposes. These purposes for creating partnerships can include "policy, service delivery, infrastructure, capacity building, and economic development" (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011, p. 2). The Purpose-based Partnership framework helps organizations clarify their reasons for forming a CSP. In addition, De Rond and Bouchikhi (2004) highlighted the complexity and evolving nature of the partnership formation process. Clarity about the potential for collaborative advantage for both partners, the types of activities that are included in formation, and an understanding of partner roles emerges gradually (De Rond & Bouchikhi, 2004).

Schirmer (2013) used a qualitative multiple case study approach to research the formation process of four CSPs in Germany involving education-related social venture organizations and corporate partners. A qualitative content analysis of interviews with leaders and stakeholders of both partner types generated evidence of two opposing formation processes: goals-driven and means-driven. The goal-driven process was similar to the causation process outlined by Sarasvathy (2001), a classical approach to partnership formation where goals are determined up front by the partners. In contrast, the means-driven formation process starts with a loose agreement to work together based on vague aspirations. The partners' means and aspirations then

shape the creation of ideas for combined activities, suggesting that partnerships do not have to be fully defined at the start to be effective. An important contribution to the body of literature about partnership formation, Schirmer's (2013) study suggested that partnerships become more effective as they evolve because new ideas emerge, and partners learn more effective ways to collaborate over time.

Partnership Implementation

Partnership implementation is a complex, long-term process over the life span of a CSP. Implementation and formation can overlap to a certain degree (McCann, 1983). Early research assessed partnership outcomes and productivity. Implementation can be affected by key factors such as the quality of partnership processes, including the prior process of formation. Quality is a key factor in being able to scale a partnership, which can be essential for major programs such as those focusing on workforce development. Yarnall and Stites (2016) made an innovative contribution by assessing the quality of campus community partnership implementation processes. They called for the need for sound metrics regarding the processes involved in workforce education, especially for the process of implementation of CSPs with employers. In response to this need, Yarnall and Stites (2016) developed the Workforce Education Implementation Evaluation (WEIE) framework. They applied the WEIE framework to two unique cases which each took different approaches to partnering with employers: large-scale partnership and employer outreach. Their research utilized Bloom and Dees' (2008) ecosystem framework. The ecosystem framework considers the environment in which partnerships grow and function. The WEIE framework provided four mechanisms for achieving and sustaining systemic change including "building coalitions, developing communications around a shared

vision, building credibility and trust, and being responsive to contingencies” (Yarnall & Stites, 2016, p. 760).

The work of Yarnall and Stites (2016) provided evidence, using workforce development as an example, that the relationship between the formation and implementation processes needs to be considered when examining CSPs in higher education since they are closely intertwined. It was revealed in the literature that the formation process is critical since it is the optimal stage for making modifications to the CSP. Implementation is directly impacted by the quality of the formation process since the two processes overlap. Implementation stood out as being a complex process in the literature. It was noted to be the lengthiest process and an ongoing process throughout the life cycle of the CSP, so it was also a focus of the literature about CSP processes. In addition to the implementation process, other major CSP processes such as governance, assessment, and dissolution, each require separate study due to their depth and breadth. The level and types of value creation are impacted by the stages of formation and implementation, so CSP value creation will be covered next.

Cross-Sector Partnership Value Creation

Recognizing the way that collaborative approaches like CSPs can create many types of value is a necessary part of realizing the shifting roles of organizations operating in the different sectors (Murphy et al., 2015). However, the partnership literature is still in its infancy of assessing the value created by CSPs (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Extant literature suggests that for CSPs to have an appeal to potential partners, the possibility of value creation needs to be clear. Austin (2012) found that the CSP has greater potential to create value for both partners when the mission of each organization coincides with the mission of the partnership.

Historically, the types of value anticipated from participating in a CSP included an increase in basic organizational resources such as funding, personnel, and space. Resource sharing and cost sharing were other basic benefits of partnership participation as well as cost avoidance (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011). Measuring these basic values was relatively straightforward for partnership leaders. However, these simplistic views of the value created from CSPs ignored other more potentially beneficial values that were occurring naturally and could better support the sustainability of a partnership in the long term (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006). To begin the discussion of value creation, it is useful to look at the types of value partners expect to gain from a CSP.

Types of Value

There are many different types of value created by CSPs and varying perceptions about their importance. Murphy et al. (2015) conducted a survey of CSP leaders to determine the differences between the benefits sought by non-profits and businesses participating in a CSP. Ranked from most desired to least, non-profits, including institutions of higher education, were seeking the following benefits:

- Address a societal need,
- Garner financial resources,
- Allow for communication with influential parties,
- Provide access to expertise/technology,
- Provide access to other organizations,
- Create capacity to influence other sectors,
- Offer competitive advantage,
- Increase name recognition/reputation,

- Improve staff retention (Murphy et al., 2015, p. 7).

In contrast, businesses ranked their anticipated partnership benefits in the following order, from most desired to least:

- Address a societal need,
- Increase name recognition/reputation,
- Allow for communication with influential parties,
- Increase staff motivation,
- Provide access to other organizations,
- Offer a competitive advantage
- Create capacity to influence other sectors
- Provide access to expertise and technology
- Improve staff recruitment success (Murphy et al., 2015, p. 8).

Overall, the results of this survey revealed how leaders from various sectors perceive the value of types of benefits from participating in a CSP in different ways. Notably, both non-profits and businesses valued the benefit of meeting a societal need the most.

For institutions of higher education, the value of participating in a CSP was originally based on simple and easily measurable one-sided benefits to the university (Maurrasse, 2002b). It is a relatively recent phenomenon that alternate types of value, which could potentially have a greater long-term effect on partnership success and sustainability, are being factored into campus community CSP formation decisions (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). For campus and community leaders to be aware of and appreciate the level and types of value created by a CSP, there needs to be a methodology for evaluating such value, which is covered in the next section.

Evaluation of Campus Community Partnership Value

Since the partnership literature is still in the early stages of assessing the value created by CSPs (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a), researchers and practitioners in the field of campus community partnerships face an ongoing challenge of agreement on acceptable evaluation models. Through the process of conducting a campus community partnership case study, Clifford and Petrescu (2012) found that more research was available regarding the value created by nonprofit-government and nonprofit-business collaborations in general as compared to the specific study of the value created by campus community partnerships. This confirms the findings of the CSP case study research conducted by Esteves & Barclay (2011) that there is a shortage of information about the effectiveness of campus community CSPs.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's 2000 report, *Evaluating University-Community Partnerships: An Examination of the Evolution of Questions and Approaches*, discussed the difficulties of evaluating campus community partnerships because of their complexity and constant evolution. However, the report also provided historically contextualized insights about and recommendations for evaluating campus community partnerships. The report offered appropriate questions to ask when conducting an evaluation of a campus community partnership, insights about the scope of data collection and methods of analysis needed, and recommendations for developing a framework to evaluate partnerships. The report authors also argued that an evaluation of CSPs needs to include meaningful questions that correlate with the central objectives of the partnerships and the organizations involved. The report suggested that partnership evaluation should be initially conducted during the formation stage. Early results can be compared to the partnership plans and then readily used to suggest modifications to the partnership (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2000). The next section reviews types of CSP performance evaluation frameworks.

Cross-sector partnership performance frameworks. Early partnership evaluation frameworks focused on outcomes with no attention to other partnership dimensions, such as relationships. Recognizing this gap, Brinkerhoff (2002) proposed a framework for assessing partnership relationships based on partner performance and efficiency. Brinkerhoff (2002) also developed a model and an interactive matrix as tools to assist leaders in deciding whether to use CSPs and to provide a common partnership language to improve leader communication. These tools could help leaders decide if it was beneficial to participate in a CSP and create realistic expectations of a CSP (Brinkerhoff, 2002).

The Performance Prism was developed to evaluate five facets of partnership performance: stakeholder satisfaction, strategies, processes, capabilities, and contributions (Neely, Adams, & Kennerly, 2002). This framework contributed to the approach of looking at the wants and needs of each stakeholder as well as their capabilities of adding value to the partnership. The Performance Prism focuses on looking at stakeholder satisfaction as well as contributions during planned changes, such as forming a partnership.

An alternative perspective revealing problems with methods for evaluating CSPs was provided by Selsky and Parker (2005). “Outcomes of business-nonprofit partnerships have been measured at three levels: direct impact on the issue and its stakeholders; impact on building capacity, knowledge, or reputational capital that can attract new resources; and influence on social policy or system change” (Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 858). They found that, in practice, most organizations prefer to measure the direct impacts of CSPs, but basic input-output models do not capture other important factors. According to Selsky and Parker (2005), such factors can include how CSPs are complex in nature, the capability to learn from the experience of participating in a CSP, the manner in which CSPs evolve, and how such partnerships are

impacted by their institutional contexts. Including an assessment of other factors such as these is considered by Selsky and Parker (2005) to be a more comprehensive way to evaluate complex CSPs established to address large social issues.

In contrast, Bennett's Hierarchy (1975) is a framework that, while not originally designed for evaluating partnerships, measures attitudinal and behavioral changes of leaders. Bennett's Hierarchy considers the quality of personal interactions in partnerships which he believed resulted in higher quality programs. It could be challenging to measure the abstract nature of personal interactions, so this is an inherent limit of this framework.

The evaluation of CSP capacity building was addressed in a study conducted in Belgium by Marlier, Lucidarme, Cardon, De Bourdeaudhuij, Babiak, and Willem (2008) about CSP sports promotion. The researchers identified thirteen key elements of CSPs that build capacity at different levels. The study added value to the field of CSPs by suggesting several actions that can be taken by organizations to build capacity at different levels. When organizations are clear about their role in a CSP, organizational capacity can grow (Marlier et al., 2008). Marlier et al. (2008) found that trust is fostered when partners maintain an open attitude about evaluating their mutual activities. This study added value to the body of research about evaluating CSPs because it looked at the perspectives of multiple partners at different stages of partnership development.

Andrews and Entwistle (2010) conducted research about whether CSPs deliver value as promised. Their study provided an alternate point of view about the value of CSPs compared to basic values like gaining space and personnel. It also afforded practical ways to look at the different types of outcomes generated by CSPs through the process of defining them. The authors incorporated the Resource Dependence Theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003) which was based on the premise that potential partners had resources that were absent in the other partner

and thus the partnership enhanced the strength of both partners. In their study of CSPs, Andrews and Entwistle (2010) found a positive association between public-private partnerships and public service effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. This finding provides evidence of the value of forming CSPs in higher education.

Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) recognized the growing importance of partnerships between sectors and how problematic the treatment of the value created by CSPs was in the literature. Their CVC framework includes the following constructs: “the value creation spectrum, identification of collaboration stages, the nature of the value creation processes in collaboration, and the resulting internal and external benefits, costs, and outcomes of CSPs at different levels” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 728-729). Austin and Seitanidi’s (2012b) study revealed how each of the collaborative processes contribute differently to value creation and placed a central focus on the formation process.

The multitude of frameworks used to evaluate CSPs and the basis of each approach reflects the complexity and evolving nature of these partnerships, particularly in higher education. The rapidly changing nature of CSPs in higher education makes it a challenge for research about how to evaluate such partnerships to keep pace. Collectively, the frameworks outlined from the literature reveal wide variances in approaches to evaluating CSPs and a lack of agreement about best practices. This lack of agreement will be further discussed in the upcoming section about the gaps found in the literature about campus community leaders’ perceptions of CSPs.

Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships: Gaps in the Literature

The rising significance of the practice of forming CSPs is evident in the literature. Early on, Warner and Sullivan (2004) studied the growing interest in organizations from different

sectors cooperating in varying degrees to address social issues to fulfill the wide range of society's needs and to potentially benefit from collaborating. The practice of forming CSPs in higher education, and the interest in doing so, are steadily advancing as institutions experience financial shortfalls and search for ways to replace these resources. Institutions of higher education are also utilizing CSPs to expand program offerings and participate in solving larger social issues for the good of society (Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010). CSPs are becoming increasingly relevant given a renewed emphasis on the role of higher education in society (Watson, 2007). Maurrasse (2002b) argued that because of the social mission of higher education, this sector is more equipped than other sectors, such as business, to improve the lives of disadvantaged populations at every level. Major professional organizations in education, including the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of Community Colleges, also developed significant programs to foster altruistic engagement between campus and community partners (Weerts & Sandman, 2008). Contrary to the acknowledgement in practice and in the literature of the increased relevance of CSPs, there are major gaps in the literature regarding the practice of participating in CSPs in the field of higher education.

The first major gap in the literature pertains to campus and community leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process. The critical role that CSP leaders play in the success of CSPs necessitates the careful study of their perceptions of CSPs, especially from the beginning of the experience. Working across sectors to solve problems requires changes in leadership behavior, like the ability to share control and for partnering organizations to have a fully developed capacity for relationships (Siegel, 2010). The success of a CSP can depend on leaders' abilities to select the right partners, develop procedures for the formation of the

partnership, and judge the risk of participating in a CSP (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 2006). CSP leaders play the role of continually managing their relationships with partners and assessing how well progress is being made toward their own organization's goals, as well as the shared goals of the CSP (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010). Studies of CSPs highlight the huge level of engagement and mutuality required for successful CSPs, these being two areas where campus leaders not have as much experience with as compared to leaders of other sectors (Hora & Miller, 2011). Examining campus and community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process may help to inform the use of CSPs in higher education.

The second major gap in the literature pertains to campus and community leaders' perceptions of the value created by forming a CSP. The literature does not offer a widely agreed-upon model or framework for identifying and evaluating the value created by CSPs in general, nor specifically in higher education. The literature also does not provide much information about specific types of value are created by a campus community CSP or their significance. Understanding the way collaborative approaches can provide value reveals a changing role for public sector organizations (Murphy et al. 2015). This rapidly changing role for higher education leaders revealed a knowledge gap in the literature about campus community partnership value creation.

A third gap in the literature is a lack of literature on the overall topic of the practice of utilizing CSPs in higher education in the U.S. This gap is a contributing factor to the lack of information available to campus leaders about participating in CSPs. The literature about CSPs in higher education reflects the use of this practice in numerous countries, as this practice was embraced and utilized early on in some locations. However, the use of CSPs in higher education in the U.S. is still a fairly new practice, so limited research is available.

Emerging Motives for Forming Cross-Sector Partnerships in Higher Education

In addition to the rising need for using CSPs for resource development, social issues related to higher education are becoming more complex, such as access and affordability, persistence and completion, impact of technology, diversification of the workforce, and the education and training needs of the adult student population. These large-scale societal issues require collaboration across sectors in order in order to make progress because they go beyond the capacity of any single sector to solve (Siegel, 2010). Participating in CSPs is becoming essential to the continued financial health, program enhancement, and sustainability of institutions of higher education, so there are clear benefits to further investigations of this practice.

The relationship between an institution of higher education and its local community is particularly complex and interdependent (Kindred & Petescru, 2014). Colleges and universities play many critical roles in their own regions and beyond, such as increasing employment opportunities, attracting new business and industry, technology advancement, supporting the arts, and conducting important research (Goldstein & Drucker, 2006). However, the literature only reveals a limited amount of evidence of CSP activity and outcomes related to these crucial roles of higher education.

CSPs have the unique advantage of being able to combine many types of resources to solve a shared issue. The evolving motivations for forming CSPs in higher education require additional research in order to provide a common understanding of the potential benefits and drawbacks of this practice in order to make the best use of available resources across sectors. Examples of emerging issues in higher education that could be addressed through the formation of CSPs will be discussed next.

Workforce Development Needs

Given predicted labor shortages due to the aging population exiting the job market, coupled with a reduced size of younger populations, CSPs related to workforce development programs call for further research (Buckley & Bachman, 2017). The average age of U.S. workers is increasing as well as the length of time spent in the job market, which will have an impact on workforce development programs provided by the higher education sector. The median age of U.S. workers is expected to be 42.4 years old by 2024 (Sorgel, 2015). As an example of how states are responding to this change, the governor of Idaho created a task force to study the state's workforce issues in order to develop suggestions for improvement to be used in the 2018 legislative session (Smith, 2017). The task force determined four major target areas for workforce improvement in Idaho: creating CSPs between business and education, offering improved career advising opportunities, required funding, and methods for effective marketing of workforce programs. So Idaho's task force on workforce issues recognized the importance of forming CSPs to address their workforce development needs, yet limited research exists to inform the CSP practice in the higher education context.

Changing Role of Community Colleges

Because of their ability to be more flexible in program offerings and tailor programs to meet local needs, the role of community colleges in the higher education process is increasing in importance. As an example, there is a renewed national interest in community college transfer student degree completion (D'Amico, Dika, Algozzine, & Ginn, 2014). It is becoming increasingly important for community colleges to partner with K-12 schools on one end and four-year institutions on the other end of the educational career of their students to foster higher rates of both two-year and four-year degree completion. CSPs could be a valuable resource for

supporting community college and transfer students' degree completion since business and industry sectors have vested interests in an expanded and better educated work force.

Meeting the Education and Training Needs of the Older Student

Cruce and Hillman (2012) conducted a study to inform higher education leaders about how the emerging older population related to the baby boomer generation was creating a new market. Their work demonstrated that this population shift impacts the design and delivery of education and training programs and brings new challenges such as how to attract the older student population to supplement declining enrollments in the younger student population (Cruce & Hillman, 2012). Institutions have responded to this population shift in a range of ways. For example, Harvard designed an educational program for older adults, recognizing that this population is living and working longer than prior generations and is expressing a desire to be more productive as they age (Freedman, 2007). Freedman (2007) drew attention to the urgent need for national prototypes and accessible programs for older students, recognizing that institutions of higher education were not paying enough attention to this major population shift.

Conceptual Framework

After a comprehensive literature review of frameworks used to examine CSPs, the framework selected for my study was the Collaborative Value Creation (CVC) framework developed by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a). The CVC provides a solid outline for examining campus community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created by CSPs.

Collaborative Value Creation Framework

The starting premise for the CVC framework was that "co-creating value is the fundamental purpose of cross-sector collaboration" (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 728). The framework offers an expansive view on the multiple dimensions and types of value created in a

CSP and how value created is related to CSP processes, including formation. The CVC provides a holistic approach to analyzing value created from CSPs, including abstract values that are not easy to measure, such as the value of associating with other partners and the value of learning from other partners. The CVC includes four constructs to guide the study of CSPs: “the value creation spectrum, identification of collaboration stages, the nature of the value creation processes in collaboration, and the resulting internal and external benefits, costs, and outcomes of CSPs at different levels” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a , p. 728-729). The application of the CVC framework supports the analysis of CSPs as value creation mechanisms. For clarification, this is not a study measuring amounts of value created or the success of a partnership, which is more of the historical practice with CSPs, but rather a study about the leader perceptions of the various types of value created by participating in campus community partnerships as well as their perceptions about the experience of partnership formation, as based on the CVC model.

The value creation spectrum is based on four sources of value (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). The first value source, resource complementarity, is based on the following concept, “the fundamental basis for collaboration is obtaining access to needed resources different than those one possesses” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 729). The framework takes into consideration the notion that “the greater the resource complementarity and organizational compatibility between the partners, the greater the potential for the co-creation of value” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 729). The second source of value is the nature of resources. Partners can either contribute basic resources, such as funding, or resources unique to their organization such as specialized knowledge and skills and established networks. Austin and Seitanidi (2012) further hypothesized that “the more a partnership involved the contribution of distinctive competencies, the greater the potential for value creation” (p. 730).

The third value source offered by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a) is resource directionality and use, which relates to how resources are utilized. Resources can largely come from one partner (unilateral) or both partners (bilateral and reciprocal). The hypothesis connected to this value source is that “the more both partners integrate their resources together, the greater the potential for value creation” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 730). The fourth source of value incorporated into the CVC is linked interests. In contrast to single-sector partnerships, organizations participating in CSPs may have very different functions and lack a common currency to readily assess the equity of the value that can be contributed to the CSP (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). According to the CVC framework, “it is critical to understand how partners view value and whether or not they perceive the value exchange as fair” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 730). The final hypothesis related to this value source is that “the more leaders perceive their organization’s self-interests as linked to the value they create for each partner and for the larger social good, and the greater the perceived fairness in the sharing of that value, the greater the potential for co-creating value” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 730). Significantly, these sources of value are the basis for the creation of four key types of expanded CSP value, which were described earlier in this chapter: associational, resource transfer, interactional, and synergistic value.

The CVC focuses on the formation stage, so it is an appropriate framework for this research, which centers on CSP leader perceptions of the formation process. The CVC was designed to evaluate CSPs between non-profits and businesses, making it a good fit for examining CSPs between public community colleges and local business, industry, and non-profits. During the construction of the concept map for this study, it became clear that the CVC was the best over-arching framework to use for this research study on CSPs because the aspects

of partnership formation and value creation were prominent in this framework. The CVC framework also offered a conceptual map for operationalizing internal and external sources and types of value related to the performance of CSPs between community colleges and other sectors.

Summary

Chapter Two began with an overview of the history and practice of CSPs in higher education. A critical synthesis of the literature revealed that higher education leaders and leaders from other sectors are becoming increasingly interested in forming CSPs as a new mechanism to generate resources and solve complex problems together. CSPs offer an alternative practice for organizations from different sectors to utilize to develop resources and solve shared issues, benefiting the partners as well as society as a whole (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011). Yet, the overall literature regarding CSPs between public and private organizations is “not conceptually precise and is weakly integrated” (Brinkeroff & Brinkeroff, 2011, p. 2). Despite the growing significance of CSPs for building capacity and solving mutual problems in higher education and other sectors, higher education researchers to date have devoted limited attention to the practice of participating in CSPs.

The literature does not offer a consensus about how leaders can best evaluate campus community partnerships and the value created by them since extant frameworks vary widely and new frameworks continue to emerge. The CVC framework was a crucial discovery in the literature to serve as a guide for this study because of its innovative approach to assessing alternate types of value creation, as compared to traditional CSP evaluation practices. The CVC provides a useful framework for examining types of value created by CSPs, such as associational, resource transfer, interactional, and synergistic value. The CVC framework also

supports the examination of leader perceptions of the CSP formation process since one of its four main constructs is about collaborative processes. Emerging motives in higher education for forming CSPs, in response to the changing environment surrounding higher education, were revealed in the literature and highlighted the need for expanded research to inform higher education leaders. Extant research highlights a need to understand campus community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created by CSPs in higher education, but the research does not yet contribute to such an understanding.

The critical synthesis of literature in this chapter was used to inform the methodology for my study, as outlined in Chapter Three. The chapter begins with an explanation of my research paradigm and the theoretical foundations for this study. Chapter Three also includes why I selected case study as my methodological approach. I then describe the design of this study in detail, including the conceptual framework I selected. In this next chapter, I will discuss my methodological approach in detail. The context of my study will also be provided in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I describe the methodology that guided my qualitative study of campus and community leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process and the value created by CSPs. First, I present the research paradigm and the theoretical foundations for this study. Next, I explain the selection of case study as my methodological approach. I then describe the design of this study in detail. I specifically describe the procedures for selecting research sites, participants, data collection, and data analysis. The last portion of this chapter discusses limitations of the study and strategies I used to advance trustworthiness. I conclude with my positionality as a researcher and a summary of this chapter.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate campus and community leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process, and the value created from CSPs. My research questions were as follows:

1. How do campus and community leaders perceive the CSP formation process?
2. How do campus and community leaders perceive the value created from CSPs?

The case study methodology selected for this study supports the exploration of my two research questions. The use of the multiple case study approach enabled me to conduct a careful, in-depth, and rich examination between the four cases of the similarities and differences of leaders' perceptions about the CSP formation process and value created (Stake, 1995) . CSP leader perceptions were studied in the context of CSPs created to support the adult student population in the area of workforce development. To select the sample for this study, I considered several national programs involving community colleges that serve as catalysts for programs to support adult students, along with related state and local programs.

Research Paradigm and Conceptual Framework

In this section, I explain my research paradigm and conceptual framework and how they influenced my study. My research paradigm is constructivism, and my selected conceptual framework is the Collaborative Value Creation (CVC) framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). This study is the first known application of the CVC to campus community partnerships specifically, representing an expanded use of an existing framework.

Research Paradigm: Constructivism

“One’s worldview on the nature of existence and knowledge has implications for how one will embark on a study” (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2014, p. 12). The paradigm that shapes my worldview as a researcher is constructivism. The constructivist paradigm is frequently associated with qualitative methodologies (Creswell, 2014). The constructivist paradigm suggests that learning is an active, constructive process (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). As a leading theorist of this approach, Piaget (1963) argued that individuals produce knowledge and form meaning based on their own personal experiences. Piaget proposed that learning is a dynamic, active process and that learners construct knowledge through their own theories of their unique environments (Piaget, 1980).

Constructivism stems from individuals constructing a personal understanding of and knowledge about the world from their own experiences, from what they have been told, and from their own perceptions (Stake, 1995). Charmaz (2006) subscribed that people construct the realities which they participate in. Researchers also construct meaning through their interpretation of the phenomenon they are studying (Charmaz, 2006). My role as a constructivist researcher was to gain an understanding of the phenomenon under study in each case setting,

gather data from individuals and documents within each case, and analyze and interpret the data to develop a deeper understanding of its meaning (Creswell, 2014).

It is frequently the goal of qualitative inquiry to make meaning of dialogue, which is acquired from research methodologies such as personal interviews, so that the researcher can gain an understanding of the experiences of the participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). An important characteristic of constructivist qualitative research is that reality is co-created by researchers and participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). According to Guba and Lincoln, it is during the data collection and analysis processes that these co-constructed realities are developed. I collected data from the CSP leaders during the interview process about the meaning they made of the experience of participating in a CSP, in particular the formation process and the value created by CSPs. I then made meaning of the information shared during interviews and sample documents through my qualitative analysis of the data. My emphasis on the phenomena of formation and value created emerged from questions I formulated based on my chosen framework for this study. My research interests are derived from making meaning of my experiences with CSPs, higher education coursework, and research training. Thus, my belief in the constructivist paradigm is reflected in my overall research design.

As a constructivist, I presume that people bring their past experiences and culture into a situation, such as participating as a leader of a campus community CSP and learning from the experience of collaborating with partners from various sectors. During my data collection and analysis, I co-constructed meaning with the participants of this study to gain an understanding of how their perceptions of the formation process impacted the start of the partnership and their expectations and assessments about the value created by the partnership. Through the process of assimilation of their experiences with CSPs, CSP leaders incorporate their new experiences with

CSPs into their prior partnership experiences and develop new outlooks. The process of assimilation offers an opportunity for CSP leaders to rethink prior misunderstandings about CSPs and evaluate what was important about their new experiences, resulting in leaders having altered perceptions about CSPs. Because this assimilation process reflects a constructivist perspective on human development (Piaget, 1975), constructivism is an appropriate paradigmatic perspective from which to pursue my research questions.

Conceptual Framework: Collaborative Value Creation Framework

The conceptual framework utilized in this study was the CVC framework. The CVC framework provided a solid framework for examining campus community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created. “The starting premise for the CVC framework was that co-creating value is the fundamental purpose of cross-sector collaboration” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 728). This premise shaped my research question about leader perceptions of value created in a CSP. The CVC framework offers an expanded view on the multiple dimensions and types of value created in a CSP and how value creation is related to phases of CSP organizational development, such as formation. Austin and Seitanidi’s (2012) view of CSP phases relates to my research question about CSP leader perceptions of the formation process.

Austin and Seitanidi (2012) provided a holistic approach to analyzing value created from CSPs. They included abstract values that are not easy to quantify, such as the value of associating with other partners and the value of learning from other partners. As outlined in Chapter Two, the CVC framework includes four constructs to guide the study of CSPs on multiple levels: “the value creation spectrum, collaboration stages, partnering processes, and partnership outcomes” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, pp. 728-729). The formation process is the central process analyzed by the CVC. This critical process emphasized in the CVC framework

shaped my research question about leader perceptions of the formation process, since Austin and Seitanidi (2012) deemed this process vital to effective CSPs.

The CVC framework supports my conceptualization of CSPs as value creation mechanisms for community and campus partners. The CVC framework guided my selection of the formation process as the key CSP process to interview CSP leaders about in order to discover their perceptions about this central process. Specifically, I developed my interview questions about the formation process using the CVC framework, as I focused on how the formation process progresses and how it relates to leader perceptions of the potential for value to be created. Unlike previous approaches in which the values gained from participating in a CSP were generalized, the CVC framework emphasizes the importance of further separating the value created by CSPs into more specific types of value and expanding the types of value to examine in a more holistic manner (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). The CVC framework also centers around a full, process-based understanding of the types of value created and the origins of these values (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). This emphasis resonates with my primary means of data collection, the personal interview. The personal interview methodology allowed me to elicit deep and rich responses to questions structured around the CVC framework to capture CSP leaders' perceptions about the formation process and value created. By studying the formation and the value creation processes together, I was able to understand leaders' perceptions of the expected value created compared to their perceptions of the actual value created.

Methodological Approach

This section provides a description of my methodological approach for this study. I begin by discussing the rationale for using the case study methodology, my research design, data collection and data analysis processes, limitations, and strategies I used for advancing

trustworthiness. The methodological approach I selected supported the intention of my research about campus and community leaders' perceptions of cross-sector partnerships.

Case Study

Case study was the overall methodological approach used in this study of leader perceptions of CSPs. Yin (1984) defines the case study research method as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 23). According to Yin (2017), “case studies are the preferred strategy whenever ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions are being asked, when the investigator has little control over the events under study, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (p. 2). “The case study approach can contribute uniquely to our knowledge of individual, social, and political phenomena” (Yin, 1984, p. 14). Merriam (2009) described the case study method as an investigative search for meaning and understanding. Creswell (2014) maintained that qualitative researchers “focus on individual meaning and give importance to the complexity of a situation” (p. 32). The use of case study as a methodology facilitates the process of answering the research questions developed for my study of leader perceptions about the complex situations of forming CSPs in higher education and creating value.

Furthermore, I selected a multiple case study design to foster the richness, depth and complex nature of the data that is gained from examining multiple situations to expand the understanding of individual leader perceptions of CSPs (Anaf , Drummond, & Sheppard, 2007; Stake, 2000). The multiple case study method was used for this study to explore four cases, each being a real-life contemporary bounded system, using in-depth data collection from multiple sources (Creswell, 2014). I purposefully selected multiple cases to examine different

perspectives of leader perceptions' of CSPs in higher education (Creswell, Hanson, Clark, & Morales, 2007). Using the multiple case study design, I explored the range of findings of how leaders perceive their experiences with CSPs based on their own unique personal experiences and knowledge (Yin, 2003). As each case was compared to the others, any patterns that emerged served to strengthen the findings (Yin, 2003). As a researcher, I interpreted the meaning of each case, whether that meaning came from learning about the specific issue of the case (instrumental case) or from learning about something unique about the case (intrinsic case) (Creswell et al., 2007). Examining multiple cases provided the opportunity for me to analyze the data from within each case and across the four different cases, resulting in rich findings.

I chose to study four cases based on Creswell's (2007) suggestion for the optimal size of a multiple case study to allow for individual cases to be adequately explored. The phenomenon under study in each of my cases was leaders' perceptions of the CSP formation process and the value created by CSPs. I examined CSP leader perceptions based on four cases, with each having a CSP that involved a campus and community partner and that was designed to support the adult student population. According to Merriam (2009), researchers can develop more compelling findings when there are variations across the cases. Each of the four community college settings was different and the eight CSP leaders interviewed were unique, which provided me with the opportunity to identify common and contrasting findings both within and across the four cases.

Sampling

I used a purposeful sampling approach (Merriam, 2009) to identify sites and individuals who would provide the greatest volume of insightful information related to my research questions. I engaged in four levels of sampling. First, I situated the study in the context of local, state, and national programs created to support adult students, particularly related to workforce

development needs. Next, I selected a state with high levels of participation in and support for programs to support adult students. Third, I selected community colleges in that state. To be eligible for selection, a community college needed to have at least one currently active CSP related to workforce development in the context of a program to support adult students in operation for at least one year. This would allow enough time for leaders to have formed perceptions of the CSPs. I selected cases in a rural setting based on available case sites in order to focus on leader perceptions in a shared context.

Once I had identified potential case sites, I determined which sites had CSPs that had continuously operated for a long period of time and selected four of these sites. This approach allowed me to identify sites where campus and community CSP leaders had significant history and experience with CSPs. Finally, I selected a sample of campus and community CSP leaders and obtained a sample of partnership-related documents, when available, at each site. Leaders with direct responsibilities for the CSPs were the primary participants in my study. One campus and one community CSP leader were identified for each case.

I also developed a sample of partnership-related documents, whenever available, that included such documents as apprenticeship partnership agreements, grant applications, marketing materials, and progress reports. Apprenticeship partnership agreement documents were especially useful to describe the purpose of the partnership, what each partner was contributing to the partnership, and the expected outcomes of the partnership. I obtained partnership-related documents by requesting such documents from the campus and community leaders of each CSP. In the following sub-sections, I describe each level of the sampling process in greater detail.

Study context: Education and training programs serving the adult student

population. The context for this study was education and training programs designed to support adult students, such as workforce development programs on local, state, and national levels.

Preliminarily, I used lists of colleges participating in various national programs to support older students in order to identify the broader sampling frame for this study. Such programs included the Plus 50 program, the Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program, and AARP's Back to Work 50+ program and Back to Work 50+: Women's Economic Stability Initiative.

These examples of national programs provide evidence of the emerging movement to support older students' education and training needs to secure gainful employment.

The Plus 50 program, a privately funded national initiative of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), was created to support employment-related education and training for the adults age 50 and older. The Plus 50 program was established in 2008 and expanded in several stages with different program iterations through 2015 (Lumina Foundation, 2015). While the program was active, it provided a model for community colleges interested in designing education and training programs for the older student population, according to the *Plus 50 Initiative: Standards of Excellence* report (LFA Group, 2010). The program ended in 2015 when its private funding concluded.

A second example of a national program to support workers age 50 and older is the U.S. Department of Labor's Title V Older Worker program, a division of which is called the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). Sixteen states had various types of organizations participating in this program. The Title V program places older workers at area non-profit agencies in dire need of support where they typically receive on the job training or training from other sources.

In response to the need for the education and training of older workers, the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) created the Back to Work 50+ Network in 2014, serving as a third example of a national program to support the older worker population. Thirteen states had community colleges and organizations participating in this program (Back to Work 50+ Community Locations, March, 2018). This program involves a partnership between the AACC and the AARP. To strengthen and expand its program, the AACC offers a partnering opportunity to community colleges around the nation. Partners benefit from learning from each other and have access to valuable resources. At the time I selected sites for this study, 10 community colleges in the nation were participating as partners (AARP, 2018).

The state and local level responses to supporting older workers are ongoing and vary by location. Individual states, in cooperation with their community colleges, are continually developing workforce development programs that are designed to meet the changing employment needs of older workers. Such programs include robust apprenticeship programs, back-to-work readiness certification programs, training for technology jobs, and specific training for jobs that are locally in demand, especially in advanced manufacturing. Community colleges within each state play a key role in providing these types of education and training through their workforce and continuing education programs. I considered such community college programs in the development of the population of my study. Community college leaders informed me of such programs on a local level when approached about programs to support adult students. In some cases, the local support programs operated in conjunction with a state or national program. Funding for certain national workforce programs tends to fluctuate, so it turned out that state and locally developed programs to support adult students provided related campus and community CSPs having greater longevity to study more in-depth.

State and institutional selection. To determine my institutional sample, I began by consulting the map of community colleges that participated in the Plus 50 program (Lumina, 2015). I identified the two states that had the most participating community colleges, reflecting to some degree the state's interest in supporting adult students and/or higher level of need based on the age of the state's population. North Carolina and Illinois each had ten participating community colleges. I selected North Carolina to study since it was funding higher education more adequately than Illinois, which was experiencing severe budget constraints that significantly impacted its operations of higher education programs. "Educational appropriations per full-time equivalent student in Illinois drastically reduced by 80% in recent years, down to \$2,196 by 2016" (Seltzer, 2017, n.p.). In contrast, the 2016 educational appropriation per full-time equivalent student in North Carolina was \$8,894 and remained at a consistent level of funding from prior years (College in NC, 2016). Another reason I selected North Carolina for my study was because eleven organizations in North Carolina participated in AARP's program for older students, which was a high rate of participation compared to other states (Career One Stop, n.d.). North Carolina ranked fifth in the country for per-student spending at public colleges and universities and spent \$9,959 per student during the fiscal year 2017, according to the State Higher Education Executive Officers' annual report (Laderman, 2017). North Carolina also has the fifth highest number of community colleges in the nation, along with many other institutions of higher education across the state, providing strong opportunities in higher education statewide. Including community colleges from only one state, North Carolina, allowed me to minimize variations in geography, population, state regulations, politics, policies, and state funding that might have influenced the setting of the institutional samples. In addition, North Carolina's proximity to Blacksburg, VA, allowed me to conduct two of my interviews face-to-face,

supplemented with interviews using Zoom for the other six interviews. Conducting face-to-face interviews when possible allowed for more in-depth data collection based on being able to build a rapport more quickly with the participant, observe the participant's body language, and visit and observe the campus and community sites. These experiences afforded by in-person visits and interviews resulted in rich field notes to complement my interview and document data.

Table 1 illustrates my initial set of community colleges and organizations in North Carolina eligible for the institutional sample that had participated in national programs to support adult students, omitting details that would enhance the risk of deductive disclosure. This initial set comprised a wide range of geographic settings and organization types but it did not provide the full rural North Carolina community college population eligible for this study.

Table 1

Preliminary North Carolina Colleges and Organizations Eligible for Sample Inclusion

Region of the State Location Type Organization

Eastern	Rural	State Community College
Eastern	Urban	State Community College
Central	Rural	State Community College
Eastern	Rural	State Community College
Eastern	Rural	State Community College
Eastern	Rural	State Community College
Central	Rural	State Community College
Eastern	Suburban	State Community College
Eastern	Rural	State Community College
Central	Rural	State Community College
Western	Urban	Regional Planning Agency
Western	Rural	Non-profit
Central	City	Regional Planning Agency
Western	Urban	State Community College
Eastern	City	Non-profit
Central	Urban	County Government
Western	Rural	Non-profit

Central	Rural	Non-profit
Western	Rural	Regional Planning Agency
Eastern	City	Non-profit
Eastern	Urban	Non-profit

Notes: Data for community college region, NC Community Colleges Main Campuses, retrieved from <https://www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/about-us/main-campuses>. Data for type of community college, Campus Setting: Rural, Suburban, Urban, retrieved from <https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/find-colleges/how-to-find-your-college-fit/campus-setting-rural-suburban-urban>.

Thus, I began the identification of the eligible set of rural community colleges in North Carolina by using participation information from the local, state, and national programs described previously. For example, I conducted a website review of the ten former Plus 50 community colleges in North Carolina as an initial method to determine whether the school continued to have some type of program in place to support older students. This process did not yield clear results. As necessary to obtain four cases as advised by Creswell (2007), I explored rural community colleges in North Carolina that participated in other national, state, and local programs to support older workers. Some of the state programs in which community colleges in North Carolina have the opportunity to participate in to support older workers include the Western North Carolina Apprenticeship Alliance, North Carolina Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and the Bio Network. I then inquired by phone to the contacts listed by these programs to confirm whether the college did have an active program to support adult students.

Once I identified four rural community colleges in North Carolina meeting the specifications of having a program in place to support adult learners related in some manner to workforce development, in existence for a considerable length of time beyond one year, and was

participating in a related CSP with a community organization, my sample was full. Eventually, four case study sites were identified for this study. These four cases are described in Chapter 4.

Individual CSP leader sample selection. To determine the individuals best able to provide rich data related to my research questions, I used purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2003). Patton (2002) explained the basis for using purposeful sampling as:

The logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry, thus the term purposeful sampling. Studying information-rich cases yields insights and in-depth understanding rather than empirical generalizations (p. 203).

This process aided my qualitative study by identifying potentially information-rich cases to study, which was the most effective use of my limited resources (Patton, 2002).

To identify participants within each case, I began by determining the campus and community leaders associated with each CSP created to support the adult student population. I used the website of each community college to identify the college contact for the related program, such as a workforce development program. I contacted this person by phone to determine who the CSP campus leader of their program to support adult students was and obtained contact information. This phone script, which was submitted for IRB approval along with all other scripts, can be found in Appendix A. Next, I contacted the CSP campus leader by phone as an introduction and to obtain basic information about the CSP and the contact information for the CSP community leader. This phone script can be found in Appendix B. I requested both campus and community leader participation in an interview via an introductory email, which can be found in Appendix C. Once each CSP leader responded to my introductory

email, I responded with an email, as described in Appendix D, to either thank them for considering my request or to schedule an interview if they agreed to participate.

Thus, for the CSP identified at each of the case study sites, two leaders—one from the participating campus and one from the participating community organization—were identified and contacted to be interviewed in person or via Zoom. In the event there was more than one CSP or more than one CSP leader at a site, I selected the CSP that had been in existence for the greatest amount of time and the leader who had been involved in the CSP for the greatest length of time. I used length of time as my selection criterion for participants since longer history of involvement could result in the collection of richer data.

Data Collection and Analysis Overview

This qualitative study aimed to explore campus and community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created. The study was designed to answer the two main research questions described previously. Using the multiple case study approach, each of the four community colleges having a CSP serving the workforce development and training needs of the adult student population was considered to be a case. Data were collected primarily through personal interviews with the campus and community CSP leaders. A secondary data collection method was partnership-related document review. For each case, whenever available, documents related to the partnership were collected as data. Such documents included formal partnership agreements for apprenticeship programs, reports about partnership progress and outcomes, grant applications, and marketing materials.

The same multi-step data analysis process (Saldaña, 2015) was applied to both the interview transcripts and the partnership-related documents. I identified codes and sub-codes, assigned descriptive terms to these codes, and then grouped these descriptive terms into

categories. The outcome of this coding process resulted in concepts that could then be grouped into themes (Saldaña, 2015). The following sub-sections describe my data collection and analysis in more detail.

Data Collection

The primary method of data collection for this study was personal interviews with campus and community CSP leaders from each of the four cases. A secondary source of data was obtained from the review of the text contained in partnership-related documents, when available. The software program, Dedoose, was utilized to enter, store, code, and analyze these two sets of data.

Personal interviews. Yin (2014) characterized personal interviews as one of the most significant sources of case study evidence. Personal interviews were conducted with campus and community leaders of the CSPs created to support the adult student population at four community colleges in North Carolina. The type of interview used to collect data for this study was semi-structured. The semi-structured interview is flexible, utilizing a mixture of closed and open-ended questions so that new topics which emerge during the interview process can also be explored (Merriam, 2009). The methodology for the personal interviews was either face-to-face or by Zoom. The interviews were approximately 60 minutes in length. The interview questions found in Appendix E were asked of each participant. Data collection included dual audio recordings of the interviews along with limited researcher note-taking. Audio recording of the interviews allowed for all of the words spoken during the interview to be accurately transcribed and available for analysis (Seidman, 2013).

Interview protocols and procedures. I submitted a complete application to conduct research to the IRB at Virginia Tech. I obtained IRB approval from Virginia Tech for my

research, which can be found in Appendix F. I coordinated IRB review with each participating community college. I provided a consent form via email to each participant in advance of their interview, which can be found in Appendix H. I obtained a signed consent form from each participant prior to the start of each interview to fulfill IRB requirements.

I used a semi-structured interview method (Merriam, 1998). My interview questions were based on the key elements of the CVC framework as they informed my two research questions. The focus of the research questions on the formation process and value created was purposeful to elicit campus and community CSP leader perceptions on these two topics. Based on the constructivist approach, my interview questions were designed and ordered to examine how CSP leaders' prior personal experiences played a role in the development of their perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created. My interview questions were also designed to discover how the experience of participating in a CSP to support the adult student population built upon the CSP leader's prior knowledge about such partnerships, the formation process, and value created plus the creation of new knowledge, including any plans for future CSPs.

In advance of my interviews, I conducted a pilot interview with a campus leader, Dr. Susan Short of Virginia Tech, and a community leader, Sue Farrar, the Executive Director of the Montgomery Museum of Art and History in Christiansburg, VA, to pilot the quality of my interview questions with each type of partner. I utilized their feedback and what I learned from the pilot interview experience to modify my interview questions as needed.

To schedule and conduct interviews, I used the procedures previously described. As a follow-up, I sent each community college leader and community organization leader of the CSPs an email to remind them about our upcoming interview and to confirm the date, time, and location. This email script can be found in Appendix G.

I arrived an hour early for each in-person interview or was prepared 30 minutes in advance to begin a Zoom interview on-line. For the in-person interviews, I checked to ensure the room was set up, and in both settings, I tested my two digital audio recording devices. I greeted the participant and had a short informal conversation to put them at ease and to introduce myself to them. Interviews were audio recorded using two recording devices to ensure participants' responses were accurately recorded. I turned on the two digital audio recording devices and asked the participant to state their verbal permission to record the interview. Next, I asked for a pseudonym and used that pseudonym during the audio-recorded interview. I conducted face-to-face or Zoom interviews of the community college leaders and community organization leaders of the CSPs. I asked the interview questions found in Appendix E as previously mentioned, according to the interview protocol I submitted to the IRB. I also took field notes to document my observations of the participants during the interview and of my visual observations of the campus and community sites and settings during a driving tour for the two in-person interviews.

When the interview was completed, I thanked the participant for their participation. The next day, as a follow-up, I sent an email to the participants thanking them for taking the time to participate in the interview and share their experiences with me, found in Appendix I. I transcribed each interview by repeating the interviews orally using voice typing software on Google Docs for accuracy. I then read the transcripts twice and listened to the tapes of each interview again to check for accuracy and made corrections if needed. I sent an email to each participant with a copy of their transcript for review. The email script can be found in Appendix J. I requested to be informed of any inaccuracies in the transcript within one week. I made any changes to transcripts based on participants' feedback. I heard from two interviewees who provided corrections regarding minor program details.

Partnership-related documents. A second source of data for this study was partnership-related documents. As available at each community college, partnership-related documents included formal written apprenticeship partnership agreements, grant applications, marketing materials, and partnership progress reports. “Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research” (Merriam, 1998, p. 118). I used these documents to triangulate the data from the personal interviews with CSP leaders for each case. I requested partnership-related documents from both the campus and community CSP leaders. Partnership-related documents were analyzed through the process of coding and the development of categories, concepts, and pertinent themes.

In some cases, only informal verbal partnership agreements were in place. However, for CSPs that had such documents, the formal apprenticeship partnership agreement document was a direct source of information about leader expectations developed during the partnership formation process regarding partner roles and value creation and correlated with interview data for the cases involved. For example, for the cases that involved state oversight of their programs, such as Case 4, it was notable that their partner agreements for programs such as apprenticeships clearly spelled out the commitments of the partners involved, including the program participant, agreed-upon resources for each partner to contribute, and required formal signatures as a binding agreement. Including these documents in my data set, when possible, allowed me to compare leaders’ initial expectations to leaders’ eventual perceptions of the partner roles and the actual value created by the CSP.

Document analysis is similar to other methods of analysis since data found in each document should be fully analyzed and understood by the researcher. This analysis results in meaning, increased understanding, and produces knowledge about experiences (Corbin &

Strauss, 2008). “Documents contain text and images that have been recorded without the researcher’s involvement, so they serve as an important source of data triangulation (Bowen, 2009, p. 27). Coffey and Atkinson (1997) refer to documents “as ‘social facts’, which are produced, shared, and used in socially organized ways” (p. 47). With this in mind, I used the interview technique to analyze the documents (O’Leary, 2014). I treated each document like an interviewee that provided me with relevant information (O’Leary, 2014). For example in Case 3, the document reporting all of the CSPs the industry was participating in revealed the industry partner’s belief and commitment in the use of CSPs and matched with the commitment to CSPs Community Leader 3 discussed in the interview, backing up this finding.

Data Analysis

As a researcher, it was important for me to be attentive to the data I collected and tentative of my conceptualizations of those data (Dey, 1993). Glasser and Strauss (1967) described the deep level of data analysis involving the process of continually refining the data as “wallowing” in the data. This includes being flexible, open to changes, avoiding theme overlaps, and considering new categories previously unknown (Glasser and Strauss, 1967). Using the constant-comparative approach (Merriam, 2009), I generated meaningful categories in which to group the data, and these became more specific as I grouped and regrouped them over the course of my data analysis. In the following six steps, I describe the data analysis procedure provided by Creswell (2014) which I used to guide my study. I also incorporated reflexivity into my data analysis as a way to monitor how my positionality might be influencing each step of my research process. I further discuss my use of reflexivity in the trustworthiness section later in this chapter.

Data preparation. The first step, as prescribed by Creswell (2014), involved the organization and preparation of my data for analysis. This step included transcribing the personal

interviews of campus and community CSP leaders using professional software designed for this purpose. I typed my field notes describing the case setting, the participants, and their behavior during the interview so these notes would be prepared for entry into Dedoose. I created an annotated bibliography of the partnership-related documents I collected. I made sure each partnership-related document was in a format accepted by Dedoose so that the text could be entered into the software and later coded.

Data review. For the second step of my data analysis, I reviewed the transcribed interviews and the partnership-related documents to gain insights. I reflected in writing on how the data could offer meaning to this study. I read each interview transcript and partnership-related document twice and created memos about my observations before beginning the coding process. For example, if a participant spent an extended period of time talking about the unanticipated benefits of participating in the CSP, I created a memo titled, “unanticipated partnership benefits.” During my document review, I looked for situations such as how well-balanced expected partner contributions were in an apprenticeship partnership agreement. In addition, during my review process, I conducted a limited amount of pre-coding (Saldaña, 2015) of data that caught my attention as being significant or surprising. I utilized this pre-coding later to see how it compared to my overall coding results.

Data coding. I chose to use Dedoose, a qualitative data analysis software program, to code and analyze my data from my transcribed interviews. Dedoose is a web-based platform, so I was able to store and access my data from any location, which provided convenience while collecting and analyzing my data from remote locations. The cloud storage was secure and could be regularly backed up in order to protect the data.

I was able to import a variety of types of document formats, including Word, into Dedoose, which allowed me to readily store, code, and analyze all data sources. The starting point for using Dedoose was to enter all of my text files from my interview transcripts into the software file. Then, for this third step of the data analysis process, I began by open-coding the data from the transcribed interviews. This involved identifying data that could be relevant to answering my two research questions or otherwise appeared to be significant. While open-coding the interview transcripts, I identified data related to leader perceptions of the formation process. As an example, I coded this remark from Community Leader 4, “We knew that the team better start training people and identifying people” as “purpose for forming the CSP.”

Next, I uploaded my second data set, the text of the various partnership-related documents and performed the open-coding process. I assigned descriptive terms to the open-codes from the interview transcripts and the partnership-related documents as a continuation of the coding process. For example, the partnership pledge document for Case 3 included this text, “I commit my time and resources and those of my employees to participate in the above activities”, so I created a code of “leader commitment” and a descriptive term of “resource sharing.” I also utilized components of the CVC framework to create some pre-conceived codes (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) to identify these descriptive terms, such as transferred resources, when applicable.

To further illustrate the use of pre-conceived codes based on the CVC, for the formation process I looked for data related to partner selection, partner roles, the purpose of the partnership, and data about partner leadership (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b). In regard to value creation, I looked for data related to the following four types of value which were used as pre-conceived codes: associational, transferred resource, interaction, and synergistic (Austin and Seitanidi,

2012a). For example, when Campus Leader 2 said that the community college benefited from partnering with the county government by gaining credibility with industry leaders for working on the skilled labor shortage, I assigned the descriptive term of associational value. If an apprenticeship partnership agreement specified that one partner would gain the use of shared staffing, I assigned the descriptive term of transferred resource. For open-codes that did not align with elements of the CVC, relevant descriptive terms were created.

After all of my interview transcripts and partnership-related documents were open-coded and the codes were assigned descriptive terms, I moved on to the next step of developing categories from my codes. Categories were used to shape the data and show what the data represents (Saldaña, 2015). For example, the descriptive terms of partner roles and shared mission were placed in the category of “elements of formation.” The category of issues between leaders was then used to inform the more general, higher-level concept of the role of leaders in the formation process. The personal interviews of CSP leaders and the partnership-related documents in this study were so rich with meaningful text that the coding process I described served as the optimal method to capture the significance of this detailed data.

Theme development. The fourth step of data analysis involved using the resulting categories or concepts identified in step three to develop emerging themes. These themes describe what this study ultimately reveals. Saldaña (2015) described themes as an outcome of the coding process which describe a more subtle process. For example, a theme that emerged from grouping the concepts of “leader traits” and “leader familiarity” was identified as “leader relationship building.”

To generate themes, I grouped concepts that appeared to be related to each another. I grouped concepts aligned with the key elements of the CVC pertaining to formation and value

created. Leader perceptions of the types of value created in each case were considered in the development of themes related to value creation from the coded interview transcripts and partnership-related documents. During theme development, I considered what leaders learned from participating in CSPs as belonging to the theme of synergistic value from the CVC. I reviewed the concepts resulting from the open-coding of the interview transcripts and partnership-related documents to identify evidence of leader perceptions of learning and about the other types of value identified in the CVC framework.

I also created new themes that did not fit into the CVC constructs. An example of findings unrelated to the CVC constructs was the theme of the role leaders' personal values played in formation process or the theme of the role leader satisfaction played in their commitment to the CSP. I continually revised my themes as I reviewed the complete list of concepts that had emerged and regrouped them. As a researcher, I remained open to the possibility of new and emerging themes generated from the data.

Description of findings. For this step, I decided how to report the themes identified in the previous step in the form of a qualitative narrative to reveal the overall findings of this study. First, I created a narrative section about each of the four individual cases based on the themes that emerged from the data for each case. I described the unique context of each case and assigned a metaphoric name to each case based on its unique characteristics. I developed a summary narrative around the combined theme discoveries from all four cases. I also reported on unique findings that emerged and did not align with the constructs of the CVC framework, both within each case and across the four cases. I used thematic analysis to identify, analyze, and report patterns within and across my two data sets (O'Reilly & Kiyimba, 2015). This approach allowed for the descriptive organization of my data in a way that facilitated the interpretation of

pertinent aspects of my research topic (Boyatzis, 1998). Using multiple sources of data collection, including personal interviews and partnership-related documents, allowed me to triangulate my data, which strengthened my theme development.

Interpretation of findings. For the sixth and final step of my data analysis, I interpreted the findings of this study and reported what I learned. As shown in Chapter Four, a within-case analysis was conducted first for each of the four cases. The resulting themes from each case were interpreted for their meaning, including how or if the themes related to my two research questions. Unique patterns of findings in the themes from each case were identified. Next, I identified and discussed threaded themes that appeared across cases, such as resource contributions and leader relationship building.

I used the core elements of the CVC framework related to the formation process and value creation, as well as emergent concepts unrelated to the CVC, to guide the interpretation of my findings. In addition, I compared themes that were revealed in personal interviews to themes identified in the partnership-related documents for each case. I reported my concluding interpretations based on how the themes from the four cases related to each other. My final step was to determine if any analytical generalizations could be drawn from the four cases in order to support applying the logic of the CVC framework to other CSP situations (Yin, 2009).

Study Delimitations

Every study has delimitations, and this one is no exception. My study was delimited by a series of choices I made throughout my research process. In this section, I describe some of those choices and the rationale for my decisions.

First, I chose to study CSPs in operation at community colleges which were designed to support the adult student population. I investigated the AACC's Plus 50 community college

participation list and found that the Illinois and North Carolina community college systems had the highest participation rates in this program, showing potential evidence of a high level of interest in supporting the adult student population. Since the higher education sector in Illinois is in a state of unrest due to severe funding shortfalls, I chose to study the North Carolina community college system. Thus, my first-tier population was composed of the ten community colleges in North Carolina that chose to participate in the Plus 50 program. I reasoned that the participation of these schools in the AACC Plus 50 program reflected some degree of interest in supporting the adult student population and served as a relevant starting point for broadly identifying my population. Therefore, I made the choice to assume that community colleges that formerly participated in the Plus 50 could potentially have enough interest in supporting adult students to continue a similar program involving partnerships with the community even after the funding for the Plus 50 ended.

However, I knew that I needed to utilize a wider sampling frame in case I could not generate a sufficiently large sample from North Carolina community colleges with prior Plus 50 programs, especially to fulfill my plan to study rural North Carolina community colleges. If additional cases were still needed, I was prepared to consider the eleven organizations in North Carolina participating in a national program, the Department of Labor's SCSEP, to partner with community colleges to provide jobs for senior citizens. My next source for cases, if needed, would have been community colleges participating in the AARP's Back to Work 50+. These national programs were limited in terms of specifically identifying rural community colleges in North Carolina for my population. My final source of cases was rural community colleges participating in state and local workforce development programs related to supporting adult students in North Carolina.

To narrow the scope of my sampling frame so it would be manageable and aligned with my research questions, I made the decision not to include community colleges that had not participated in any local, state, or national programs to support the adult student population. My research questions were intentionally aligned with the CVC framework and were also designed to result in a manageable amount of data to collect.

Several areas of literature were somewhat relevant to the study, but I elected not to include them. First, the literature on remedial education for adults at community colleges was somewhat related, but I chose not to include it since this topic does not necessarily correspond to education and training programs for older adults seeking employment. I also chose not to study life enrichment course programs for older adults at community colleges for the same reason. Lastly, I did not elect to conduct a quantitative study using methods such as surveys because I believed the resulting data would not have been rich enough. The lack of personal conversation and flexibility would not have allowed me to delve more deeply into the perspectives of the participants in my study.

Study Limitations

In addition to its initial delimitations, in the end my study also had several limitations, as all studies do. First, interviews are valuable as they allow participants to share experiences and to express their thoughts and feelings, but they are not flawless (Weiss, 1994). My interviews relied on leaders to provide self-reports of their experiences regarding participating in CSPs related to supporting workforce development and adult students. Since my interview protocol was designed to elicit information about experiences that CSP leaders defined as important, there could be a bias about the data from the point of view of each leader.

A second limitation is potential researcher bias. I reported my positionality to add transparency to my study along with the realization that my positionality contributed to my ability to co-construct the data along with my research participants in a meaningful way. My positionality aided in my interpretation of the data because of the insight I have as a researcher on the topic of campus and community cross-sector partnerships. It is also possible that my belief in the potential benefits of CSPs caused me to view the data in a more positive light.

There were considerations about my population and sample I could not control, resulting in additional limitations to my study, which I acknowledge. Certain colleges that previously participated in national programs for older students might not have continued with similar programs in-house once funding ended for national programs. Finally, I could not control who decided to participate in this study. It was up to each of the campus and community leaders if they were willing to participate in my study.

Trustworthiness

The trustworthiness of this study is based on the extent to which my findings accurately describe the phenomenon studied, campus and community CSP leaders' perceptions of the formation process and value created. The extent to which my procedures for collecting data and developing conclusions are clear and can be replicated by another researcher, and the likelihood that my findings have meaning in other similar situations, also impact the trustworthiness of my study (Krefting, 1991; Streubert & Carpenter, 1999).

Two sources of data collection were used for this study: personal interviews and document review, when available. By interviewing CSP leaders from both campus and community organizations, I explored the voices of leaders from both perspectives about CSP formation and value created. This strengthened the credibility, dependability, and confirmability

of my study (Krefting, 1991). Based on the constructivist paradigm, it was not my goal to determine whether my interpretations of the data were right, because my interpretation of the data brought multiple perspectives into play.

The use of reflexivity at each stage of my research added to the trustworthiness of my findings. “A researcher's background and position will affect what they choose to investigate, the angle of investigation, the methods judged most adequate for this purpose, the findings considered most appropriate, and the framing and communication of conclusions” (Malterud, 2001, pp. 483-484). To document influences of my background and position, I wrote journal entries about my research decisions and the reasons for them along with memos to self-reflect on how my positionality as a researcher might influence the steps of my data analysis.

To increase the confirmability of my study, I also regularly wrote memos describing my work during data analysis to create an audit trail. Dedoose includes a memo-writing system, which supported the documentation of my data analysis decision points and provided reminders to me throughout data analysis to ensure transparency in the way I interacted with my data and interpreted the findings. For each case, I captured a detailed, thick description of the community college or community organization setting to be able to share so people who read my study could feel like they have experienced the case, allowing for appropriate naturalistic generalizations on their part (Stake, 1995). These descriptions also increased the transferability of my study.

I recorded my reactions to the interviewee responses and partnership document text in a journal during the data collections stage. I also noted my emerging interpretations of the data during my data analysis as a form of researcher reflexivity. My research journal provided a first-hand account of any potential researcher bias or preconceptions I might have that could influence my findings. The journal was also a tool to show how my findings emerged from the data itself

during the analysis stage and a record of my ongoing processes, including any modifications along the way.

The following steps were taken to enhance the accuracy of the data to ensure its trustworthiness. Prior to conducting my interviews with CSP leaders, I conducted a pilot study of my interview questions by interviewing two campus and community leaders in person to test the effectiveness of my interview questions on a leader from both sectors. I made some minor adjustments to my protocol based on feedback from each pilot interview. I further enhanced the accuracy of the study by only interviewing informed respondents, the leaders of CSPs, who were all governed by the same state regulations and operated within the same higher education climate, including state funding rates. I did not speak with students, related staff members, or other area employers at each site.

Several components of trustworthiness were enhanced by these steps, such as validity and study replicability. My audio-recorded interviews were transcribed using dedicated software. Next, I gave each participant a copy of the transcript from their interview to review for any corrections needed. I organized my initial codes from each case into themes to make meaning of my research and discussed these themes with my advisor. I also shared and discussed the case descriptions with my advisor as they emerged. Collectively, the measures I have described served to enhance the trustworthiness of my study.

Positionality Statement

As a qualitative researcher whose work is shaped by the constructivist tradition, it is important for me to acknowledge why I am interested in the topic of campus community partnerships. My views as a researcher are considered here because I co-constructed the meanings campus and community leaders made of their CSP experiences (Charmaz, 2006).

Since I designed this study and collected and analyzed the data, it is good practice as a researcher for me to share my related experiences, values, and beliefs that influence my research work on campus community partnerships in this section.

My initial interest in CSPs between education and community began while I was working as a regional planner for a 13-county planning agency in central Tennessee. The value of recycling was gaining prominence as a method to conserve the use of expensive new landfill space based on strict federal standards developed to protect the environment. My position involved connecting local government recycling programs with K-12 schools to raise awareness about recycling. I witnessed how such partnerships could readily accomplish a mutual goal of educating program users and increasing participation in recycling. Even though this was a new practice for both sectors, the CSP thrived due to adequate funding and support and joint agreement on the mission to protect the environment and reduce waste management program costs. This experience led me to believe that the CSP process was facilitated by positive circumstances such as adequate resources and a readily accepted joint mission.

Next, as a project manager for the City of Geneva, Illinois, I coordinated a new marketing CSP between the city and the downtown business association for the purpose of joint marketing. This partnership helped to increase business activity in the downtown area and thereby sales tax revenue and resulted in local businesses feeling supported by the city. This feeling of being supported improved the fragile working relationship between these two sectors. Thus, I witnessed how a CSP with a shared mission, in this case marketing and increasing business activity, could improve the relationship between two sectors. I observed how sectors which were historically at odds on an issue such as business taxation rates could readily form a partnership which was mutually beneficial.

In my role as an economic development practitioner for the City of Radford, Virginia, I was introduced to the concept of the “invisible wall” which existed between the city and the university. The relationship between these two sectors was a negative one at that time based on points of contention between residents and students, such as loud noise levels and property destruction and their impacts on neighborhoods and property values. I was tasked with representing the city in a new partnership for the arts, the Radford Highlander Festival, which was purposefully created to improve relations between the city and Radford University by celebrating the Scottish heritage of the city. I observed how the process of forming this CSP for the arts helped to break down the “invisible wall” and pushed the two entities to work together on a mutually beneficial project. I saw first-hand during meetings how hard it was for leaders to give up established territory and decision-making authority that were previously held close. I also witnessed how individual leader perceptions as well as traits and behaviors influenced the formation process and value created by this CSP. I found it to be an unnecessary void that there was such a relationship gap between the university and the city which had been preventing them from working together towards mutual progress to benefit all the city’s residents. This experience greatly piqued my interest in creating other types of campus community partnerships to improve relationships between sectors and accomplish shared missions.

As a community engagement practitioner at Virginia Tech, I observed the challenges of forming a CSP when a power imbalance of resource levels and influence exists between a major university and small, local non-profits. I observed that this power imbalance made it challenging for the local non-profits to feel like they had an equal voice in partnerships designed in some cases to create student and faculty engagement opportunities. By engaging with non-profit leaders and becoming aware of their interest level in CSPs as well as their reservations, I gained

an understanding of how CSPs had the potential to be used to build capacity for both partners over the long term if trust and relationship quality could be enhanced through the process of collaborating on a more jointly agreed upon mission. I became interested in the ways in which trust could be built and maintained using best practices for CSPs keeping the smaller voice of the community partner in mind.

I experienced how readily all sectors of a community could join forces during a crisis during the time of the April 16, 2007 tragedy at Virginia Tech. Locally, the entire New River Valley banded together to help the community at large through this crisis. This experience taught me that when partners from each sector willingly remove all barriers to partnership formation, the community at-large can benefit immensely. I witnessed how immense progress can be made quickly toward a mutual goal, which in this case was healing and recovery. I observed that a crisis could inspire an intense spirit of cooperation that remains for as long as needed to serve a mission but can eventually diminish. This experience revealed to me how once the needs of a crisis were met, the lack of available resources to sustain support for related campus community partnerships impacted the positive relationship gains derived from uniting during a crisis to a certain extent. However, it was uplifting to be a part of the experience of all sectors of the community working together for a common mission, which was a positive outcome of a major tragedy. Members of various sectors in the community, including myself, witnessed the advanced level of progress that can be made when sectors collaborate and are united by a common mission or through sharing a common experience.

These combined experiences led me to my doctoral work in higher education with an emphasis on the study of a particular type of CSP, campus community partnerships. In addition, through my work as a Graduate Assistant in the Department of Engineering Education at

Virginia Tech, I had the opportunity to witness first-hand how a CSP between higher education, industry, and K-12 education can operate effectively and develops over time. This CSP was created to increase middle school students' exposure to the field of engineering and careers in engineering in an Appalachian setting. Assisting with the analysis of data from this research project has created a new interest area for me of how to utilize CSPs with industry to bring diversity into the classroom as well as strengthening my belief in campus community partnerships. I was very impressed by the relationship building that developed between the university and the middle school teachers during this project and I can envision the potential for future similar projects to foster an interest in STEM careers beginning in K-12.

I believe campus community partnerships have a high potential for positive and mutually beneficial results, possibly in ways that are yet to be explored. My thinking has been further shaped by my research about CSPs in general plus campus community CSPs, specifically, woven throughout my doctoral coursework, internship, and independent research experiences. I acknowledge that I bring my belief in the formation of campus community partnerships to benefit society into my research. I have been purposeful in taking a constructivist view of the data throughout this research process to study the full spectrum of campus community leaders' perceptions of CSPs to support adult students. The process of conducting this research taught me to be open-minded to what research participants have to say to be able to collect the best data for my study and provide the most trustworthy data analysis possible.

Summary

This chapter provided detailed information about the methodology used in this qualitative study of campus and community leader perceptions of the CSP formation process and value created. The context for this study is community college programs involving a CSP which served

the adult student population. Purposeful sampling was used to identify community colleges in North Carolina that had workforce development programs in place to support adult students and a corresponding CSP. A multiple case study approach was employed to elicit perceptions from CSP leaders in each community college setting. I collected data from campus and community leaders in four cases of community colleges with workforce development-related CSPs designed to support adult students, through personal interviews conducted face-to-face or via Zoom. A second data source was the available partnership-related documents for each case. Transcribed interviews and partnership-related documents for each case were analyzed using open coding. Themes were identified from these codes corresponding to the core elements of the CVC related to formation and value creation for each case. When present, themes unrelated to the CVC were also identified in each case. I remained open to the possibility of outliers and negative cases during my data analysis and identified emerging themes. The findings were compared within and across each case. This chapter also described strategies I used for enhancing the trustworthiness of the study, along with the delimitations and limitations of the study. My positionality as a researcher was included to illustrate how my experiences and beliefs influenced my research process. Chapter Four discusses the findings of my data collection and my analysis of these data in detail.

CHAPTER FOUR STUDY FINDINGS

This multi-site case study explored campus and community leader perceptions of the CSP) formation process and the value created from participating in a CSP. Austin and Seitanidi (2012b) determined that the CSP formation process is significant because it sets the stage for the collaboration required to create value throughout the life of the CSP. The formation process is also critical for initial relationship building and establishing trust between partners (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011). This study utilizes the Collaborative Value Creation framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) to explore the CSP formation process and expanded types of value gained from participating in a CSP. Understanding more about value creation is important because “there has been an insufficient treatment of how the various collaboration processes contribute differently to value creation as well as an often underspecified, vague, and uneven assessment of different types of value” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b, p. 930).

Data for this study were collected from personal leader interviews and a variety of case documents shared about four community college cases involving a CSP between a campus and community organization in predominantly rural areas of western North Carolina. Each community college participated in a CSP involving a workforce-related program to support adult learners based on a high demand for a skilled labor force. Flyvbjerg (2001) argued for an increased use of case studies for comparison of unique experiences, particularly as a critical social science tool to examine the role of values and power. The use of this multi-case study approach allowed for a detailed and up-close examination of both the campus and community leaders’ perceptions of CSP formation and value created within the context of each of the four unique community college cases. My study utilizes the power of learning from the stories told by

the campus and community leaders in each case to make meaning, as espoused by Donmoyer (1995).

This chapter begins with a description of each case and the elements of the formation process perceived as important by the campus and community leaders interviewed. The case descriptions serve as a foundation for the presentation of more detailed findings in the sections that follow. Case descriptions include the setting of each case, the partners involved from different sectors, why and how the partners were selected, the reason for forming the CSP, the initial structure of the CSP, a basic description of the CSP leaders interviewed, and the unique aspects of each case. The case descriptions also include findings from the unique case documents and a discussion of how these findings relate to or support the interview findings in each case. A metaphorical name was given to each case to highlight the “personality” of each CSP that emerged throughout the data analysis. This use of metaphors as a descriptive tool is helpful for visualizing and understanding each case and highlighting different themes (Morgan, 1996). Khan and VanWynsberghe (2008) proposed that “mobilization of case knowledge occurs when researchers accumulate case knowledge, compare, and contrast cases, and in so doing produce new knowledge” (p. 71). Therefore, this section concludes with a cross-case comparison about the basic features of the cases and the formation process for each CSP.

Next, the leader perceptions of value created in each case are presented and compared, using the four different types of value themes from the CVC framework – associational, transferred resource, interactive, and synergistic (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) – as a guide. Additional themes related to value creation also emerged from data analysis. These themes included leader satisfaction, leader relationships, the personal values held by leaders, communication, and the impact of CSP participation on leaders. After presenting these themes, I

discuss the leaders' perceptions of the value created by the CSP, weaving in the initial expectations of each leader. Next, for each case, I describe how leaders' perceptions of the actual value created differed from their expectations. Finally, I present comparisons about value creation across the cases to reveal greater depth within these findings and a comparison of the different documents shared by the leaders in each case.

I use several terms throughout this chapter. *Campus partner* refers to a higher education partner, such as the community college in each of these cases. A *community partner* is any organization in the community, such as an industry, local government, K-12 schools; or a non-profit organization, such as an economic development organization or Chamber of Commerce. The *formation process* includes steps taken from the time someone has the idea to form a CSP leading into the implementation phase. *Value* can be described as any type of benefit derived from participating in a CSP.

Case Descriptions and Key Elements of the Formation Process

This section provides a description of the basic features of each of the four cases in this study, along with my findings about the leader perceptions of key elements of the formation process. Similarities and differences in these two topic areas were found across the four cases. Consistent with multi-site case study methodology (Yin, 2003), the depth of each case was drawn from rich stories the campus and community leaders shared with me during personal interviews about their lived experiences participating in a CSP, starting with the formation process. Table 2 summarizes the basic features of each case followed by a cross-case comparison of these features.

Table 2.

Summary of Case Features

Case Feature	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4
Metaphor	Phoenix	Beehive	Compass	Treasurer
Setting	Rural, southwestern NC, adjacent to an urban area	Rural, southwestern NC, near a metropolitan area	Rural, central western NC, near an urban area	Rural, southwestern NC, adjacent to a metropolitan area
CSP Type	Community college, economic development organization, industries	Community college, county government, industries	Community college, Chamber of Commerce, economic development organization, industries, school system	Community college, industries, businesses
Campus Leader	College Administrator	College Administrator of Economic and Workforce Development	College Administrator of Workforce and Continuing Education	College Administrator of Economic and Workforce Development
Community Leader	Economic Development Organization Administrator	County Government Department Head of Continual Improvement	Industry Manager	Industry Manager
Years of Operation	6-10	1-5	6-10	1-5
Documents Collected	Apprenticeship Partner Agreement Partnership Descriptions	Grant Application with Program Description Public Information and Recruitment Presentation Industry Partner Recruitment Presentation CSP Marketing Materials	Community Leader CSP Progress Report for Corporate Office Apprenticeship Partner Agreement Partner Pledge Form CSP Marketing Materials	Apprenticeship Partner Agreement CSP Marketing Materials

Comparison of Case Features

The four cases shared several common features, including setting, roles, purposes, and guiding documents. First, each case was situated in rural, western, North Carolina, so the cases shared geographic, economic, and cultural similarities. For each case, a community college was the campus partner, and was collaborating with some type of organization from the community, labeled as the community partner. In contrast, the community partners in each case represented different sectors, such as non-profit economic development organizations, county government, business, and industry. Each partner had some kind of connection to workforce development, whether it was providing training, apprenticeships, support to business and industry, or a source of stakeholders. All of the partners of the CSPs had a vested interest in the vitality of their particular community at large.

The campus and community leaders interviewed represented a variety of roles within their organizations but shared the sub-group similarity of either working for a campus or community organization. Each leader held a similarly high-ranking position within their organization, so they had considerable authority with which to engage jointly in CSP leadership and decision making. Each leader was held accountable to a higher authority in their organization, whether that was a college president, advisory board, county commissioners, or corporate office, as well as to the stakeholders they serve. The high ranking of the CSP leaders helped to lend visibility and credibility to the CSPs they were engaged in.

Document Highlights

A wide variety of pertinent sample documents, as permitted based on confidentiality and availability, was collected from the CSP leaders as a second data source for this study. The documents held meaning and purpose for each associated case, as shown in Appendix K.

Examples of how the case documents relate to the interview findings can be found in each case description.

The marketing materials and press documents shared with me, showing positive CSP results such as increased program participation levels since the start of each CSP, coincided with feedback from the CSP leaders that the CSPs were progressing better than anticipated. In comparison to the importance tied to a formal partnership agreement, Campus Leader 2 reported that one of the most significant document types for the formation of their CSP was actually the initial meeting attendance sheets, not an official partnership document. It was critical for the success of such a major community-wide undertaking and buy-in for interested leaders of partnering organizations to regularly attend meetings regarding the CSP's formation.

For the cases that involved state oversight of their programs, such as Case 4, it was notable that their partner agreements for programs such as apprenticeships clearly spelled out the commitments of the partners involved, including the program participant, and required formal signatures. In contrast, none of the cases with state oversight used a formal document to establish the actual CSP, as all negotiations were conducted verbally. Additionally, the CSPs in all four cases had been operating for three or more years, so they had similar partnership maturity levels and were all in an on-going implementation phase rather than the initial formation stage. Overall, the four cases shared common features such as setting and purpose, which helped to distinguish what can be learned from the unique nature of each case, including the varying ways documents were utilized to support each CSP.

Case 1: The Phoenix – Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process

Case 1, The Phoenix, is a CSP between a community college, a regional economic development organization, and multiple local industries. The setting of Case 1 is a rural county

in the western region of North Carolina adjacent to an urban area. The service district of this community college is experiencing an aging workforce. The CSP was created between five and ten years ago to address the needs of local industry. This region is now in an economic growth phase and is experiencing a critical shortage of skilled workers to meet the needs of potential new companies being recruited to the area. To meet this need, the CSP established an apprenticeship program about three years prior to data collection for this study to provide opportunities for adult students in advanced manufacturing. The Apprenticeship Partner Agreement Document for this CSP reflects the careful planning that was involved with its formation, including partner selection, the roles of partners, expectations of the partners, the cost equity and cost-sharing built into this CSP, steps taken for the sustainability of the CSP such as required staffing, and compliance with state regulations. The Current Partnership Summary Report revealed several other CSPs the college is involved with related to workforce development, showing the major focus on this issue.

For Case 1 (The Phoenix), the CSP leaders interviewed included a community college administrator (Campus Leader 1) and an economic development organization administrator (Community Leader 1). Both of these leaders became a part of this existing CSP less than five years ago. The influx of new leadership helped to revive this dormant CSP and give it new purpose.

Campus Leader 1 reported that the purpose for creating a new apprenticeship program through this existing CSP was that the manufacturing sector was growing significantly, resulting in a workforce shortage that needed to be addressed. According to Campus Leader 1:

When I first joined this partnership as part of my new role with the college, all these industries were really screaming for employees. If we didn't feed them skilled workers, they were going to leave our area. Using the existing partnership to create an

apprenticeship program just had to happen, but it was actually a natural organic kind of activity for this partnership.

Campus Leader 1 elaborated, “The community’s priority to attract jobs to the area was a challenge which was both economic and political in nature. The community’s vision was to continue to recruit industry, yet the necessary workforce was not available.” Campus Leader 1 explained that the reason for selecting the economic development organization to partner with was that local industries wanted workers, but not just any workers, as specific skills are needed to perform advanced manufacturing. The college viewed itself as a logical partner for this CSP: “They couldn’t find the workforce and we are a training entity and a feeder for all those companies, so it was just a natural fit” (Campus Leader 1). The role of the campus leader in this CSP included significant efforts to first build up the internal support for the college departments that would be involved with operating this CSP. “My role is making sure that my team that actually works directly with the partnership, that their efforts are supported, their efforts are resourced, and that I’m getting information to them about how we can reach a certain population” (Campus Leader 1).

For the community partner, the main expectation of this CSP was to meet the needs of existing employers and to generate an adequate supply of skilled labor to attract new industry to the region. After receiving direct input from industry stakeholders, the community organization began considering adding a new program to the existing CSP to address these concerns.

According to Community Leader 1, “I had the experience of being approached by one industry partner and then a second one to explore the idea of having an apprentice program to develop more skilled workers, so I knew the need was there.” The community college was a likely and familiar partner in this effort to expand the available pool of skilled workers. Community Leader 1 explained how this familiarity helped with creating the apprenticeship program:

We work with the community college on multiple workforce initiatives. Our organization works with over 100 manufacturers locally and the college is working with that same number—that same population, helping them with customized training. So really from the time XYZ industry comes into town, they know about our training and that we work hand-in-hand with the community college. So the apprenticeship program came to us from an industry who was interested in creating this, but at the same time they were talking to the college about creating this program, so we just decided to work together—let's meet the needs of industry!

The campus and community leaders of this CSP actively involved the industry leaders in the formation process, revealing an inclusive and participatory approach to formation. As part of the revival of this CSP, Community Leader 1 decided to directly involve local industry leaders as partners to recruit additional industry partners right from the start, and explained why and how that process worked:

So we always believe it's easier when you have industry backing our programs. The college and us can say, "Hey, we think this is a great idea." But until industries agree to actually use a program, it doesn't make any sense. So when one industry came to us and then a second potential industry partner, we put it back on the industries to interview who else they wanted in the room. So that's how we got to a total of four employers for this project initially.

Distinctive Features of the Case

One of the unique aspects of this case was that the two campus and community leaders interviewed were pre-alliance champions (Rondinelli & London, 2003). Each leader had a strong drive to support a partnership to address the need for skilled workers in the region as this goal directly related to the mission of each organization. Both leaders were accustomed to working with CSPs and were aware of the potential to meet a need through a CSP, each bringing this philosophy into their new roles. According to Campus Leader 1, "We partner with everybody! We also have a philosophy that we don't do anything by ourselves." In addition, Community Leader 1 was previously connected to the campus, which gave this leader a built-in understanding of the campus partner.

A second unique aspect of this CSP was the high level of personal and professional satisfaction the leaders derived from participating in the CSP, which was an emerging value theme in this case. “The body of work will speak for itself,” according to Campus Leader 1, showing a high level of personal and professional satisfaction with the work associated with this CSP, rather than seeking the reward of public recognition. “It’s just rewarding to me to be involved” (Campus Leader 1). Because of the way the community leader witnessed lives being dramatically improved through participation in the apprenticeship program, Community Leader 1 expressed, “It becomes a much more personal thing than a lot of the work that we do.”

A third unique aspect was the spirit of altruism expressed by both CSP leaders, which emerged as a theme about leader personal values during the coding process. The leaders were not specifically concerned about individual or organizational gain. The altruistic spirit of the two leaders carried over into the CSP. Campus Leader 1 revealed this spirit of altruism in these remarks:

You set your ego aside when you’re in a partnership. You set yourself and your organization aside. You make a decision that “we’re in this for the good of the group.” When it comes time for recognition it’s okay if you don’t get it, because the benefit will come to you in some manner along the way.

Community Leader 1 also shared insight about the benefits of working together for the common good, “I think that it’s probably cheesy and cliché to say, together everyone achieves more, but that’s the truth.”

Metaphorical Description

The metaphorical name selected for Case 1 was The Phoenix. According to ancient Greek mythology, a phoenix is a bird that represents rebirth, transformation, and renewal. The phoenix aptly represents this case since the two new CSP leaders described how they created a rebirth of this CSP, restoring a non-functioning CSP into an effective partnership and expanding its scope

and purpose. The addition of new leaders to this CSP rejuvenated the campus and community organizations' commitment to the mission of the CSP. The original purpose for creating this CSP remained constant, so the entrance of new leadership naturally restored this CSP, along with the support of their corresponding organizations and community buy-in of the new apprenticeship program.

Case 2: The Beehive - Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process

Case 2, The Beehive, is a CSP between a community college, the county government, and local industries. The CSP was created less than five years ago to create a program to provide viable career paths for residents who were unemployed or underemployed, and to meet the extreme need for skilled labor in the county. The Grant Application for this CSP echoes the urgent need for this partnering program to address the shortage of skilled labor and provide a living wage for residents in order to reduce poverty in the county. The program provides fully paid training for specific career paths so that participants can earn while they learn instead of remaining in a dead-end job at low pay. Upon completion of this program, graduates have the opportunity to interview with each of the industry partners, frequently receiving multiple job offers.

For Case 2, the two CSP leaders interviewed included a community college administrator in the area of economic and workforce development (Campus Leader 2) and a county government department head who worked in the area of continual improvement (Community Leader 2). The setting of Case 2 (The Beehive) is a rural county in southwestern North Carolina near a metropolitan area. The county is beginning to feel the effects of an aging workforce. The high rate of poverty in this county, specifically for adult women, weakens the tax base and is significantly higher than the national average poverty rate of 13.4% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Campus Leader 2 reported that women in this county are typically employed in low-paying industries such as retail, fast food, and sales. This situation is described as a barrier to advancement in the Grant Application for the CSP. In response, the county is actively seeking to build on its largest employment sector, manufacturing, by attracting new industry to provide additional quality jobs for its residents. However, there is a critical shortage of skilled workers necessary to recruit such new industry.

The community partner played an active role in the formation and coordination of this CSP. Here is how Community Leader 2 described this role:

We are really, I guess I would say, we're the catalyst, if you will. Our role is mainly to do the organizing. We organized the industries. We helped organize the class. We do all of the screening and applications for people who are going to be a part of the class so we kind of serve as the back end facilitating everything. You know, there's lots of facilitation of doing industry tours and doing interviews and managing the different instructors and class expectations and things like that. And we incorporated a 501C3 non-profit in order to have a third party be an independent and charitable organization to handle all of the finances and things of that nature for this partnership.

The public presentations, included in the documents for this case, were used for information sharing and recruiting and illustrate the grassroots work done by the community partner to raise awareness about two critical issues in the county—the lack of skilled labor and cyclical poverty. These presentations were regularly made to community organizations including local churches, as well as business and industry-related organizations. The presentations revealed what the CSP planned to accomplish and what it would take to make this happen. This same information was shared with me by the leaders and reinforced and elaborated upon by the data in the presentation documents. The community leader in this CSP made the greatest effort out of all of the cases to reach out to each segment of the population to provide information about this CSP and the associated opportunities for local residents, as part of the formation process. As a result, the number of applicants has grown for each training cohort.

Campus Leader 2 reported that part of the reason for forming this CSP was to address the underemployment needs of residents (inadequate pay, lack of advancement opportunities, and no benefits). According to Campus Leader 2, “We’re really targeting those people who have a great work history and strong work ethics and they just can’t afford to leave their jobs to be educated and trained in order to prepare for a better career.” Community Leader 2 added:

We wanted to meet the need of skilled workers for local manufacturers while at the same time we recognized that through some survey data and Census data, that we have a large population in our community who are working full time but who are making less than a living wage. They’re working in a dead-end job like retail, fast food, or in the restaurant business with no, I guess, bridge, to give them an opportunity to better themselves. And so our goal was to kind of connect those two issues and put them together and see if we could connect the people in those jobs to skills to get them a career for personal growth and that would also help industries, on the other side, with staffing.

When determining who to partner with for the education component of this CSP, Community Leader 2 explained, “We thought the community college was an obvious partner because the county doesn’t do a lot of training, so we knew that we would need them on board to help figure out the required coursework for this program.” The marketing materials shared from this case showed how the campus partner played a key role in revamping the curriculum needed for job training, in cooperation with local industry partners. Campus Leader 2 realized the importance of each partner knowing their respective roles in the CSP, which helped to facilitate a smooth formation process:

We don’t get into the hiring because we feel like that’s the industries’ role. Our role is to train students and to educate students, so I think as long as we understand where we fit in that model, in that puzzle, I think we’re fine. And that’s kind of how we look at it. The resource that we’re going to provide you is the training component of it, whether it’s a short-term certificate that we’re doing or whether it’s an associate degree or an apprenticeship or an internship, you know, it’s all education related.

The first industry partners were among the four largest industries in the county and the ones that the CSP leaders knew had significant staffing opportunities. To create a CSP with multiple industry partners and continually expand, Campus Leader 2 explained what was needed:

I think the trust was already there before we created this new CSP and here's why. I took a position related to training when I first started working for the college. The President said to me that we needed to build trust with industries. He said, "You have to become the face of the college as it relates to industries in the community." So I would attend meetings. I would do a lot of presentations. For two years, we just laid a lot of groundwork. We built a lot of trust with industries and other partners as well. So that's why I think the trust was already there and major industries were willing to join the partnership. Our industries just needed some solutions to the problems that were already defined together.

Distinctive Features of the Case

The most unique aspect of Case 2 (The Beehive) is that it is situated in a county whose key leaders all have a full understanding of the benefits of CSPs based on their previous experiences collaborating in CSPs across the county. As a result, there are continually multiple, active CPSs designed to address a variety of community needs. Frequent contact through CSPs, both past and present, resulted in leaders from many sectors being closely intertwined professionally and familiar with each other personally, creating a family-style work atmosphere within this county.

A second unique aspect of this CSP is that area leaders looked for a CSP model outside of their own region to create a partnership to solve a local issue. The CSP in Case 2 (The Beehive) is loosely modeled after an employment program that local leaders explored in person at a major city in a nearby state. This model program created a non-profit organization to fund the program through financial contributions from multiple industry partners. This same approach became an integral part of the structure of the CSP in Case 2 (The Beehive). The unique financial structure of this CSP was outlined in the Grant Application shared for this study. The innovative

CSP funding mechanism required industry partners to make a significant financial commitment. To attract industry partners, the community partner took a targeted approach to obtain feedback from industry leaders during the formation process:

We knew that our idea was a little bit different and probably would take them awhile to bring them up to speed as to what we were thinking about doing, so we thought having the county manager call and say, "You know, this is kind of what we are thinking about doing. We'd like to get your feedback and see if this is a viable option for solving some of your issues." If you're the HR director and you get a call from the county manager, you're going to pick up! (Community Leader 2)

Another component borrowed from the model program was requiring participating employers to guarantee a certain wage to participants hired after the end of the training, thus helping to alleviate poverty.

A third unique aspect of this CSP is that program participants take a personal risk of quitting their current employment in order to participate. Participants are paid full-time wages during the training program at the community college, but there is no guarantee of a job at the end of the training — only a guarantee of being interviewed by all of the participating industries. The challenges faced by stakeholders were addressed in the marketing materials shared for this case. These challenges are offset by the fact that to date, every participant has secured a job offer.

Metaphorical Description

Case 2 was given the metaphorical name of The Beehive because it was humming with CSP leader-connected activity. After conducting the campus and community leader interviews for this case, it became apparent that they and other leaders of various sectors in the county constantly cross paths and interact with one another while engaging in a wide variety of CSP efforts, including planning for and creating new CSPs. The continuous CSP activity and interactions between CSP leaders, combined with a growing comfort and familiarity with

working together, strongly resembled the way a colony of bees actively gathers pollen from around the community and then buzzes around the hive making a valuable end product—honey. Similarly, the combined efforts of the CSP leaders in this case also resulted in a community reward: the community was strengthened each time a problem was jointly addressed. As described in the marketing materials and public presentations from this case, the program outcome of a stakeholder securing a skilled labor job and earning an attractive salary helped to alleviate some of the poverty in the county and provided skilled employees for local industries. Through their participation in this CSP, leaders continually renewed their belief in the benefits of participating in CSPs and the value of dedicating their limited time, energy, and resources towards accomplishing shared goals.

Case 3: The Compass – Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process

Case 3, The Compass, is a CSP between a community college, a county-wide Chamber of Commerce, a county-wide economic development organization, local industries, and a local school system. The CSP was created by the community college six years ago to address the needs of local manufacturers, help them succeed, and strengthen the economic vitality of the region. Local industry leaders were interested in participating in this CSP because they urgently needed help filling the shortage of skilled workers in the area.

Case 3 (The Compass) is situated in a small, southwestern rural county in North Carolina in the vicinity of a metropolitan area. About a third of its workforce is employed in manufacturing, so this CSP focuses on the support of local manufacturers. The county has a high poverty rate and is experiencing an aging workforce (U.S. Census, 2015). The county's population has been gradually declining, creating a particularly critical shortage of skilled workers, especially to meet the needs of potential new companies being recruited to the area.

However, significant growth is on the horizon for this county based on long range development planning in the region, so being able to support the needs of new and existing employers will become even more essential.

For Case 3 (The Compass), the CSP leaders interviewed included a community college administrator of workforce and continuing education programs (Campus Leader 3) and a local industry manager (Community Leader 3). Campus Leader 3 shared in the CSP Progress Report an appreciation for the benefits of participating in CSPs, noting that forming CSPs with other area community colleges, school systems, local industry, and businesses is essential to ensuring the vitality of the college, as well. According to Campus Leader 3, “The idea was that bringing manufacturers together in one room with the organizations that support them, could help us more easily hear what the industries’ needs are and how best we could position them to be successful.” For example, a current issue being addressed by this CSP, as well as by another related CSP, is retaining recent graduates to live and work in the area, according to Community Leader 3:

It is one of our main problems and I think I speak for all of the employers in the area, because I’ve heard it so much while participating in this partnership. We have a hard time selling ourselves to local residents, including the younger people, for a couple of different reasons. First of all, the [product name] industry took such a downturn in 2008 and their parents and grandparents were laid off. So in turn they’re telling their kids and grandkids, “Don’t stay and work here because it’s a risky operation. You’re probably going to be laid off.” It’s hard to overcome that stigma with workers here of all ages. Secondly, younger people are not aware of how much new technology plays a role in manufacturing and the variety of job types involved. Older workers don’t know about all of the training we offer, either.

An overall shortage of workers is an ongoing issue for this area. According to Community Leader 3, “Our area struggles for employees and that was even before the unemployment was as low as it is now. So pretty much we are at full employment—anybody and everybody out there who wants a job has a job.” Community Leader 3 explained how tackling these employment issues directly related to the reason for becoming involved in this CSP as an industry partner:

Well, the main driver for me, like I said, was to educate the community about what we do so that we could attract employees—whether it’s young people or their parents or grandparents looking for that second career or their post-retirement job or whatever. We were having a hard time recruiting. A lot of people living here would drive by our building and say, “I don’t know what they do there!” We have good, clean, well-paying jobs with futures for young people and for all ages and management positions available. I wanted the word to get out to the community about what our company has to offer for employment so that’s why I really started participating in this manufacturing partnership.

The community partner’s commitment to strengthening the community, as a major employer, is featured in the CSP marketing materials, which outline the strong career options available, describe how the industry supports continuing education, and highlight the efforts of non-profit organizations to lift up the community.

Distinctive Features of the Case

This case illustrates the many steps involved in CSP formation and the value of careful planning that involves all partners from the start to foster cooperation and fairness, which can result in a payoff in the long run:

So in a group setting we had a couple initial meetings spanning six months where we would meet at lunch to talk about things—talk about expectations, perceptions, perspectives...kind of walk through that. And then from there we fleshed out, how would this look? Who would be responsible for what and what the outcome could be? And what would be the larger mission of the partnership? What is it that we wanted to accomplish and what direction did they want to go? (Campus Leader 3).

The Partner Pledge form clearly outlines the expected partner engagement options and the required partner commitment to the stakeholders. One of the unique aspects of this case is the eventual high level of industry sector leader participation in the CSP, considering the pressing demands on their time. There are 25 local industries participating, with 10 being very actively involved in the CSP. Community Leader 3 described this dynamic as “a lot of committed folks in the community working together can accomplish so much more than one organization trying to do it on their own.”

In addition to having a high level of local industry leader buy-in, a second unique aspect of this CSP is that a large portion of the manufacturing workforce in the area is older and accustomed to traditional manufacturing methods as opposed to new, advanced manufacturing methods. This poses a major training challenge for manufacturers making this switch, as well as a resource challenge for the community college as it struggles to meet industry training needs.

Campus Leader 3 explained:

We have individuals in their 40s and 50s [working at industries] and sometimes it's challenging because many of these individuals are going through the transition of using existing processes that they probably have done manually for 20 years—for most of their careers—and now these processes are becoming automated. So the type of skills they have to develop now are very different than the skills they've used throughout most of their careers.

A third unique aspect is that the founding leaders of this CSP made a strategic decision from the start to only involve the key decision-makers of each industry partner, in an effort to make the best use of leaders' time and to have quick access to available resources. As Campus Leader 3 commented, “Many times when you get groups together like this, the decision-makers will delegate participation down to HR or a manager. They can demonstrate need but they're not the ones who can actually make changes to projection schedules and training investments.”

Based on firm commitments from top industry leaders, decisions about adding new training

programs and making curriculum adjustments at the community college can be made expediently to best meet employer needs. Campus Leader 3 further explained how this selective leader recruitment process was carried out:

The college president went to the highest level of each company to get those folks together so they could understand that, with what we're talking about doing, they will have to make decisions on things unless they clearly delegate those decisions down the line. So when we got those folks together for about that first year, it was about relationship building and sort of consensus-building and developing just, comfort, in terms of who we are and what we are and what we want to accomplish. And we wanted to ensure that they knew that it was a good use of their time to do this partnership. So that was the first thing—to get those decision-makers to the table and get them talking and really become a big part of the process.

This is an example that illustrates the importance of leader relationships in the CSP formation process. Campus Leader 3 said a related purpose for forming this CSP from the college's perspective was to figure out how to find commonality in the education and training needs of the major manufacturers in the county, which also influenced the industry partner selection.

Personal values held by leaders, such as loyalty and commitment to the community in which one lives, was an emerging theme in this case showing personal reasons why leaders decide to participate in CSPs. It also shows how a leader perceived value from participating in a CSP. Having a long personal history in the community, Community Leader 3 described the leadership role played as a partner in this CSP as a personal commitment towards working hard on long-term community strength, which was an added motivation for participation:

My role is just to share my ideas and to stay engaged and to follow up. If there's things I need to do beyond the meeting, then I follow through with it and be committed to the work. A lot of behind-the-scenes work goes on with all of these partnerships I'm involved with, so if I made a commitment to be in the partnership, then I made a commitment to do the work. We all have common problems and they have common solutions. If we can solve the problem of attracting and retaining employees for everybody, that's a win for everybody—not just us. I really want to be able to be a part of the foundations in the community that are being laid for the future work for future generations—something that's going to outlive me.

Metaphorical Description

The metaphorical name for Case 3 is The Compass. A compass is a valuable tool to help people find their way, typically while hiking, boating, or reading a map. A compass is used to help someone know in which direction to go to proceed to a destination. This represents the mission of the CSP in Case 3 (The Compass) to regularly come together and communicate the needs of industry to the community college. Other participating sectors, such as the Chamber and local school system, were also involved to support the needs of industry in a coordinated manner. The industry needs shared were then used by the college to determine the best of course of action—what direction they should go in providing support to the industries in their service district. According to Campus Leader 3, this process allowed for the best allocation of the college's resources to meet the needs of industry in an efficient manner. Another distinctive feature for Case 3 included a strong focus on leader relationship building. In this case, leaders spent a full year working on relationship-building to prepare the CSP for full operation. Campus Leader 3 discovered how having a loose, flexible CSP design helped with program adaptability.

Case 4: The Treasure - Case Description and Findings about the Formation Process

Case 4 (The Treasure) is a CSP between a community college and multiple local companies representing a wide variety of sectors. The setting of Case 4 (The Treasure) is a large, rural county in western North Carolina near the center of the state. The county is experiencing a growth phase due to its close proximity to a thriving metropolitan area. This region faces an ongoing challenge of a critical shortage of skilled workers, especially to meet the needs of potential new advanced manufacturing companies in the process of being recruited to the area as well as the modernization of existing companies. The CSP was created five years ago to create a program to cultivate highly skilled workers for large and small manufacturers and prepare them

to enter the workforce immediately upon completion of the program, based on a high level of need for skilled employees. Originally starting with five companies, there are currently 16 companies participating in this CSP, representing advanced manufacturing and several other industries, with new company members and types actively being recruited. The program has grown from five types of apprenticeships available to 12.

For the participants, the program provides an alternative to traditional higher education or a new pathway to earning an undergraduate degree, especially for those who enjoy working with their hands, are interested in careers in a STEM-related field, and/or need to continue working full-time while preparing for a new career. For two to three years, apprentices work alongside mentors and receive job-specific training, tuition-free education at the community college, and a salary. The tuition and salary are both paid by the sponsoring industry. The program is used as a tool to train and recruit much needed skilled employees for local companies. Participants can also readily transfer to a four-year college as juniors upon completion of the apprenticeship program.

For Case 4, the CSP leaders interviewed included a community college administrator of economic and workforce development (Campus Leader 4) and a local industry manager (Community Leader 4) who also manages the apprenticeship mentoring program for the industry. The role of the community college in this CSP was to develop the applicable curriculum for each type of apprenticeship, staff the classes, help to recruit companies and apprentices, train and educate the students, and manage grants and program certifications. Campus Leader 4 describes the leader role this way: “It’s my role as leader trying to make sure that the apprenticeship program is promoted throughout the region and also to cut through any red tape that may hinder the progress of the program.” The role of the community partner (and

other local companies) was to offer an apprenticeship program and to support apprentices as students attending the community college for education and training. Companies offer on-the-job training and feedback to apprentices using a schedule that does not conflict with community college classes. They also provide a mentor and pay a salary to the apprentice. Campus Leader 4 explained how the CSP originally got started and how partners were selected:

We were approached by several employers actually asking the college to consider offering courses related to instruction in the apprenticeship programs each company had. Those conversations went on for a few months and then the college decided that, well, let's talk with some other companies and see if there's any interest in maybe developing a full-fledged apprenticeship program. At the time, the intent was just to deliver related instruction for the existing apprenticeships so that the individual employers would each be the sponsors of their own apprenticeship programs. But after a few conversations, we decided to go ahead and apply for a registered sponsorship of apprenticeships to [a federal agency] and [a state agency], which we were approved for. At the same time we also applied for federal funding to help with the startup costs, which got this program off the ground quickly.

As part of the start-up of this CSP, the college conducted a survey of all industries in its service district to determine initial interest in the apprenticeship program, functioning as a major outreach campaign.

Community Leader 4 explained how the college was eventually selected as a partner for their company, "We were already using them for some training and working with our HR person on special programs, and then it kind of morphed into, "What else can we do together?" This CSP also met a need of addressing the company's aging workforce:

I kind of think back to our history because this plant had participated in an apprenticeship program in the past. We had gotten out of it because of the economy but at the same time we looked at the future—it's because of succession planning. You're planning for the future. We knew that the team better start training people and identifying people. Also, about 50% of our maintenance people will be eligible to retire over the next four years. There are a lot of people since I've been around who are getting close to retirement. I can take you out to the floor right now and I can introduce you to 35 to 40-year veterans. We have a big gap between people who stay 5 years and 30+ years. It's also a problem that new employees don't always stay after we train them and teach them—but that's probably a whole other paper! (Community Leader 4).

Community Leader 4 describes the company's role as helping people gain a new skill set as well as mentoring the apprentices. "We want to increase the available pool of people with a designated skill set to meet the staffing needs of our company. By helping people get paid to learn on-the-job, it goes back to providing valuable opportunities for community members." The community partner also participates in recruiting and interviewing apprentices. The specific roles of the community partner are clearly stated in the formal Employer Partnership Agreement shared for this case. This company considers participation in the apprenticeship program to be a part of its overall commitment to the community, coupled with other community service efforts. This commitment was evidenced in the press releases provided for me about the positive results of this program. The community leader contributes to the partnership by providing customized input and guidance to the college regarding curriculum development and works closely with college staff, such as the program coordinator and the success coach. This particular partner goes so far as to support its apprentices by providing a van for transportation to and from the college for classes. The marketing materials for this CSP stress how this community partner is dedicated to supporting local residents and providing transportation to training is just one example of this.

Distinctive Features of the Case

The most unique aspect of this case is that having such a full-scale, fluid apprenticeship program in partnership with a community college is rare, according to Campus Leader 4. A second unique aspect of this case is that in order for the CSP to work, the campus partner had to significantly enhance the participating departments within its own organization, connecting economic and workforce development with education. The college also needed to be flexible enough to effectively deliver the education and training required for each new type of

apprenticeship, and to have the resources to be responsive to each industry's needs. As Campus Leader 4 explained,

Within the college, this became a major collaboration between economic and workforce development, which includes continuing education life skills, such as [several credential and degree program pathways], and business and industry training, and then the curriculum and academic side of the house that has responsibility for awarding degrees—there's a lot involved with it for all of us here.

A third unique aspect of this CSP is that many of the industry partners are based out of a certain international region. The leaders of these companies actively share information and experiences with each other, so the success of the program depends on the satisfaction level and feedback shared between the leaders of these companies. According to Campus Leader 4, "The [international region] manufacturing industry is rather close-knit and so when you have good experiences, they tend to communicate those experiences to their colleagues—whether they're competitors are not." The steps taken by the college to streamline the program for the [international region]-based companies, such as assisting with required reports and providing a success coach for the apprentices, helped to encourage their participation, as it is a major investment of time, personnel, and funding for each participating company. The positive reputation of this program helped it to quickly expand and involve additional partners, resulting in more choices of apprenticeships for area residents. This excitement about the success of the CSP and expanded opportunities for residents was included in the marketing materials shared for this case.

A fourth and final unique aspect of this CSP is that Community Leader 4 personally participated in an apprenticeship program nearly 30 years ago, which was actually a campus community partnership, so this leader has a high level of commitment to the CSP and its participants and helped to revive this dormant program at the company this leader represents.

The emerging themes of personal leader values, commitment in this case, and leader satisfaction derived from participating in a CSP, were shown here. In fact, Community Leader 4 wants to remain involved in the program post-retirement and feels personally invested in the sustainability of the program:

Me personally, that's my background, that's how I started—in an apprenticeship. I was actually a year out of high school when I got hired as an apprentice, which was a six-year program at the time, where we went to college for two years and earned an associate's degree, had on-the-job training for two years, and committed to work for the company for two years. I share this with the new apprentices as much as I can. I didn't know what I wanted to do when I graduated so I got into the apprenticeship program and it's the best thing that ever happened to me. Even when I'm retired, I will still appreciate the opportunity that I was given, and I want to give it back. I want to volunteer so people understand about the value of this program. I hope the people I'm dealing with now as apprentices also want to be a mentor one day to the next apprenticeship group.

Metaphorical Description

The metaphorical name for Case 4 is The Treasure. A treasure is considered to be something valuable, rare, and frequently hard to find. It became evident when speaking with Community Leader 4 that the program offerings for residents were so meaningful and potentially life-altering that a participant could feel like they had found a valuable treasure related to job training and improved employment opportunities. This is because the rewards are so great for apprentices from participating and completing this full-scale apprenticeship program as evidenced by positions secured in skilled labor and much higher income and benefit packages. The formal Apprenticeship Partnership Agreement also provided details of what is expected of each stakeholder participating in this program. Despite the potential for impact, relatively few residents have yet to take advantage of the program offerings created by this CSP, as if the benefits have not yet been discovered. The marketing materials for this CSP include the description by the college of this program as, “an incredible opportunity for local residents.”

Cross-Case Comparison of Leaders' Perceptions of the Formation Process

For each case, the campus and community leaders perceived different elements of the formation process to be significant based on their interview responses, as shown in Appendix L. For example, based on how its importance tends to be stressed in the partnership literature (Getha-Taylor, 2014), the perception of the importance of trust being necessary for CSP formation was only shared by Campus Leader 2. Both of the leaders in Case 2 and Case 3 perceived the rank of the leader participating in the CSP to be critical so that decisions could be made in an expedient manner, especially pertaining to funding mechanisms and commitments. In contrast, all eight of the leaders perceived having a shared mission to be an important element of CSP formation, so this is clearly a critical formation element.

Part of the formation process was determining what resources will be shared for the CSP. Campus Leader 2 felt particularly strongly about the importance of resource contributions:

I think one important thing is that when you're forming these partnerships--know who's on the committee and what resources they have that they have access to. I think that's real key and because really it's all about resources--it's not about one individual--it's about what resources can be provided to really benefit whatever it is that you're trying to benefit, which in this case we were trying to benefit students.

As an example of the wide range of resources a partner can provide, Campus Leader 1 reported the different types of resources the college provided when they helped to revive the existing CSP: "We contributed financial resources; we contributed intellectual talent and manpower of the leadership; we contributed our network, too; we were also able to generate grants for the partnership; and we were able to leverage a grant using the partnership, as well." For the colleges in Case 1 and Case 4, it was necessary for them to use resources to first build up their own internal departments in order for the college to be prepared to participate in the CSP and provide external support.

Case 1 was the only case where bringing in new leaders was a critical element of a revitalization of the existing CSP and programs associated with it, basically needing to go through somewhat of a second version of the formation process in order to make it operational. Regarding the funding structure, the community leader in Case 2 placed the strongest emphasis on this component, especially as it pertained to sustainability and equity. Community Leader 2's goal was to take the initial burden of financing the CSP away from the college and government partners as soon as possible and transfer it to the industry partners who directly benefited from obtaining the skilled labor. Nearly all of the leaders perceived having clearly defined partner roles as an important element of CSP formation. Case 2 is the only case where the leaders placed a high value on the use of an external model to design the CSP, making this a unique feature of Case 2's approach to the formation process. The individual values held by leaders, an emerging theme, came into play in formation for at least one leader in each case. Almost all of the leaders had prior experience participating in a CSP, which contributed to their positive attitude towards the use of this tool and their choice to use it again.

The elements of formation deemed to be important to leaders in each case helped to inform the personality that emerged for each case. For Case 1, The Phoenix, the two leaders being pre-alliance champions quickly served to invigorate this dormant CSP. Otherwise it would not have been feasible to create a major new apprenticeship program through this CSP. Case 2, The Beehive, involved partners who were also participating in a wide range of other CSPs around the community and had the most prior CSP experience. The leaders in Case 2 perceived a higher number of formation elements to be important, as compared to the leaders in the other three cases. In Case 3, The Compass, recruiting a sizeable group of industry partners to participate in the CSP to provide feedback about their needs to the college was necessary for the

college to know what direction to go in supporting local industry. For Case 4, The Treasure, in order to create the desired high-value apprenticeship program for local residents, it was important to Community Leader 4 that the college had significant resources to offer. Community Leader 4 greatly valued the modern, high-tech training facility available at the college for their apprentices to use and that the campus leader had previous experience managing an apprenticeship program. Clearly, some elements of formation carried more weight than others for the leaders of each case based on the particular characteristics and needs of the CSP and the individual perceptions of the leaders, while several common elements (shared mission, resources, and defined roles) were considered important to the majority of leaders.

Leader Expectations and Perceptions of the Value Created

Investigating the ways that collaborative approaches like CSPs can produce value is an essential aspect of understanding the evolving roles of public-sector organizations in addressing social and economic issues (Murphy et al., 2015). When CSPs are formed, each leader has certain expectations of the types and level of value to be created by the partnership. Leader expectations can be as simple as meeting a certain resource need or as complex as addressing a major societal issue, like poverty or career barriers. This section, and the two sections that follow, describe the expectations of value creation for the campus and community leaders in each case and compares them with leaders' perceptions of the actual value created as each CSP progressed. Comparisons are also made across cases regarding the leaders' perceptions of value creation.

The value resulting from participation in a CSP is a key part of the motivation for organizations to participate (Austin, 2010). Without this motivation, it is possible campus and community leaders could decide to not participate in CSPs, which lends importance to this study.

The Collaborative Value Creation (CVC) framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) provided four expanded ways to look at value created from a CSP, which offered themes for the analysis of the data in this study, as follows:

- “Associational value is a derived benefit accruing to another partner simply from having a collaborative relationship with the other organization.” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 730).
- “Transferred resource value is the benefit derived by a partner from the receipt of a resource from the other partner.” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 731).
- “Interaction value is the intangible outcomes that derive from the processes of partners working together.” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 731).
- “Synergistic value arises from the underlying premise of all collaborations that combining partners’ resources enables them to accomplish more together than they could have separately.” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, p. 731).

Leader perceptions of these four types of value created from the CSPs are outlined below, along with other emerging themes about value created for each case.

Case 1: The Phoenix – Findings about Value Created

Looking at the basic expectations for this CSP, Campus Leader 1 was interested in the benefit of increasing student enrollment as a way to generate revenue for the college. Although this was a targeted outcome, it was not viewed as the only potential benefit of the CSP:

I didn’t look at it like that. I really looked at it as if you do the right thing by the community, by the partnership, by the students, and by the people, then the funding will follow. You don’t need to chase the money. You do the right thing and the rest will come (Campus Leader 1).

The main expectations of this CSP for Community Leader 1 were meeting the needs of the employers in the community and having an adequate supply of skilled labor to attract new

industry to the region. These initial expectations of value created were perceived as being met by both leaders, along with the expanded values discussed below.

The campus leader described a high level of associational value naturally derived from participating in this CSP. Campus Leader 1 felt confident in the increased visibility and project credibility the college would reap and how this would relate to future funding. The campus leader explained how community colleges, in particular in North Carolina, are funded for their physical plant by the county commission. The associational value resulting from this CSP served to enhance the college's relationships with county commissioners, which resulted in an increase in county funding for the college. The college and the economic development organization worked side-by-side publicly, symbolizing their shared mission:

You had the college and the economic development organization sitting side-by-side all on the same page, moving in the same direction. The public and certainly our funders saw that our efforts were aligned with their efforts, and that we were at the table when they were recruiting companies (Campus Leader 1).

Enhanced by the marketing efforts of the apprenticeship program, the community publicly witnessed how the two organizations were directly connected through this program and that they were both supporting local industries and employment opportunities, bringing credibility to the work of both organizations, according to Campus Leader 1.

Community Leader 1 was especially convinced that the CSP provided its organization with credibility to local industries. "So you start seeing how this really focused effort moves the needle so much more to the point where employers are like, "All right now—this program is really working!" (Community Leader 1). The CSP also increased the visibility of the work of the economic development organization in the local school system. "If the hundreds of people getting good jobs have stories to tell, you become a champion at home." (Community Leader 1). Since the CSP had the students and employers' best interest in mind, that benefited everyone and

raised awareness about the need for more skilled labor in the area. The credibility of the CSP for having a successful program and meeting the needs of the community was perceived to be more important than the visibility of individual organizations. “We all want the gold shiny star, but it wouldn’t have worked unless our organization and the community college didn’t come together.” (Community Leader 1).

Having a positive impact on the organization’s mission in some manner is another type of associational value that can be created by a CSP (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Campus Leader 1 shared, “I think the mission is the mission, but it strengthened our work in support of the mission. It didn’t change it at all.” The power of increased associational value can also serve to expand an organization’s mission. According to Community Leader 1, “Our focus is on creating and retaining quality jobs, and I think that’s so often what we focus on—is on the recruitment side or the retention side. But the workforce focus is now a bigger part of what we do.”

Transferred resource value gained for the campus partner included grants, funding, program resources, and increased enrollment. For the community partner, transferred resource value gained included funding from multiple sources, increased staffing, and shared funding for marketing. Campus Leader 1 reported interaction value gained including access to networks, knowledge creation, and internal program building. The community partner also benefited from access to campus networks, as well as knowledge creation about the apprenticeship program and community needs, changed organizational behavior towards increased community outreach, and support provided for related programs by the campus partner.

Both partners felt that the CSP created long-term gains in synergistic value. Campus Leader 1 shared about their increased political power, the new practice of planning for future CSPs, and how the campus leader’s spirit of altruism impacted the CSP in a positive manner

both internally and externally. Community Leader 1 reported witnessing a life-changing impact of the program on the participants, continual strength gained for the industry by adding skilled workers, and process-based improvements from this program serving as a model for future apprenticeship programs. These results exceeded the Community Leader's initial expectations for the potential value of this CSP, as it resulted in an innovative tool to make expedient progress. Leader satisfaction and leader relationships were two emerging value themes in the data, both of which were important to the campus and community leaders. A summary of leader perceptions of value created in Case 1 can be found in Appendix M.

Case 2: The Beehive – Findings about Value Created

The purpose for forming the CSP in Case 2 (The Beehive), according to Campus Leader 2, was to address underemployment and unemployment of area residents who were working full time but not earning a living wage and with no other options available. The expectation was for the community college to train and provide opportunities for more secure and solid careers, coupled with providing skilled employees for local companies, thereby resulting in increased enrollment and available training resources at the college. For the community partner, the county government, the purpose of CSP participation was to raise the overall community health level. The community leader expected that the CSP could help lift up local residents so that fewer people would be living in poverty and they would be able to eventually buy houses and pay taxes. The other community partner expectation was that this CSP could help recruit new industries to the region:

Our goal with this CSP is really just trying to help the community be the best that they can be. That gives us a lot of value. The other piece is we're looking to recruit new industries in the area so we would be able to show them the level of effort that we're putting forward in workforce development. This could help us to be very competitive when we are competing for industry. Most people think of recruitment as offering tax incentives or a building but most industries now, what they're looking for if they want to

relocate or expand, their first question is, “Do you have the workforce? Do you have the people that will take these jobs?” Because across the country, unemployment is very low so it’s hard to find qualified people. So we knew having this program helping us meet that need could be a huge win for attracting industry. (Community Leader 2).

Leaders described initial expectations for the CSP that aligned with the notion of associational value. Campus Leader 2 explained that the college’s mission remained unchanged, but participating in the CSP allowed them to enact their mission in new ways:

I think the mission was always there. The mission of the community college is to provide our community members with adequate training so they can enter the workforce. That’s always been the mission of the community college. So when our students get jobs, I think we’re meeting the mission. During this whole process, we kept the mission in front—this is our mission, this is our mission. We stayed focused on the mission. That’s part of why we were able to deliver, as we did not deviate from the mission of what this college is from what this program was set out to be (Campus Leader 2).

Similarly, Community Leader 2 spoke of the clarity of their organization’s mission and how the CSP closely aligned with accomplishing this mission:

Our mission is actually very simple—it’s making our community better. That is our mission statement—four words—but there’s a lot in there. Whether that’s making our community safer or healthier or more fun to live in or more affordable, we’re trying to make the community better. I think this partnership illustrates that mission in a very comprehensive way. When you think about the ripple effect of pulling someone over for a speeding ticket, you know that helps the community to some level. But when you think about the vast effect that it has on the community by giving somebody a job who doesn’t have a job, that is huge. That affects so many things and it doesn’t just affect them, it affects their family, it affects their community, and it affects their kids. Lots of times poverty is cyclical and there’s generational poverty here so if we can break the generational poverty, we’re making the community so much better.

In addition to associational value, Campus Leader 2 shared that innovation was a value derived from participating in this CSP (and others) in the county. “We do a lot of creative things with our partnerships. You really have to in this day and time. You just can’t keep doing the same thing as you’ve done in the past and remain competitive and solve complex problems.”

According to Community Leader 2, an expanded purpose for creating this CSP was part of an

ongoing effort to improve the overall health of the community, which includes social health and economic health. “Our county ranked low out of all counties in North Carolina for health so we’re trying to do a lot of pretty outside of the box things to target that ranking in order to improve our community health.” Such a massive undertaking requires local support. “Our county commissioners are 100% behind this program and that’s another thing, is to make sure that you have politicians and elected officials adequately involved in supporting your programs” (Campus Leader 2).

Learning from the CSP was considered to be another accrued value by Campus Partner 2. “After the first round of the program, we noticed some things we needed to change and improve on, so we did. We’ve seen some successes with the program, and we would like to see more.” Both leaders shared a strong preference for using CSPs to work on community issues. According to Community Partner 2:

We are a government of partnerships. A lot of people associate government with silos and just doing one thing and doing it over and over—just doing the same thing and not being able to change. But I think being able to show people that we’re thinking outside of the box gives a lot of value to our brand as a county and as a place where people are proud to say, “I live in this county.” We as a county are able to say, “Here’s something that we’re doing to serve you.”

This related to the emerging theme of leader relationships. Campus Leader 2 felt that the county’s size contributed to their ability to relate personally as local leaders and readily create CSPs:

When I visit other counties, I don’t see the partnerships in other counties that I see in this county. And I’m not just saying this because I’m from here and I live here. But I think that we’re kind of the perfect size that we can have these great partnerships. I serve on other partnerships with the sheriff, with the chief of police, with the superintendent of schools...I see in some of the meetings that go to—I see county commissioners at the meeting, I see city councilmen. So we’re kind of small enough so we know each other, and we play in the same sandbox, but I think it’s been really good to see a lot of partnerships. And it’s just a natural flow. We understand the county needs us to work together and when we come in the room, we have to put down our personal agendas and

look at what's best for the county residents. It's refreshing to know that we can drop our hats and represent local residents when we go into these meetings. We all look at it that way.

Both organizations benefited from the high visibility and the success rate of this CSP, enabling both to build trust with the community—thereby increasing future participation levels. Collectively they improved their ability to attract new industry to the area by showing evidence through the CSP of the community's efforts to supply skilled labor. Campus Leader 2 reported benefiting from a high level of transferred resource value from this CSP. This is in part due to private industry funding being channeled directly to the community college to support job training programs. Both partners benefited from shared leadership. Further, the non-profit created to manage the funding of this CSP added value for both partners since it facilitated contributions.

For both leaders, interaction value was another type of value created by the CSP. Campus Leader 2 reported access to new student populations and an open door to be able to share new programs with area industry. Community Leader 2 shared gaining the ability to change industry behavior regarding becoming an active participant in the process, which resulted in major industry expansions. Synergistic value gained for both partners included the ability to emulate a CSP model from another community, an increase in community earning levels and overall community health, the creation of a self-sustaining program, frequent exposure of government staff to more industry staff making it easier to work together organically, and the long-term potential of ending the cycle of poverty in this county. For Campus Leader 2, this CSP resulted in: major new program investments to expand program capabilities, access to a student population with a strong work history and desire to succeed, increased viable career choices for

participants, plus the excitement generated amongst community leaders and in the community about this successful program led to buy-in for new programs.

Leader satisfaction was an emerging value theme in this case. Most notably, Campus Leader 2 had a strong regard for the family feel of this and other CSPs in the community, as well as a personal increase in self-awareness of leadership traits. Because of how well this CSP is operating, Community Leader 2 experienced a major increase in pride of working for the county government, enhancing this leader's work satisfaction. A summary of leader perceptions of value created in Case 2 can be found in Appendix N.

Case 3: The Compass – Findings about Value Created

For Case 3 (The Compass), the campus partner expected to be able to gather many local industry leaders in one place on a regular basis to get their feedback about what their needs were to be successful. The community leader primarily expected that the CSP would help to get the word out to the community about their company and the strong career options available there plus training opportunities. “The second thing we hope to gain from participating in this CSP with the college and other industry is keeping the people that we have—keeping them engaged and happy so they don’t want to leave. Those are the two goals for us.” (Community Leader 3). Community Leader 3 has high expectations for industry to be able to continue to work together through this CSP along with some uncertainty about how this will play out in practice.

We all compete for employees, we know it, but it doesn’t feel competitive because we’re working together. It feels like we’re just trying to solve that common problem—so how do we do it? How do we roll up our sleeves and solve it so that we’ll get some benefit and so will everybody else? (Community Leader 3)

Community Leader 3 has a firm belief in the value of CSPs based on experience as a CSP leader. “Every time I’m invited to participate, I always say ‘yes’ because number one—it benefits us and the company—but it also benefits the community. I was instantly impressed

when I joined this partnership because everyone at the table was engaged.” Campus Leader 3 sees value in the information that is obtained through the process of participating with industry in a CSP needed to guide the development of programs at the college, which can otherwise be challenging to obtain:

We certainly benefit by developing a better understanding of what their workforce training needs are. You do this by establishing relationships, gaining confidence, getting trust, and working with them to really tease out their needs. Sometimes they have needs for training of incumbent workers but also the types of skills they’re looking for in new employees—that in many instances it’s hard for them to articulate what it is they’re looking for. So by developing that relationship and that trust then we’re able to sit down and have multiple conversations with them overtime. It’s kind of an iterative process to find out what they’re looking for and see where we fit. And sometimes identify their needs for where we don’t fit, which is also just as important.

The eventual high level of industry participation increased credibility for the CSP partners. This associational value of project credibility can have an unplanned spillover effect for a partner, as suggested by Campus Leader 3:

Even though you can’t quantify this...since we have a foundation that relies on corporate and personal financial support for our college, I feel sure that having a successful partnership like this—even though we’ve never asked for money as part of the partnership—when our Foundation folks do make the rounds for the annual giving campaign to these companies—well typically it’s the same person, the same decision maker involved. I think by having successful relationships with them in other venues helps us in terms of more funds and more commitments to our Foundation as well.

Campus Leader 3 benefited from valuable information shared at meetings and the opportunity to network. The community college experienced an increase in credibility and visibility, especially amongst industry. It was an important value gained by the campus partner for the community to realize the critical lack of skilled workers in the county. Community Leader 3 appreciated that the CSP resulted in the community having a better understanding of the type of work done by the leader’s advanced manufacturing industry. Community Leader 3 also found value in being

associated with the CSPs strong brand and being exposed to a major cross-section of collaborative community leaders, which tends to strengthen problem-solving efforts.

For transferred resource value, the campus partner gained shared building space with the economic development partner in this CSP, expansion in the number and types of courses offered, and increased enrollment levels. Community Leader 3 found value in the campus partner organizing and hosting meetings of the CSP, CSP oversight provided by the economic development organization, and program funding to train workers. Campus Leader 3 reported interaction value derived from this CSP, including the ease of communicating with the economic development partner since they are housed in the same building, gaining a better understanding of industry needs and relationship building, increased opportunities to share other college resources with industry, and improved access to the industry network. Community Leader 3 shared that this CSP serves as an example to the industry's corporate leaders and owner of the value of participating in CSPs, especially factoring in the time involved for leader participation. Community Leader 3 valued gaining access to other industry leaders. Participating in this CSP increased this community partner's ability to change company behavior regarding community relations.

There was a common theme across all of the cases that the CSPs were consistent with the organizations' mission. Campus Leader 3 shared:

It certainly is consistent to our overall mission of providing high-quality education. Certainly by participating in this process, we were able to fulfill that component of the mission to a great extent because we were able to reach individuals, provide them with education and training opportunities which otherwise they probably would have not either pursued on their own or it would not have been made available to them through the employer, so definitely what this has done is directly helped our broader mission of providing successful high-quality education and training to the folks in our county.

Looking at the value of mission impact from the perspective of an industry partner of a CSP,

Community Leader 3 shared:

The mission of our company is really to be a world-class manufacturer and do the best that we can do in our line of work. Having said that, if that's the mission specific to us, having high quality employees innately increases our chances of fulfilling that mission. If we have happy engaged skilled employees, then we're going to do better at whatever we do. If people don't leave and we don't have to train and retrain, we have better consistency, better quality. I am hoping we can see a measurable difference since we joined this partnership.

The campus partner identified several forms of synergistic value gained by participating in the CSP. These included the large investment the college chose to make to develop new training resources; area companies experiencing greater success, leading to a more vital community; improved internal processes that allowed for idea development for new programs; increased political influence; and shared leadership. Community Leader 3 was enthusiastic about how this CSP resulted in an innovative internal employee relations partnership and found it to be a positive change for the industry to be an active member of community leadership overall.

Leader relationships and the leader experience of participating in a CSP were two unique forms of value that emerged in this case. Campus Leader 3 recognized how valuable relationship building and familiarity between leaders are for a CSP to be successful. Community Leader 3 shared a strong preference for being able to select CSP leaders who are committed to the community and willing to do the necessary work, including behind the scenes. This leader saw value in CSP leaders being familiar with each other and each other's organizations and needs. Campus Leader 3 found value in having a loosely defined and flexible CSP design to allow for partner flexibility and the ability to make changes quickly. Community Leader 3 described how participating in this CSP provided the value of an increased opportunity to participate in other CSPs. This leader had strong feelings about the personal value of being able to contribute to the

long-term vitality of the community. Even though participating in CSPs is a time investment, Community Leader 3 found it to be worthwhile based on the leader relationship building that results from this work. A summary of leader perceptions of value created in Case 3 (The Compass) can be found in Appendix O.

Case 4: The Treasure – Findings about Value Created

In Case 4 (The Treasure), the community partner, a local industry, was already familiar with the good work of the community college before forming this CSP together. “The college has been a big support for us. We have a training grant so we partner to do a variety of training, from hourly workers to the engineers. It’s helped us tremendously to have them as a resource.” (Community Leader 4). Their relationship, which Community Leader 4 said has been nurtured for many years, is a comfortable one. “All the people that we deal with from the college are very helpful. It just makes it easy—you don’t need any more difficult things added to your day!” (Community Leader 4).

Benefiting the CSP overall, the campus leader had prior experience working with apprenticeship programs so leadership in this area comes naturally. “I’m the person that just kind of brought all these folks together and continue to push these folks in the right direction. This program is proving to be a very attractive option with 31 apprentices participating last spring.” (Campus Leader 4). Campus Leader 4 managed to keep the cost of participation very low for participants by seeking grant funding and state funding, so there is no financial hardship.

Campus Leader 4 shared perceptions of many types of associational values gained from this CSP. These included higher visibility among local residents seeking employment and increased public awareness about the lack of skilled labor in the region. Further, the high level of stakeholder satisfaction among employers in the international region associated with the

predominant industry in Case 4 (The Treasure) generated increased community trust in the work of the community college. It also led to state and national support and recognition. It benefited the campus partner for the college president to see the worth of this CSP because it increased the college's potential for participation in future CSPs. Community Leader 4 shared that the industry was gaining value from a strong reputation in the community for the company supporting residents by providing strong employment opportunities through the apprenticeship program, which improved the company's recruitment efforts:

I feel like I'm saying the same thing over—it's still the mission to me to have a strong, skilled workforce. Maybe I'm thinking simple, but succession planning is keeping up with the times—having knowledgeable people work on what we need to work on. We need to just keep on keepin' on and find new ways to attract talent. You know the days are gone where, "My dad worked in the plant." It's just not like that anymore. So how do you attract people who want to come and work here? You have to be known for not using those people but show that you are actually helping people and building people up. So participating in this CSP falls right in line with that mission. (Community Leader 4)

The importance of a CSP can be perceived to directly relate to the importance of core areas of an organization's mission. Campus Leader 4 explained:

I think what we're doing with this partnership is well within the mission that we have that is workforce and economic development related. That's the primary work of the community college—to increase economic and workforce opportunities for individuals within our service district. That includes working with the economic development commission, Chambers of Commerce, and workforce development boards. Another benefit is that our partnership with local industries seems to be of genuine interest to those new employers that are considering locating here.

The campus partner in this case identified several transferred resource values gained by participating in the CSP. These values included student tuition being paid by the sponsoring industry, which led to increased enrollment levels; gaining a key industry volunteer for the program; and grant funding opportunities. For the community partner, transferred resource values included staffing that benefited the apprenticeship program, such as a success coach and employment coach provided by the campus partner. The community partner appreciated the

value of the apprentices being trained at the college's state-of-the-art facility. This perception aligned with the reporting about this facility in marketing materials about the CSP: “[Program] supports the learning environment at [College] with state-of-the-art training spaces and equipment that can be used for the local community’s benefit.” From the community partner’s perspective, the industry benefits from the retention of skilled employees who experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Regarding interaction value gained, Community Leader 4 shared about the value of learning about other resources at the community college, being able to offer a unique career opportunity to local residents, keeping up with technology trends, and having capable skilled workers. The CSP helps with the company’s succession planning and retention, improving the company’s strength overall. Campus Leader 4 reported the interaction value of enjoying improved relations with the for-profit/industry sector. The college gained knowledge about the optimal curriculum to offer to meet training needs and benefited from the creation of a full-scale regional apprenticeship program.

Both leaders shared key synergistic values gained. Campus Leader 4 found long-term value in having room for program growth along with upgraded facilities and available skilled labor to recruit new industry to meet its mission. The campus partner experienced a major process improvement of developing an effective working partnership between three divisions within the college. This CSP resulted in a spin-off CSP for the community college, creating a pre-apprenticeship program for high school students in collaboration with two other community colleges. Community Leader 4 shared that a positive organizational change has been that members of the apprenticeship program are like a family and actively support each other, leading to a greater chance for success and retention. Thus, a new form of value created was the culture of valuing the apprenticeship program internally and at the corporate level of this industry. From

the community partner's perspective, having skilled labor ready to work improves the product and production for the community partner. This CSP allows for new ways to attract talent of all ages. Community Leader 4 found greater flexibility in working with the community college than a previous for-profit apprenticeship program company.

Several unique types of value emerged in the leaders' responses in this case, including leader satisfaction, communication, and relationship-building. Campus Leader 4 found it personally very satisfying to see the local impact of the CSP's programs first-hand, as a community member. Community Leader 4 was passionate about the value of giving back to current apprentices, having also participated in an apprenticeship program many years ago. In a new role as apprentice mentor, Community Leader 4 found this experience to be very personally and professionally rewarding to be able to lift people up. Community Leader 4 found value in how easy it was to communicate the industry's needs to the dedicated program staff at the community college. This leader shared that the industry gained value from having a long-term positive relationship with the community college and that the established relationships with college staff made it easier to work together. A summary of leader perceptions of value created in Case 4 can be found in Appendix P.

How the CSP Results Differed from Leader Expectations

At some point in the process of participating in a CSP, its leaders typically evaluate how the results of the partnership differed from the expectations of each partnering organization. Findings revealed a range of responses about these differences from CSP leaders in each case.

Case 1 The Phoenix—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations

In Case 1, the results were highly positive as far as Campus Leader 1's eventual perceptions of the CSP, "Oh, I think it's more than I ever dreamed it would be. I really do." The

success of the CSP was not considered to be a “win” by any one entity but rather a collective success. What was striking to Community Leader 1 was just how participating in the apprenticeship program was a true life-changing experience for local people. “That they have somebody who really sought them out and helped them with this program. They’re going to start with a good salary and they’re going to get a certificate.” Community Leader 1 shared initial doubts about the program: “Honestly I don’t think we thought we would be successful.” After struggling with the initial start-up of this CSP, the program was challenged with low participation numbers in job fairs, industry tours, and training participation. The community leader described the first job fair for this program as “depressing” since the attending employers did not end up with potential employees due to a low turnout. This changed as the CSP evolved. “This year we had really more students apply than there was space. We have to keep that momentum up with those applicants, too, so that’s something you have to think through.”

(Community Leader 1).

Case 2 The Beehive—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations

Community Leader 2 reported an unanticipated high-value result of the CSP has been the myriad connections made between the staff of both partner organizations.

I think this program has really helped connect more County staff to different industries in the area so having 1) more knowledge and 2) more connections is helping everybody work together better than expected. Connections between organizations are organically happening when people know other people. I think that’s been a benefit that we didn’t think about a lot. Another unexpected value was a new, easy access to industry leaders. If I’m working on a program and I want to seek advice of an industry leader, I’ve got the cell phone number of a plant managers who supervises 600 people. I know him in person now so I can call him and say, “Hey Bill, what do you think about this idea? Would this work?” And he can give me feedback, so I think that’s been a really good side effect.

(Community Leader 2).

Campus Leader 2 shared an unexpected benefit, as well. “We have been surprised that each of the participants of the training program has received multiple job offers from the participating

industries—not just one offer.” Industry partners were very satisfied with the available employee pool resulting from the training program. In addition, “Amazingly enough, we were able to hit every goal and I was really surprised at that, since there were a couple of goals that I was concerned about that I did not think we would meet, as far as enrollment numbers in the program.” (Campus Leader 2). For Community Leader 2, the word-of-mouth sharing about the program that resulted from the grass-roots marketing campaign was more effective than hoped.

Case 3 The Compass—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations

In Case 3 (The Compass), the main expectation of the campus partner was to be able to hear from local industry leaders about what their needs were in order to best be able to design programs for them. The campus partner hoped for a high level of industry participation initially. For Case 3 (The Compass), many industry partners did not realize the value of joining the CSP until later on in the process based on environmental factors, but eventually they did choose to participate:

We got started in this in '12 or '13, you know the economy was still in a recession around here in western North Carolina. So they didn't have a perceived need to either hire people or train people. Then as production changed and as new companies came in, then we went from a labor surplus of unskilled labor to a shortage of skilled labor very, very, quickly. Then when that turned, these companies saw the CSP as another avenue so they could 1) help understand how to get them the people they needed to hire for entry levels and 2) how to train folks. And yes, they did come to the table later as their businesses' needs changed. (Campus Leader 3).

Campus Leader 3 also reported a surprising result, in regard to recruiting industry partners for CSP and their interest in working with the college:

I guess probably the most surprising thing today is the newer companies that come into the county to set up shop seem to be more active and more interested and engaged than the older more traditional companies—maybe because they're looking for labor or maybe they just want to get established in our community. But the newer companies are typically more active, more aggressive, more engaged in terms of the partnership than some of our traditional, sixty-year-old [product name] companies, for example.

It has been a harder sell to recruit some long-standing industries to participate in the CSP than expected by the campus leader, but overall industry participation has been strong.

Community Leader 3 perceived some positive unexpected outcomes of the CSP and working with other community leaders:

I didn't expect the committee members, first of all in the partnership, would be as engaged as they are and willing to commit the level of time and resources that they do. And then the second thing is, I didn't expect that this would branch off into so many different partnerships.

Case 4 The Treasure—How Results Differed from Leader Expectations

Campus Leader 4 shared that the CSP results ended up being very close to what was expected. There was only one unexpected but appreciated result on the part of the campus leader. “I don’t think the results are really different in any way from what I expected. I think it’s mainly the idea that it provided more exposure for the college even on a national level, which was of high value, but that was not an original expectation of the CSP” (Campus Leader 4).

The community partner was very pleased with the apprentices it acquired so far as a result of this CSP, and with its ongoing working relationship with the college. These results help to justify the corporate spending on this program, which was initially a challenge to secure, as described below.

We have to get a budget approval and how are we going to do this to get a hard yes? It is hard just from the whole management level needing to watch every expense, which is to be expected. They’re naturally very expense driven because we’re basically adding a large account. We’re not only paying for school but we’re paying apprentices to go to school. And they’re coming in and working. So but to me it’s worth it in every way if you weigh out numbers and then you’re getting good employees out of it. So that’s part of my role to help with these conversations and justify the program. The value-added is not immediate. It’s actually like a marathon—it pays off later on down the road. (Community Leader 4).

Learning Experiences of the CSP Leaders

When asked to reflect on what they would do differently if they formed a new CSP, leader responses showed evidence of learning from the experience of participating in a CSP. While each response is unique to a CSP, the responses all involve making some type of change that would lead to improvement of a new or existing CSP. Therefore, in this section, findings are presented thematically instead of by case. The themes pertaining to what CSP learned from the experience of participating in a CSP were: documenting the CSP; and leader roles, planning, and process improvement.

Documenting the CSP

Campus Leader 1's suggested change revolved around documentation of the CSP:

I wish my team would have documented the process a little bit better because well, it's like riding a bicycle while you're trying to build it or flying a plane when you trying to build it. If you don't document what you kind of went through you will lose track of what you went through and therefore if you made any mistakes or don't do this or we should have done that—you don't have it documented and you won't remember it. So I wish we would have done better at documenting the model. And we didn't but it's not too late because we're right in the throes of it anyway. It is amazing how it gets away from you as you move forward just doing the business of the day. And people are knocking down our doors now they all want this apprenticeship program. So we did a good job of marketing—almost too good (laugh)!

Campus Leader 2 echoed the suggestion to document the CPS process more, as part of the leader role and how other team members could assist in this area:

I need to do a better job documenting the process. I'm an engineer by trade and my degree is in engineering. I'm a process-oriented person but I'm a visual person, as well, and everybody that I have on my team may not be a visual learner. They may be more of a detailed learner. And so sometimes I may draw a flowchart and say. "This is where we are—this is where we need to get to." I've got my flowchart up there; I've got my visuals up there—that makes sense to me but there's no details. They say the devil's in the details, but I've never been a detail person. Even if I'm not the person who's putting the details out there, I need to have somebody on my team who's able to interpret what I am after and put it into details so that others can have it as a model to follow.

Leader Roles, Planning, and Process Improvement

Community Leader 1 plans to play less of a facilitator role in the proposed CSP for a youth apprenticeship program based on lack of staff resources but will still engage in encouraging industry to participate. This leader would also start the CSP planning process sooner to allow plenty of time for brainstorming together and finding a way to work within the highly structured academic calendar of the college and local school system, “There are lots of moving parts and pieces.” (Community Leader 1). Another lesson learned was making sure to have ample industry partners before launching the CSP to allow for flexibility of participant placement. “You kinda need to have somebody waiting in the wings to help absorb if that’s necessary, so those are things to learn, too, that it’s good to spread the love a little bit.” What Campus Leader 2 would do differently is related to learning from personal leader behavior regarding leader role and style, along with the emerging theme of leader satisfaction:

I took an interpersonal class where we did surveys about ourselves as a leader. I feel like the results created an awareness of who I am and how I lead, and I feel like that I’m growing as a leader every day. One of my biggest challenges in the CSP was delegation. I would delegate more. I took a lot of the responsibilities on myself. I’m not the greatest delegator and I know that that’s one of my flaws as a leader. One of my strengths as a leader is, I’m a servant leader. I’m just a naturally born servant leader. I believe in serving first. So it depends on who you have in the group. Some people are fine with me taking leadership. Others may want to take a more active role. I don’t feel like anybody felt like I took over but there were just some things that I felt like I could do that they probably couldn’t do, and I had access to that they didn’t have access to. So I think the class I took is really helping me understand who I am as a leader and it kinda points out how I can improve to better serve and work with others. It’s how you perceive yourself and then it’s how others perceive you as well (Campus Leader 2).

Sometimes it was challenging for CSP leaders to discern what they might do differently and seemed to require additional thought during the interviews. Community Leader 2 said:

I was thinking about this question when you sent it over. I don’t think we would do that much differently. We’ve been very intentional with each step of the process to make sure that it doesn’t go to quickly. Because if we allowed it to get ahead of ourselves, you know, if we had a first class and we graduated 10 people and only one of them got a job there would be no second-class. It would be no second chance because the community wouldn’t trust us enough to quit their job and come to class and the industries wouldn’t

trust us enough to give us a financial contribution, so we've been very strategic each step of the way to make sure that we don't do anything that is less than optimal.

After the first session of training underemployed students, Community Leader 2 realized how the recruiting process became easier:

It's something you really have to explain in person to build trust. You know like, "I know you're going to pay me to go to school I don't understand", was the response when we first started this program. But recruiting for the second class and being able to say when I'm speaking at a local church, "Hey, one of your members of your congregation, Linda, has been through it. She is sitting right here, and she can tell you how great it is." So Linda stands up and says, "I did it and you can do it, too!" So we've definitely seen a lot of interest from the community by having personal results to share.

Some CSP leaders planned improvements related to the documents being used for the CSP. Campus Leader 3 explained:

I would probably have a more formally defined document with expectations and the reason being is that in the current CSP, we have folks in [two industry names]—we have [three industry names]—they have some commonalities but they're each in different fields. So we've had to keep our guidelines about the partnership to a minimum. Whereas when we create a CSP in the [industry name] field, [people working in trade #1] are [people working in trade #1], [people working in trade #2] are [people working in trade #2]—so we could probably do better with prescriptive documents and more detailed documents as to what it is that we want to accomplish and make sure the partners all understand how they would benefit from it.

Another improvement theme, leader contributions, related to having the right people at the table, as well as improving the actual CSP documents, was discussed by Community Leader 3:

I think a lot of the partnerships are made up of people who are invited that they know will contribute. I think that if I had any recommendation for the future for something different, is if members are not contributing, then there is a way to exit that person and replace them from their organization. Most partnerships I'm involved with have some type of underlying memorandum of understanding—it's more like rules that set the parameters for the committee structure. I wish we would have something like that on everything because then there would be a way to exit a member if they weren't participating. At our next meeting we're doing some restructuring about what the next phase is going to look like and if the document needs to be modified.

Campus Leader 2 also stressed the importance of selection of the leaders for a new CSP:

I think one important thing is that when you're forming these partnerships, know who's on the committee and what resources that they have that they have access to. I think that's real key and because really, it's all about resources. It's not about one individual, it's about what resources can be provided to really benefit whatever it is that you're trying to accomplish, which in this case we we're trying to benefit students. So regardless of what you're forming or what's your intended outcome, just make sure that everybody that's on the partnership's committee can contribute something. Find out what their strengths are and how they can build to the team. Let their strengths become your weaknesses and you focus on that. The team is only as strong as its weakest link. I mean I know that's cliché but it's true—if there's a weak link in the team the entire team is weak as well. (Campus Leader 2).

Perceptions about what to change for future CSPs covered most topic areas, including financing the CSP. Campus Leader 4 touched on this:

I really can't think of anything else that we would do differently except for maybe doing an initial search for grant funding. The fee we charge to participants doesn't cover all the cost for the administration of the apprenticeship program. I think early on if we would have established a base cost for that, it would have helped us plan financially. We're not in any means in that desperate of a situation financially with the apprenticeship program. But I think that as far as the additional funding that we started out with, the base funding that would be charged to the employers, we could have been better off as far as explaining to them that we need this much money from you to be able to help start the program up and to continue on to help market the program. I created more of a challenge for myself as a leader to deal with finding some extra funding sources to help support the program administratively the first time around. (Campus Leader 4).

In Case 4 (The Treasure), the community leader realized a change that needed to be made after the first session of the apprenticeship program regarding logistics:

When the conversation started with the college, and there's no negativity in this statement at all—it's just growing pains, we were thinking that the apprentices would go to school like one day a week or two days a week and then the rest of the time they would be in the plant. So as they started going to class, well this class was in the afternoon, this class is on Tuesday and Thursday, this class is on Monday. It turns out we made it work but they don't have as much time in the plant right now as we originally thought. So this is just a logistics issue we need to figure out going forward. I think we have a very open communication with the college so we will be able to work this out. (Community Leader 4).

Community Leader 2 talked about how the feedback process will remain a central part of future CSP efforts, as part of what was learned from their CSP about critical processes:

The success of this partnership is, I think really is just making sure that we're getting input from everybody on a constant basis. So at the end of the first class, we sat down with all the candidates and asked how their experience was and what they would change for the next time and what did they like and what didn't they like and made adjustments. And we've done the same with the industries so after their interview day we called them all I called them all individually and I said, "What did you like about this program? What can we do better?" And just constantly making sure that we're getting people's input and then showing them that we're going to apply that input. It built a lot of trust from both sides. I think that's been a huge piece of the success, making sure that everybody is on the same page and everybody's excited and bought into what it is that we're doing. (Community Leader 2).

Overall, the suggested changes across the four cases do not involve alterations to the missions of the CSPs, but rather relate to CSP process improvements. Collectively, the planned improvements outlined by the CSP leaders in each case provide important insights about CSP best practices in higher education. They also offer a wealth of knowledge for other campus and community leaders considering forming a CSP or seeking to improve an existing CSP.

Leaders' Plans for Future CSPs

The CSP leaders in each case were asked about any plans they have for future CSPs. In some cases, leaders indicated that the current CSP was going to serve as a model for future similar CSPs. Leaders expressed how the success of the current CSP was an inspiration to create more CSPs or to expand the current CSP to meet other related needs in the community. As in the section above, findings in this section are organized thematically. The themes regarding future plans for CSPs related to modeling after an existing CSP, creating a higher level CSP, and expansions of current CSPs.

Modeling After an Existing CSP

Campus Leader 3 shared plans for a new CSP, which would be modeled after the current CSP, along with the reason it was needed:

So we have talked about a similar partnership for construction. Residential and commercial construction are very active in our area because we have a housing shortage. We're probably going to have a thousand to fifteen hundred more families moving into our area in the next couple of years. We're experiencing potentially some significant growth and our inventory is pretty low on housing. So we know that there's a lack of skilled tradespeople needed—plumbers, electricians, HVAC, masons, and roofers. Companies have struggled to get folks to come in the field, so we thought about a similar initiative targeting training and apprenticeships for the construction fields.

Creating a Higher-level CSP

Campus Leader 2 is considering the idea of a county-wide collaborative Leader Council to intentionally involve all critical sectors of the community in a CSP to support the community, which would be a major new CSP effort based on success with the current CSPs in the county. It was evident from the interview responses that CSPs remain in the forefront of these campus and community leaders as a joint problem-solving mechanism.

Expansions of Current CSPs and Summary of Future CSP Plans

Considering the value created from CSP participation and despite the challenges faced, every leader in this study had plans to participate in future CSPs. Some future plans involved continuing current CSPs and every case included plans to create new CSPs, either using a current CSP as a model for a CSP with different sectors, or an entirely new CSP. A summary of the leaders' perceptions of plans for future CSPs is provided below in Table 3. These plans also included expanding the current CSPs in some cases.

Table 3

CSP Leaders' Plans for Future CSPs

Case	Summary of the Current CSP	Plans for Future CSPs
------	----------------------------	-----------------------

Case 1 The Phoenix	<p>CSP between a community college, economic development organization, and local industries</p> <p>Purpose: To create an Advanced Manufacturing Apprenticeship Program to develop a skilled labor pool for current and future employers and improve career opportunities for residents</p>	<p>Campus Leader: Scale the current CSP into expanded apprenticeship programs for tourism and hospitality, masonry, construction, electrical, plumbing, IT, coding; offer an apprenticeship program to incarcerated residents</p> <p>Community Leader: Expand the advanced manufacturing apprenticeship program adding more industry partners; create a pre-apprentice program that is for high school students</p>
Case 2 The Beehive	<p>CSP between a community college, county government, local industry, and the county school system</p> <p>Purpose: Provide career opportunities for underemployed and unemployed residents and build the skilled labor pool for current and potential industry</p>	<p>Campus Leader: Create a county-wide Leader Council for local leaders from all the major sectors to communicate and lead collaborative programs to support the community</p> <p>Community Leader: Add additional pathways for the current program partnering with other sectors such as construction, plumbing, electrical; utilize the new pathways to provide opportunities for people with criminal records; continue to explore other pathways for people who are not a fit for manufacturing or skilled trades</p>
Case 3 The Compass	<p>CSP between a community college and local industries</p> <p>Purpose: To provide a formal mechanism for communication between the partners to determine the needs of industry and best ways to meet those needs</p>	<p>Campus Leader: Create a similar CSP for residential and commercial construction companies to address their needs related to expected major growth in this sector to meet a rapidly rising housing demand</p> <p>Community Leader: Will be participating in a new CSP to create a science and math school in the region; is willing to participate whenever asked with new CSPs to support the community based on the track record of existing CSPs in the community</p>
Case 4 The Treasure	<p>CSP between a community college and local industries</p> <p>Purpose: Create an apprenticeship program to increase the skilled labor pool and offer strong career opportunities to residents</p>	<p>Campus Leader: Are in the process of getting a pre-apprenticeship program approved; create a CSP with building contractors to establish a Building Trades apprenticeship and with HVAC contractors; seek grants to develop a workforce related CSP with area high schools</p> <p>Community Leader: Plan to grow the existing CSP for apprenticeships; work with the community college to fine tune the curriculum and schedule; plans to strengthen the existing CSP to ensure it is sustainable;</p>

		open to participating in other regional CSPs for apprenticeships
--	--	--

Conclusion

This chapter began with case descriptions for the four cases and a description of campus and community leaders' perceptions of the key elements of the formation process. By providing rich findings about CSP participation among campus and community organizations based on personal interviews with leaders and the CSP documents shared, the four cases in this study revealed a distinct personality for each case based on their unique characteristics and operation styles. Based on the personality that emerged from the findings about each case, I assigned each case a metamorphic name: Case 1 (The Phoenix), Case 2 (The Beehive), Case 3 (The Compass), and Case 4 (The Treasure). Next, I compared the features of each case across cases as well as the leaders' perceptions of the formation process.

The next section covered the leaders' initial expectations about the value creation and then a discussion of leaders' perceptions of the actual value created. Findings showcased the broad scope of value types gained from participating in a CSP, in comparison to the traditional treatment of only assessing quantifiable resources gained. The types of value perceived by the campus and community leaders in this study were rich and added to what the leaders perceived as critical long-term impact of participating in a CSP. This section concluded with leaders' perceptions of how the CSP value creation differed from leaders' expectations. I included the insights leaders shared about they learned from the experience of participating in a CSP as well as their plans for creating future CSPs or expanding existing CSPs. Overall, this chapter revealed how my study provided an opportunity for campus and community leaders to share rich details

about their lived experiences of participating in CSPs to develop resources and address shared issues in their communities.

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This multi-case study of CSP leaders' perceptions of the formation process and value created from participating in campus community CSPs helped to narrow the considerable gap in the literature on this topic. Because campus and community leaders have a responsibility to their organizations when considering whether to participate in such a practice, any available research about CSPs can be quite useful to their decision-making process. This chapter covers the summary findings of my study related to CSP formation and value creation, along with how these findings relate to the CVC framework and other prior research in this field. A discussion of this study's key implications for future practice, policy, and research, followed by the limitations of this study, completes this final chapter.

Summary of Findings

A summary of the core findings of my study about CSP leaders' perceptions will be outlined in this section, as they relate to my two research questions. These research questions were informed by the CVC framework as a novel way to look at campus community CSPs, as follows:

1. How do campus and community leaders perceive the CSP formation process?
2. How do campus and community leaders perceive the value created from CSPs?

Regarding my first research question, the summary of findings related to campus and community leaders' perceptions of the formation process will be covered in sections related to the major elements of formation perceived as significant by the CSP leaders. The findings about leaders' perceptions of formation will cover key elements of formation, CSP leader influence on formation, and CSP personalities as they relate to formation. Next, I will provide the summary of the findings about leaders' perceptions of value creation that were perceived as significant by

CSP leaders. The four expanded types of value as outlined in the CVC framework will comprise the key sections of the findings about value creation: associational, transferred resource, interaction, and synergistic. Several emerging types of CSP value creation will also be summarized in this section. The findings for each case include results from the analysis of the case documents.

Campus and Community Leaders' Perceptions of the Formation Process

Each of the eight campus and community CSP leaders was interviewed about the elements of the formation process perceived as important. For each case, the campus and community leaders perceived different elements of the formation process to be significant based on their interview responses, as shown in Appendix L.

Key elements of formation. Both of the leaders in Case 2 (The Beehive) and Case 3 (The Compass) perceived the rank of the leader participating in the CSP to be critical so that decisions could be made in an expedient manner, especially pertaining to funding mechanisms and commitments. All eight of the leaders perceived having a shared mission to be an important element of CSP formation. Resource contribution and type were perceived as a key formation element by all of the leaders. In Case 1 (The Phoenix) and in Case 4 (The Treasure), the process of strengthening operations within the partnering organizations was critical to being prepared to form a CSP. Financial structure was considered to be a vital contribution towards successful formation and contributing to the CSP's sustainability. For example, in Case 2 (The Beehive), the CSP leaders utilized an external model to design an innovative approach to the financial structure of the CSP.

Organizational compatibility was perceived as a key formation element in three of the cases. Previous experience working together on other programs or CSPs was a factor in deciding

to form a new CSP together. Having a shared mission was what attracted potential partners to each other initially and was perceived as vital by the CSP leaders, such as increasing the available pool of skilled labor and providing quality job opportunities for residents. Using a participatory approach during formation to develop a shared mission and understanding of that mission increased partner buy-in during formation, especially for Case 3 (The Compass).

CSP leadership influence on formation. Nearly all of the leaders perceived having clearly defined partner roles as an important element of CSP formation, which helped the process go more smoothly. The individual values held by leaders, an emerging theme, came into play in formation for at least one leader in each case. Almost all of the leaders had prior experience participating in a CSP, which contributed to their positive attitudes towards the use of this tool and their choice to use it again. Other formation themes that emerged included values held by leaders, such as loyalty and commitment to the community in which one lives, and also related professional and personal experience. Leadership style was also a factor in how the CSPs were formed. For example, Campus Leader 1's servant-leadership style played a role in the formation of Case 1 (The Phoenix). Leaders' commitments to playing an active role in the CSP and willingness to commit the required resources, such as start-up funding and staffing, was a key formation element serving to get the CSP off to a strong start. CSP leaders had certain expectations of each other regarding commitment, including sharing ideas, staying engaged, following up on assigned tasks, and going above and beyond what is expected outside of the meeting to support the CSP, including doing behind-the-scenes work when needed.

CSP personalities. My study revealed an unanticipated finding of how CSP personalities started to take shape during formation. The elements of formation deemed to be important to leaders in each case helped to inform the personality of each case. For Case 1 (The Phoenix), the

two leaders being pre-alliance champions quickly served to invigorate this dormant CSP. Case 2 (The Beehive), involved partners who were participating in a wide range of other CSPs around the community, resulting in a high level of leader activity across the county. The leaders in Case 2 (The Beehive) perceived a high number of formation elements to be important, as compared to the leaders in the other three cases. In Case 3 (The Compass), recruiting a sizeable group of industry partners to participate in the CSP to provide feedback about their needs to the college was necessary for the college to know what direction to go in supporting local industry. For Case 4 (The Treasure), in order to create the desired high-value apprenticeship program for local residents, resource sharing was particularly critical.

Campus and Community Leaders' Perceptions of Value Created

The campus and community leaders in each of the four cases offered their perceptions of the value created by participating in a CSP. This section includes a summary of the types of value that leaders shared, including the four types of value outlined in the CVC (i.e., associational, transferred resource, interaction, and synergistic; Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) and other types of values that emerged.

Associational value. The findings revealed numerous examples of associational value, or values related to working together (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a), created by the CSPs in these four cases. Participants in this study perceived that the public visibility of the CSPs in each case increased the partners' credibility with the community and with funding sources. The value of associating with other sectors, such as industry, was elevated further by campus and community leaders working together when recruiting potential industry partners because the CSPs provided evidence of a proactive commitment of leaders to solving shared issues in the community. When CSP leaders publicly shared information with community members at public meetings,

presentations, and through marketing efforts, they raised awareness about the shared issues the CSPs were created to solve, such as new industries demanding more skilled labor, underemployment, and poverty. This public awareness resulted in public buy-in for the programs associated with each CSP.

However, associational value manifested differently across cases. In Case 4 (The Treasure), the industry partner went to great lengths to offer a full-scale apprenticeship program for local residents, but the participation rate increase did not play out as quickly as anticipated. The community leader was perplexed by this, and the leaders had not yet determined what was causing the slower response rate despite the high level of benefits to program participants, to the point of being life-changing. For Case 2 (The Beehive), participation in the CSP's program to increase the amount of skilled labor available grew dramatically with each cohort, which could be related to the grass-roots style of marketing carried out for this CSP helping to spread the word about how this program was directly impacting residents' lives. Notably, the apprenticeship program in Case 4 (The Treasure) did require a much longer time commitment than the job training program in Case 2 (The Beehive). These participation factors warrant additional study.

According to campus and community leaders, other ways in which CSPs created associational value included engagement with other key leaders in the community, as well as gaining a reputation for building people up in the community by working together to provide better opportunities for residents. These high-impact values were not the original reason for joining a CSP, but the leaders perceived them as being very beneficial to themselves as leaders and to the organizations they represented. The leaders of Case 1 (The Phoenix) likened this experience to "becoming champions at home."

Transferred resource value. Transferred resource value is the type most closely aligned with foundational perspectives about the value that can be created by CSPs (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). According to campus and community leaders, the CSPs in the four cases drew on several funding sources, including grants, shared funding, county government, and local industries. Being able to combine funding resources had a dramatic impact on the operational strength and sustainability of the CSPs. The colleges in each case benefited from increased enrollment, even if that was not the mission of the CSP but rather an offshoot of the mission, such as reducing underemployment. In all four cases, the partners benefited from shared staff or increased staffing levels related to the CSP. Shared leadership was also perceived as a high-impact value.

Program expansion was another value that was perceived, especially by the campus leaders, as building up long-term capacity for the colleges. Campus and community leaders also noted benefitting from other forms of transferred resource value, such as meeting hosting, planning, and providing lunch for attendees. Despite the upper-level positions held by these leaders, even lower-cost types of support were valued.

Certain types of transferred resource value only showed up in certain cases. For example, in Case 3 (The Compass), both partners benefited from sharing space. In Case 4 (The Treasure), leaders noted that the CSP would benefit from volunteer assistance when the community leader retired since he planned to continue to support the apprenticeship program. In the two cases where the community college had a state-of-the-art training facility, Case 2 (The Beehive) and Case 4 (The Treasure), this value ranked very highly for the community leaders in those cases.

Finally, in some instances, campus and community leaders in the same case identified the same sources of transferred resource value (i.e., shared leadership). In other instances, common sources of transferred resource value were identified by either the community leaders (i.e.,

training facilities at the community college) or the campus leaders (i.e., increased enrollment) across two or more cases.

Interaction value. In the CVC, interaction value refers to values derived from the process of working together (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Access to new networks was a form of interaction value that stood out as particularly worthy to campus and community leaders in each case. According to the leaders, this access was invaluable because networks take a long time and major investment in energy to develop. Leaders felt that access to new networks could open up entirely new arenas of opportunities and expedite relationship building that would otherwise take years for each leader to accomplish individually. The leaders felt similarly about new target populations, such as older students, for job training and apprenticeship programs. Another significant form of interaction value, reported by leaders of Case 1 (The Phoenix), was the development of an internal mechanism for how each division of the college could learn to participate in a CSP and knowledge creation of a model for future apprenticeship programs to add. In all four cases, leaders identified sharing knowledge about community needs, representing yet another type of interaction value.

Across cases, the interaction value created by CSPs led to positive outcomes for both partners. For example, in Case 3 (The Compass), those who worked at the college learned what industries' specific needs were. Through the CSP, this knowledge contributed to strengthening the industry such that it became more productive, efficient, and profitable, improving the economic vitality of the community. In turn, the campus leader reported that the college valued their interactions with industry so much that they worked to improve existing internal processes and create others in order to develop new programs and create ways for industries to follow

through with offers of support. As another example, the ability to interact together helped to improve relationships between the college and local industry in Case 4 (The Treasure).

Synergistic value. Synergistic value is the most profound of the four types of value examined in this study because it can result in the most radical organizational change, influence, and long-term impact (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). Examples found in the four cases proved this to be true. All eight leaders reported plans to create new and expanded CSPs in the future, offering positive implications for their communities given what they had learned about the value of sectors working together. The expanded programs resulting from the CSPs drove new investments in staff, programming, and infrastructure at the colleges, tremendously building up education and training capacity. The leaders in Case 1 (The Phoenix) reported increased political power for both partners as a result of the CSP. The CSP in Case 4 (The Treasure), resulted in a spin-off, pre-apprenticeship program for high school students involving two other community colleges. The community leaders in the Case 3 (The Compass), and Case 4 (The Treasure), both reported a greater ability to influence corporate attitudes and behavior regarding community outreach based on the positive results from participating in their respective CSPs thus far.

The leaders in all four cases reported that being able to share leadership had myriad positive outcomes since new ideas were shared, new ways of thinking emerged, and the burden of managing the CSP was lightened for each sector. Leaders in several cases also noted another form of synergistic value: internal process improvements. For example, in Case 1 (The Phoenix), members of several divisions within the college made necessary resource and programming modifications and learned how to fully participate in a CSP, and the college in Case 3 (The Compass) developed new internal processes for instituting new programs. The Case 4 (The Treasure) leaders gained so much from establishing the first apprenticeship program that

multiple new CSPs were created and 12 different types of apprenticeship programs are now offered, representing a meaningful gain in synergistic value.

Relationship to Prior Research

Existing research about campus community partnerships informed my study about leader perceptions of CSP formation and value created. Because this study was guided by Austin and Seitanidi's (2012a, 2012b) CVC framework, I will first discuss how the findings of my study relate to their framework. Next, I will review how the findings relate to prior research about CSPs in higher education and the role of CSP leaders.

Relationship to the CVC Framework

The CVC framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a) has been typically used as a tool to evaluate business and non-profit CSPs. This is the first known application of CVC framework to the value created by campus and community CSPs. This study utilized the constructs of the CVC related to value creation and the collaborative stage of formation (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, 2012b). Austin and Seitanidi's study (2012b) revealed how the collaborative processes involved in CSPs contribute to the value these partnerships create. The CVC framework has a central focus on the formation process since it is considered to be the most critical stage for fostering value creation. With this in mind, the formation process and value creation were the two constructs selected to guide this study of CSPs in higher education.

The formation process. CSPs can produce a wide range of values depending on how they are designed and implemented. Thus, it is essential to study the origins of the CSP before trying to interpret data about the outcomes of the CSP, the value created. My study, utilizing the CVC framework, provided a new lens through which to view how formation and value creation are perceived by leaders of campus and community CSPs.

Partner compatibility. The critical starting point for a CSP is identifying linked interests with a shared issue (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b). Each case in this study involved a CSP with the over-arching shared issue of workforce development. The shared issue displayed specific nuances in each case, making them each unique. The same linked interest can be perceived differently by leaders of different sectors (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b). For example, in Case 2 (The Beehive), the campus leader specifically looked at the issues of underemployment and poverty as they related to how the college could provide education and training to reduce these issues. The community leader in Case 2 (The Beehive) specifically looked at these same issues as to how they relate to overall county-wide health. Selecting the most appropriate partner for a CSP is a critical step that largely serves to determine the potential for value creation (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b). The leaders in each case accomplished the collaborative practice of partner selection in varying ways to meet the needs of what they were trying to accomplish and based on the unique characteristics of their communities.

Resource complementarity. When cross-sector partners are compatible, a high degree of resource complementarity can occur since “each partner has the potential to contribute, including tangible (money, land, facilities, machinery, supplies, structures, natural resources) and intangible resources (knowledge, capabilities, management practices, and skills)” (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012b, p. 993). This study revealed a broad array of types of resources contributed to the CSPs in each of the four cases. Types of resources shared included expanded funding opportunities, shared space, shared leadership, shared staff, institutional knowledge, previous leader CSP experience, specialized resources such as high-tech training facilities, access to networks, expanded access to populations to serve, process improvements, gaining an understanding of community needs, potential for future collaborations. In each case, the partner

compatibility level was high for each CSP, so the CSP resource complementarity was correspondingly high. The willingness of the partners in each sector to contribute to the CSP as part of the formation process also influenced the level of eventual value creation.

Value creation. The basis for the CVC framework is that creating value is the main reason for organizations to form CSPs (Austin, 2010). Without the use of the CVC framework as a basis for examining more in-depth types of value created, the value created by the campus and community CSP in each of the four cases in my study would have been limited to the basic resources gained for each partner. The study would have missed the meaningful findings about the four expanded types of value identified in the CVC framework.

More in-depth types of value. As a result of using the four expanded types of value offered by the CVC framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a), I obtained rich information from the campus and community CSP leader interviews about the value created by each CSP. This information was corroborated by the documents shared in each case for this study. These more in-depth value types were previously less examined in the literature.

It was not straightforward to previously assess the potential impact of participating in a campus community CSP when the scope and meaning of these more in-depth types of value were not available to leaders for consideration. The findings of this study pertaining to value creation, as outlined in Chapter 4 and in the previous section of this chapter, turned out to directly correlate to the four expanded types of value established by the CVC framework. Organizational compatibility found in each case served to increase the level of value created, which was higher than expected by the leaders in all four cases. In one case the leaders had limited anticipation of success and were pleasantly surprised by the success of the CSP, even in its early stages. The four types of value outlined in the CVC framework were presented by the

campus and community leaders in all four cases in varying degrees and depth, further revealing the uniqueness of each case and the high level of relevancy of the CVC framework to campus and community CSPs. Using the CVC framework allowed for the examination of value creation that has long-term impact, such as those values identified as synergistic values. The long-term value created could potentially have the greatest influence on the sustainability of a campus community CSP, so this type of value is particularly noteworthy for campus and community leaders to explore when considering whether or not to participate in a CSP.

Relationship to Other CSP Research

In addition to Austin and Seitanidi's body of research on CSPs (Austin, 2000; Seitanidi, 2010; Austin & Seitanidi, 2014; Austin & Seitanidi, 2016), particularly the development of the CVC framework, my study expands on prior research related to CSPs in higher education and leader perceptions of CSPs. This section includes examples of such connections.

Political, financial, and operational dynamics. In a study of 182 public and private partnerships, Henig et al. (2016) revealed political, operational, and educational dynamics that significantly influenced the success of CSPs. Similarly, in this study, Case 1 (The Phoenix) provided an example of how having the campus and community CSP leaders appear together at public meetings served as evidence of their collaboration and resulted in an increase in political and financial support for their CSP work. In turn, the increased support contributed to the CSP's success and to political leaders' willingness to support future CSPs. Case 2 (The Beehive) illustrated the influence of operational dynamics on CSP success. Specifically, this CSP used a financing model borrowed from a successful CSP in another state as a way to achieve the CSP's mission to reduce underemployment and poverty through direct industry funding of the CSP efforts.

Setting the tone of the CSP. Leaders set the initial tone of the CSP and determine its direction as it progresses (Crosby & Bryson, 2007). In Case 3 (The Compass), Campus Leader 3 went to great lengths to involve all of the industry partners in the formation process, extending this process to over a year's time in order to build relationships. This resulted in a high level of continued industry partner participation, as the community partner in this CSP. The positive outcomes of the relationship building that went into Case 3 (The Compass) also connects to Austin's (2000) finding that "due diligence and relationship building are key process variables that can determine the fit between the partners" (p. 50). In Case 2 (The Beehive), there was a family tone to the CSP, established by the high level of familiarity between key leaders in the community. This tone set an atmosphere of trust and mutual support, along with a willingness to consider future collaborations. In Case 4 (The Treasure), the campus and community leaders both wanted to support the community and lift people up through improved employment opportunities. They were also willing to commit whatever resources necessary to make this CSP work, which sent a message to each other of high-level commitment to the mission of the CSP.

Leader selection. Rondinelli and London (2003) emphasized the importance of the selection of leaders they referred to as "pre-alliance champions who are senior level, have a high level of commitment to the mission, and play a central role in developing the necessary teams for the CSP" (p. 73). The two leaders of the CSP in Case 1 (The Phoenix) met this description of being pre-alliance champions. In fact, their energy and dedication committed to this CSP helped to revive it from a dormant and ineffective state.

Community partners tend to closely observe the organizational levels of university leaders appointed to CSP leadership roles, as this can reflect how much the university values the partnership and how invested it intends to become in the relationship (Leiderman et al., 2002). In

each of the four cases in this study, an upper level college administrator served as a CSP leader, sending a clear message to the community partners that the college valued the work of the CSP and was invested in the effort. Applying this same concept to the community partner, in Case 2 (The Beehive), the highest county government official was the person who initially contacted each of the potential industry partners. Community Leader 2 reported that this made a positive impression on the key industry leaders in the county, resulting in their eager participation in the CSP. Their participation included a willingness to make sizeable financial commitments to the CSP, which were necessary for its operation.

Importance of community involvement. Community members find value in being included in the process of redefining community needs and developing ways to meet those needs (Crosby & Bryson, 2005). In Case 2 (The Beehive) and Case 4 (The Treasure), the community partner and other industry partners helped shape the apprentice program by designing and providing feedback about curriculum, determining course schedules, and providing feedback to the colleges about the effectiveness of their training programs. It was of high value to them as leaders to be asked to provide input into the program and to see that their input was taken into consideration when changes needed to be made.

Leaders are more likely to engage in cross-sector collaboration if separate efforts by one or more sectors to address a public problem previously failed and leaders believe the problem cannot be corrected by one sector alone (Crosby, 2010). This phenomenon was evident in Case 2 (The Beehive), where the CSP was aimed at addressing societal issues of underemployment and poverty. The leaders perceived these problems as too complex for any one sector to tackle. In Case 4 (The Treasure), the community partner had previously participated in several similar CSPs and had not had a very positive experience. Yet, over the ensuing years, Community

Leader 4 was aware that building up the skilled labor pool was another type of issue that one sector could not solve on its own. Eventually, this leader reached out to the community college, based on familiarity and satisfaction with its programs and personnel. It was the actual structure, including appropriate partner selection, that needed to be remedied so that a CSP could address this shared issue.

Partnering with higher education. Weerts (2005) found that “community partner leaders formed their opinions about campus commitment to engagement through a combination of three factors: language and symbolic actions of campus leadership, personal experiences with faculty and staff, and success in navigating the complex structures of the university” (p. 1). One of the attractions to Community Leader 4 of working with the community college was the level of support and friendliness this leader and other staff encountered when working with the college staff.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research

This study offers a multitude of implications for future practice, policy, and research regarding how campus and community leaders perceive the CSP formation process and value creation. In addition to how this study can inform campus and community leaders’ decisions to become involved in CSPs, there are widespread implications of the potential benefits to the host community from an increase in collaborations across sectors.

Implications for Practice

CSP participation offers campus leaders an additional avenue for compensating for reductions in funding to higher education, so this is a timely and relevant practice for today’s campus leaders to consider. Many campus leaders may not previously have considered using the practice of forming a CSP with a community organization to solve a shared issue. If campus and

community leaders are to make decisions about CSP participation in an informed manner and reap the potential resource generation benefits of this practice, they must be able to access relevant research. These leaders can utilize findings from this study to gain an understanding of the lived experiences of other campus leaders who have done so, and to learn from leaders' perceptions of these experiences. It may also be meaningful for campus leaders to learn more about community leaders' perceptions of participating in a CSP with a campus partner. Gaining an understanding of how partners from other sectors view participating in a CSP may increase empathy, communication, and collaboration between partners and help partners know what to anticipate from each other. Increased understanding of the benefits of participating in a CSP and how processes such as formation actually work could serve to increase the use of this practice by campus leaders. This understanding could help to garner support for the use of CSPs from higher level campus administrators and external funding agencies. For example, the National Science Foundation might consider this collaborative practice as an approach for supporting campuses and communities to address societal issues.

For community leaders considering participating in a CSP, this study provides insights from other community leaders who participated in campus community CSPs as a potential basis to guide decision-making. By learning about leader satisfaction and positive CSP results, community leaders may be receptive to the idea of partnering with a campus partner. This idea might not previously have seemed possible based on power differences or lack of experience with CSPs in general. Just as with the campus leaders learning about the community leader perspective, findings of this study may help community leaders to understand campus leaders' perspectives. My study also provides concrete examples of the types of shared issues that can be tackled through campus community CSPs, which could serve as an inspiration to both types of

leaders to participate in CSPs. The nature of campus community CSPs is changing to become more collaborative and to address shared issues, so having information about leaders' perceptions of this experience from both sectors is beneficial.

In addition to informing campus and community leaders, this study may be useful to other members of organizations in these two sectors as they are asked to participate and support a campus community CSP. For example, findings about the perceived key elements of the formation process and the potential for types of value created may benefit college staff members, staff members of community organizations, and non-profit board members since CSPs are a relatively new practice. CSPs require a significant investment of staff time and resources, so it is valuable for all of the potential players to understand how CSPs are formed and what types of value could be potentially expected as outcomes of a CSP. With better information, members of campus and community organizations can work within and across organizations to consider potential CSPs to create to develop resources and expand populations served.

Implications for Policy

Findings from this study may inform policy makers about the potential benefits of CSP involvement and the types of resources that might be needed to support CSP efforts. Various governmental entities could provide seed funding and ease or streamline regulatory requirements for programs coordinated by campus community CSPs. Non-profit and private organizations could offer financial incentives for campus community CSPs that effectively work to resolve shared issues. Funding support mechanisms for campus community CSPs could specifically target critical shared social issues, such as poverty in the community or inadequate employment or training opportunities. The shortage of research on the topic of CSPs in higher education could

warrant policy to support and fund research in this area, especially in regard to the impact of CSPs during times of funding constraints in higher education.

As an example of a national higher education organization working to foster partnerships and related policies, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) issued a set of guidelines for establishing partnerships in general, “Making Partnerships Work: Principles, Guidelines, and Advice for Public University Leaders” (2018). These guidelines included policy recommendations, most importantly stressing that local, state, and federal policies should not be a barrier to the establishment of partnerships with public colleges and universities. The authors stressed the need for policy to clear the way for large-scale partnerships between the higher education sector and private businesses so that the private sector can feel comfortable entering into agreements. These recommendations apply to my study regarding the establishment of CSPs, as well. Policies need to be clear that it is acceptable and encouraged for institutions of higher education to form CSPs with the public higher education sector. Additional guidelines could be developed by other national and state organizations specific to different types of higher education institutions. Other entities could form guidelines for community partners, including both non- and for-profit organizations, to support the use of CSPs. Such guidelines could incorporate findings from this study and other campus community CSP research, particularly more recent research reflecting the increased trend of interest in cross-sector collaboration.

Suggestions for Future Research

Because of the evolving nature of the topic of CSPs in higher education, numerous avenues of research could be explored. A future study could employ a quantitative methodology instead by changing the data collection method to an online survey of campus and community

CSP leaders, with modifications made to the questions used for the in-person surveys to examine CSP leader perceptions. Conducting a survey online could help to eliminate researcher bias since there would be no face-to-face interaction with the participants. Providing an online survey to campus and community CSP leaders could allow for the use of a larger sample size and result in broader responses. The results of this study could then be generalized since the sample would be larger and broader in scope. Using an online survey could result in higher participation levels of leaders of CSPs since it may allow for more flexible and convenient response times for participants who typically have high responsibility levels and demanding schedules. However, a questionnaire would not allow for the collection of rich data that is afforded by personal interviews.

Another future study about leader perceptions of CSPs could involve changing the institutional sample to urban community colleges or to public four-year colleges. Such a study would yield information about whether and how geographic setting and/or institutional type influences leaders' CSP participation experiences. Such findings might offer meaningful comparisons to the rural community college sample in my study. In the four-year college setting, the use of CSPs for purposes beyond research and service learning requires more study. It would be valuable to learn about the perceptions of campus and community leaders involved in the early stage of the use of this approach to shared problem solving. A third suggestion is to conduct a study to create a new model or framework about what campus community CSP factors lead to sustainability. There is ample room in this field of study for additional models and frameworks to guide research and practice related to CSPs.

Another suggested study could involve examining campus and community leaders' perceptions of the implementation process, since this process is also considered in the CVC

framework (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). This study could focus on barriers to CSP progress and sustainability and factors that support CSP success, as well as how CSPs manage change.

Finally, it would be of interest to conduct a study about the attributes of communities that tend to be more amenable to forming campus community CSPs to solve shared issues. Factors such as leader traits, organization types, economic considerations, population size, and predominant social issues could be examined, among other factors. This study could assist higher education leaders with determining which communities may be most likely to have organizations amenable to forming CSPs. The use of CSPs in higher education is a field of study leaving much to be explored to inform research, policy, and practice.

The sustainability of CSPs is a related major topic which also needs more research. A study could be conducted to examine which features of CSPs contribute towards the sustainability of the CSP. It is possible a future study could focus on which elements of the formation process contribute best to CSP sustainability or how the extent and types of value creation lend themselves towards CSP sustainability. This is a critical topic since leadership of organizations and CSPs has the potential to change, so fostering the continued sustainability of CSPs is essential for the ongoing use of this practice to solve shared issues and meet needs in higher education.

The research for this study was conducted during 2019, which was prior to the advent of the new global challenges caused by COVID-19 and the advancing social movement in support of Black lives which is focused on achieving racial justice and equality. Both of these topics lend well to the use of CSPs because they are complex problems best addressed by multiple sectors through the use of CSPs. How CSPs will be utilized to address these two critical problems is an additional suggestion for future topics of study.

Limitations of the Study

Interviews are valuable because they allow participants to share experiences and to express their thoughts and feelings, but they are not perfect (Weiss, 1994). My interviews relied on leaders to provide self-reports of their experiences regarding participating in CSPs related to supporting workforce development and older students. Since my interview protocol was designed to elicit information about experiences that CSP leaders defined as important, data could have been biased toward the point of view of each leader. A second limitation is potential researcher bias. I described my positionality to add transparency to my study, along with the realization that my positionality contributed to my ability to co-construct the data along with my research participants in a meaningful way. My positionality aided in my interpretation of the data because of the insight I have as a researcher on the topic of campus and community cross-sector partnerships. I am aware as a researcher that my belief in CSPs could result in viewing data in a more positive light in certain instances.

There were considerations about my population and sample I could not control, resulting in additional limitations to my study, which I acknowledge. For example, it was not possible to anticipate funding changes for national, state, and local programs considered for my population. The end of the funding for the national Plus 50 program resulted in my population focus shifting to state and local workforce development programs to support adult students serving a broader student age range over 25 years of age. Finally, I could not control who decided to participate in this study. It was up to each of the campus and community leaders if they were willing to participate in my study.

Conclusion

Interest in the use of CSPs in higher education is on the rise, driven by resource shortfalls in traditional funding areas and an increase in shared societal issues, which are more effectively solved by sectors working together (AASCU, 2018; Crosby & Bryson, 2005). Findings from this study may serve to inform campus and community leaders about the CSP formation process and value creation in order to facilitate their decisions about participating in CSPs.

As a key starting point to formation, partner selection was perceived by the CSP leaders to be a critical step influencing the potential for value to be created. Partners, as organizations and their leaders representing campus or community, tended to be selected based on familiarity of working together previously on different projects or CSPs, as well as familiarity between leaders, sometimes to the extent that the relationships between leaders was described as having a family-like feel. Organizational compatibility also played a key role in partner selection. Partner selection was carried out in a purposeful manner, ensuring that each partner had resources to contribute to the CSP and the two organizations agreed upon the proposed mission of the CSP, having a high level of interest in solving a shared issue together. Shared issues of the CSPs in this study were related to workforce development and expanded sometimes to large societal issues, such as underemployment and poverty. In some cases, the need to address the shared issue was of an urgent nature. Additional partners for the CSPs were sometimes recruited by leaders from within the same sector, such as industry. In some cases, the personal motivation of leaders made participating in a CSP appealing, including having a heartfelt commitment to the community. This finding connects well with the historic mission of community colleges—to meet the needs of the local regions in which they reside (Bragg, 2001).

Making infrastructure improvements was perceived by the leaders to be another key step during formation. The partners took extra care to ensure that from within their organizations,

they were ready to be active players in the CSP. Innovation emerged in one of the cases, where the unique and highly effective financial structure of the CSP was modeled after a successful CSP in another state. Clear identification of leader roles helped the CSPs operate smoothly. Many of the perceptions of the eight leaders about formation mirrored the elements deemed important for formation in the CVC framework.

It was essential for leaders to be fully committed to participating in the CSP, including dedicating resources, participating in the shared leadership of the CSP, and contributing time, energy, and individual talents. A central manner for securing leader buy-in was having upper-level leaders invite other leaders to the table and open the door for introducing the proposed CSP, garnering feedback about the CSP plans, discussing potential benefits of the CSP, determining the needs of partners, and outlining the necessary partner commitments to participate. Leaders who previously participated in a CSP were highly likely to be interested in participating in another CSP, based on an awareness of the potential of CSPs to effectively address shared issues. The formation steps of well-structured CSPs were then easily replicated in the creation of new or expanded CSPs in each case. Individual leader traits, leader motivation, and leader relationship building emerged as important themes of the formation process.

Value creation lies at the center of the host of reasons for organizations to be interested in forming CSPs. The CVC framework created by Austin and Seitanidi (2012a; 2012b) provided structure for examining the campus and community leaders' perceptions of value creation in this study. Findings both confirmed and expanded on the CVC framework because leaders perceived new forms of value creation, offering rich new insights about potential benefits of CSPs as practice in higher education. The value creation results perceived by the eight leaders in this study directly connected to the four expanded types of value offered in the CVC framework. The

four expanded types of value that can be created by a CSP provide many new ways to regard and more fully understand and appreciate the rich value created by a CSP, as compared to the traditional method of identifying basic resources gained, such as funding, shared space, and staff.

The eight campus and community leaders in this study provided rich examples of their perceptions of the value created from participating in a CSP. These examples could readily be categorized based on the four expanded values from the CVC: associational, transferred resource, interaction, and synergistic (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a). This reveals the strength of the CVC framework as a tool to assess CSPs. Other perceived values that emerged in this study included leader satisfaction and the experience itself of participating in a CSP.

This study contributed to the body of knowledge about campus community CSPs by examining campus and community leader perceptions of the formation process and value creation using a relevant conceptual framework, the CVC (Austin & Seitanidi, 2012a, 2012b). Among participants in this study, leaders' perceptions of CSPs did align with the core features of the CVC framework. Examples of all four types of expanded value were found in the data about leader perceptions.

Findings also add to the available information about the experience of participating in a CSP related to higher education, specifically about formation and value creation of CSPs. One unanticipated finding was that CSPs each had unique characteristics, which lent to an identifiable personality of the partnership. The personalities were influenced by leadership styles and personal traits of the leaders, culture of the community, needs of the community, the types of shared issue being worked on, and other unique characteristics of each case.

By drawing on findings from this study, campus and community leaders who are considering CSP participation can know what to expect from the CSP formation process and the

types of value that may be created. Leaders can learn from the experiences and choices of the eight campus and community leaders in this study and avoid potential pitfalls while establishing a CSP. This study confirmed that there can be much more to participating in CSPs than meets the eye, for CSP leaders and the organizations they serve. There exists a multitude of potentially positive aspects to consider related to this emerging collaborative problem-solving practice for higher education and their prospective partners from other sectors.

References

- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2020). *Fast Facts 2020*.
- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2017). *Fast Facts 2017*.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). (2015). *Back to Work 50+*.
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). (2018). *Community Locations*. AARP.org.
Retrieved from <https://www.aarp.org/aarp-foundation/our-work/income/back-to-work-50-plus/smart-strategies-for-50-plus-jobseekers/info-2014/community-locations.html>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (2018). *Making Partnerships Work: Principles, Guidelines, and Advice for Public University Leaders*.
- Abdy, M., & Barclay, J. (2001). Marketing collaborations in the voluntary sector. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(3), 215-230.
- About Us*. AARP.org. Retrieved January 4, 2017 from <https://www.aarp.org/aarp-foundation/our-work/income/back-to-work-50-plus/about-us/>
- Afshar, A. (2005). *Community-Campus Partnerships for Economic Development*. Partnerships/Community, Paper 26. University of Nebraska/Omaha.
- American Council on Education. (2008, November). *Mapping New Directions: Higher Education for Older Adults*.
- Anaf, S., Drummond, C., & Sheppard, L. A. (2007). Combining case study research and systems theory as a heuristic model. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1309-1315. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732307308946>
- Andrews, R. & Entwistle. T. (2010, July 1) Does cross-sectoral partnership deliver? An empirical exploration of public service effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. *Journal of*

Public Administration Research and Theory, 20(3), 679-701. Retrieved from
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup045>

Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2004). Analyzing documentary realities. *Qualitative Research*, 3, 77-92.

Austin, J. E. (2000). Strategic collaboration between non-profits and business. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25, 69-97. DOI: 10.1177/089976400773746346

Austin, J. E. (2010). From organization to organization: On creating value. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(Suppl. 1), 13-15.

Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012a). Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses: Part I. Value creation spectrum and collaboration stages. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(5), 726-758.

Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2012b). Collaborative value creation: A review of partnering between nonprofits and businesses. Part 2: Partnership processes and outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 929-968.

Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. M. (2014). *Creating value in nonprofit-business collaborations: New thinking and practice*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/vt/detail.action?docID=1632619>

Austin, J. E., & Seitanidi, M. (2016). Value Creation through Collaboration. *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*, 427-443.

Bahr, P. R., Mehri, N., Cummins, P. A., & Brown, J. S. (2020). Community Colleges and Older Learners in Ohio Higher Education.

Barr, J. (2016). The plus 50 population in higher education: Challenges and triumphs. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 64(1), 51-55.

- Bennett, A. (1975). Hierarchy as a learning platform. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 36(3), 255-260.
- Bloom, P., & Dees, J. (2008, Winter). Cultivate your ecosystem. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(1), 47-53.
- Blumenstik, G. (2018). *The adult student*. The Chronicle of Higher Education.
- Boggs, G. R. (2010). Democracy's colleges: The evolution of the community college in America. *Prepared for the White House Summit on Community Colleges, Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges*, 1-15.
- Bohn, S., Reyes, B., & Johnson, H. (2013). *The impact of budget cuts on California's community college system*. Public Policy Institute of California.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. DOI: 10.3316/QRJ0902027
- Bowen, S., & Martens, P. J. (2006, October). A model for collaborative evaluation of university-community partnerships. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 60(10), 902.
- Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London: Sage Publications.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, E. (1996, April) The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49(7), 18-33.
- Bragg, D. (2001) Community College Access, Mission, and Outcomes: Considering Intriguing

Intersections and Challenges, Peabody Journal of Education, 76:1, 93-116, DOI:
10.1207/S15327930PJE7601_06

Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J.A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement.

Journal of Social Issues, 58(3), 503-516.

Brinkerhoff, J. M., & Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2002). Government–nonprofit relations in comparative perspective: evolution, themes and new directions. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 22(1), 3-18.

Brinkerhoff, D., & Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2011). Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31, 2-14. DOI: 10.1002/pad.584

Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2002). Assessing and improving partnership relationships and outcomes: a proposed framework. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25, 215–231.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of Cross-Sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public administration review*, 66, 44-55.

Buckley, P., & Bachman, D. (2017, July 31). Meet the workforce of the future. *Deloitte Review*. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/deloitte-review/issue-21/meet-the-us-workforce-of-the-future.html>

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010, February). *Employment projections 2010-2020*. US Department of Labor.

- Burtch, B. (2012, July 31). Profiles in partnership: Interviews with America's leading nonprofit and for-profit organizations on creating successful cross-sector partnerships. Cision PR Web. Retrieved from <https://www.prweb.com/releases/2012/8/prweb9753140.htm>
- Business-Higher Education Forum (BHEF). (2010, October 28-29) "Aligning Education and Workforce: Goals to Foster Economic Development." Proceedings from "Cities for Success: A BHEF Leadership Summit. Louisville, KY.
- Bustamante (2019, June). Educationdata.org. Retrieved from Educationdata.org/college-enrollment-statistics/
- Callan, P. M. (1997, December). Stewards of opportunity: America's public community colleges. *Daedalus*, 126(4), 95-112.
- Campus Setting Rural Suburban Urban*. Retrieved March 3, 2017 from <https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/find-colleges/how-to-find-your-college-fit/campus-setting-rural-suburban-urban>
- Career One Stop (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.careeronestop.org/>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clifford, D. & Petrescu, P. (2012). The keys to university-community engagement sustainability. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(1), 77-92.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1997). Making Sense of Qualitative Data.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1996). The American community college (3rd ed., Rev.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Colby, S. & Ortman, J. (2014, May). *The baby boom cohort in the United States: 2012 to 2060*. United States Census Bureau.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.

Crookston, A., & Hooks, G. (2012). Community colleges, budget cuts, and jobs: The impact of community colleges on employment growth in rural US counties, 1976-2004. *Sociology of Education*, 85(4), 350-372.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: qualitative. *Quantitative, and mixed methods*.

Creswell J.W. (2007) *Qualitative Enquiry and Research Design: Choosing among 5 Approaches* (2nd ed.), London, UK: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. & Clark, V.P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark, V. P., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The counseling psychologist*, 35(2), 236-264.

Crosby, B. (2010). Leading in the shared power world. *Public Administration Review*, 70, 69-77.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world* (Vol. 264). John Wiley & Sons.

Public Management Review, 7(2), 177-201. DOI: 10.1080/14719030500090519

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaborations. *The leadership quarterly*, 21(2), 211-230.

Cruce, T. M., & Hillman, N. W. (2012). Preparing for the silver tsunami: The demand for higher education among older adults. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(6), 593-613.

Cummins, P., Kunkel, S., & Walker, R.M. (2015). *Adult education and training programs for older adults in the U.S.: National results and cross-national comparisons using PIAAC data.*

D'Amico, M. Dika, S., Elling, T., Algozzine, B., & Ginn, D. (2014, June). Early integration and other outcomes for community college transfer students. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(4), 370-399.

de Rond, M. & Bouchikhi, H. (2004, September). On the dialectics of strategic alliances, *Organization Science*, 15(1), 56-69.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists*. New York: Routledge.

Domonkos, Leslie S. (1999). History of Higher Education. ASHE Reader on The History of Higher Education. Edited by Lester F. Goodchild & Harold S. Wechsler. Ginn Press.

Donmoyer, R. (1995). Empirical research as solution and problem: Two narratives of knowledge use. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(2), 151-168.

Dougherty, K. J., Lahr, H. E., & Morest, V. S. (2017). Reforming the American community college: Promising changes and their challenges.

Drummond, M. (2002) *History of Community Colleges*. In: Kenny M.E., Simon L.A.K., Kiley-Brabeck K., Lerner R.M. (eds) *Learning to Serve*. Outreach Scholarship, 7, 185-197. Boston, MA: Springer.

Education Advisory Board. (2019, October). Adult learners: Who they are and what they want. Retrieved from <https://eab.com/insights/daily-briefing/adult-learner/adult-learners-who-they-are-what-they-want-from-college/>

- Esteves, A.M. & Barclay, MA. (2011, October). New Approaches to Evaluating the Performance of Corporate–Community Partnerships: A Case Study from the Minerals Sector, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103(2), 189-202. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0860-7>
- Fain, P. (2019, May). College enrollment declines continue, *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/05/30/college-enrollment-declines-continue>
- Fernandez, K. (2009, February/March). Back to Work. *Community College Journal*, 16-25.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge university press.
- Freedman, M. (2007). *Encore: Finding work that matters in the second half of life* (1st ed.). New York: Public Affairs.
- Gelmon, S., Holland, B., Seifer, S., Shinnamon, A., & Connors, K. (1998, Fall). Community-university partnerships for mutual learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 97-107.
- Gelpi, A. (2019). Streamlined academic requirements attract older students. *Recruiting & Retaining Adult Learners*, 21(12), 8-8.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Goggin, J. (2009, July). Encore careers for the 21st century aging-friendly community. *Generations*, 33(2), 95.

- Goldstein, H., & Drucker, J. (2006). The economic development impacts of universities on regions: Do size and distance matter? *Economic Development Quarterly*, 20(1), 22–43. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891242405283387>
- Guskey, T.R. (2000). Evaluating professional development. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press, Inc.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hannon, K. (2015, April) Over 50 and back in college: Preparing for a new career. *New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/04/your-money/over-50-and-back-in-college-preparing-for-a-new-career.html?emc=eta1&_r=0
- Hardy, C., Lawrence, T. B., & Phillips, N. (2006) Swimming with sharks: Creating strategic change through multi-sector collaboration. *International Journal of Strategic Change Management*, 1(1):96-112.
- Harris, L. W. (2018). Helping older adults go back to college. *Community College Journal*, 89(3), 35-35.
- Hebel, S. (2014, March). From public good to private good: How higher education got to a tipping point. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/From-Public-Good-to-Private/145061>
- Henig, J., Riehl, C., Houston, D., Rebell, M., & Wolff, J. (2016, March). *Collective impact and the new generation of cross-sector collaborations for education: A nationwide scan*. Teachers College, Columbia University.

- Hora, M. T., & Millar, S. B. (2011). *A guide to building education partnerships: Navigating diverse cultural contexts to turn challenge into promise*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Husser, W., & Bailey, T. (2017 September). Projections of Education Statistics to 2025, 44th Edition. NCES.
- Jenkins, D., & Belfield, C. (2014). Can community colleges continue to do more with less? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 46(3), 6-13.
- Jepsen, C., & Montgomery, M. (2012). *Back to school: An application of human capital theory for mature workers*. Open Access publications 10197/4435, School of Economics, University College Dublin.
- Jones, S.R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2014). Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Juszkiewicz, J. (2020, July). *Trends in community college enrollment and completion data, Issue 6*. American Association of Community Colleges.
- Khan, S., & VanWynsberghe, R. (2008, January). Cultivating the under-mined: Cross-case analysis as knowledge mobilization. In *Forum qualitative Sozialforschung/forum: Qualitative social research* (Vol. 9, No. 1).
- Kasper, H. T. (2003). The changing role of community college. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, 46(4), 14-21.
- Kindornay, S., Tissot, S., & Sheiban, N. (2014). *The value of cross-sector development partnerships*. Ottawa, CA: North-South Institute.
- Kindred, J., & Petrescu, C. (2014). Expectations versus reality in a university-community partnership: A case study. *International Society for Third Sector Research*, 26, 823-845.

DOI :10.1007/s11266-014-9471-0

Krefting, L. (1991, March). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(3), 214-222.

Lacy, P., Haines, A., & Hayward, R. (2012). Developing strategies and leaders to succeed in a new era of sustainability: Findings and insights from the United Nations Global Compact-Accenture CEO Study. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(4), 346-357.

Laderman, S. (2017). State Higher Education Finance FY 2016. *State Higher Education Executive Officers*.

Learning for Action. (2015). *Plus 50 Programs in Practice*.

Le Ber, M., & Branzei, O. (2010). (Re)Forming strategic cross-sector partnerships: Relational processes of social innovation. *Business & Society*, 49(1), 140-72.

Leiderman, S., Furco, A., Zapf, J., & Goss, M. (2002). *Building Partnerships with College Campuses: Community Perspectives*. Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, DC.

LFA Group. (2009, October). *The Plus 50 Initiative: Executive Summary of the Year One Evaluation Report*.

LFA Group. (2010, October). *The Plus 50 Initiative: Standards of Excellence*.

Long, B. T. (2016 December). State Support for Higher Education: How Changing the Distribution of Funds Could Improve College Completion Rates. Miller Center, University of Virginia. Retrieved from http://web1.millercenter.org/commissions/higher-ed/Long_No9.pdf

Lumina Foundation. (2015, January 16). *Plus 50 programs in practice*.

Ma, J., & Baum, S. (2016). Trends in community colleges: Enrollment, prices, student debt, and completion. *College Board Research Brief*, 4, 1-23.

- Main Campuses.* NC Community Colleges. Retrieved March 1, 2017 from
<https://www.nccommunitycolleges.edu/about-us/main-campuses>
- Maldonado, C. (2018). Price of College Increasing Almost 8 Times Faster Than Wages, *Forbes*.
Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/camilomaldonado/2018/07/24/price-of-college-increasing-almost-8-times-faster-than-wages/#407d343f66c1>
- Malterud, K. (2001, August 11). Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The Lancet*, 358, 483-488.
- Marlier, M., Lucidarme, S., Cardon, G., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., Babiak, K. & Willem, A. (2015). Capacity building through cross-sector partnerships: A multiple case study of a sport program in disadvantaged communities in Belgium. *BMC Public Health*, 1-10.
- Martin, L. L., Smith, H., & Phillips, W. (2005). Bridging “town & gown” through innovative university-community partnerships. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 10(2), 1-16.
- Mattessich, P. W., & Monsey, B. R. (1992). *Collaboration: what makes it work. A review of research literature on factors influencing successful collaboration*. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 919 Lafond, St. Paul, MN 55104..
- Maurrasse, D. (2002a). *Beyond the campus: How colleges and universities form partnerships with their communities*. Routledge.
- Maurrasse, D. (2002b) Higher education community partnerships: Assessing progress in the field. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 131-139.
- McCann, J. (1983). Design guidelines for social problem-solving interventions, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 19(2), 115-135.
- McFarland, J., Hussar, B., De Brey, C., Snyder, T., Wang, X., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., ... &

Bullock Mann, F. (2017). The Condition of Education 2017. NCES 2017-144. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from
<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017144.pdf>

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Wang, K., Rathbun, A., ... & Mann, F. B. (2018). The Condition of Education 2018. NCES 2018-144. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018144.pdf>

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., ... & Barmer, A. (2019). The Condition of Education 2019. NCES 2019-144. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED594978.pdf>

Melchiorre, M. M., & Johnson, S. A. (2017). Finding new ways to reach older students: Creating a social media marketing plan for professional and continuing higher education programs. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 65(2), 73-81.

Mellow, G. (2000). The History and Development of Community Colleges in the United States. Paper presented at the combined seminar of the Inter-American Development Bank and the Harvard Graduate School of Education (Cambridge, MA, September 4-8, 2000).

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from "Case Study Research in Education."*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350 Sansome St, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.*

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* John Wiley & Sons.

Millar, M. (2004). Global strategic partnerships between MNEs and NGOs: Drivers of change and ethical issues. *Business and Society Review*, 109(4), 395-414.

- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G. & Wiebe, E. (Eds.) (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. DOI: 10.4135/9781412957397
- Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2017, August). *A lost decade in higher education funding*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/a-lost-decade-in-higher-education-funding>
- Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., Masterson, K., & Waxman, S. (2018, October) *Unkept promises: State cuts to higher education threaten access and equity*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/unkept-promises-state-cuts-to-higher-education-threaten-access-and>
- Morgan, G. (2006). Images of organizations (Updated ed.) SAGE Publications.
- Mortenson, T. (2012, Winter). State funding: A race to the bottom. *American Council on Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/state-funding-a-race-to-the-bottom.aspx>
- Murphy, M., Arenas, D. & Batista, J.M. (2015) Value creation in cross-sector collaborations: The roles of experience and alignment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130 (1) 145-162.
- Neely, A. D., Adams, C., & Kennerley, M. (2002). *The performance prism: The scorecard for measuring and managing business success*. London: Prentice Hall Financial Times.
- Nienhüser, W. (2008). Resource dependence theory: How well does it explain behavior of organizations? *Management Revue*, 19 (1), 9-32.
- O'Leary, Z. (2014). The essential guide to doing your research project (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- O'Reilly, M., & Kiyimba, N. (2015). *Advanced qualitative research: A guide to using theory*. London: Sage.
- O'Shea, S. (2018). Considering the Cultural Strengths of Older First Generation University Students: An Australian Perspective. *Understanding Experiences of First Generation University Students: Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Methodologies*, 143.
- Oxford Economics and AARP. (2016, September). *The Longevity Economy*.
- Patton. M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford University Press.
- Phillippe, K. & Gonzalez, L. (2005). *National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics*. American Association of Community Colleges.
- Piaget, J. (1963). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Piaget, J. (1980). The psychogenesis of knowledge and its epistemological significance.
- Pierce, K. (2015, January 4). Student tuition now officially pays more than states for public college funding. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/01/04/student-tuition-public-colleges-gao_n_6411998.html
- Ramley, J. A. (2014). The changing role of higher education: Learning to deal with wicked problems. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 18(3), 7-22.
- Rondinelli, D., & London, T. (2003). How corporations and environmental groups cooperate: Assessing cross-sector alliances and collaborations. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 17(1), 61-76.
- Roueche, J. & Jones, B. (2005). *The Entrepreneurial Community College*. American Association

of Community Colleges.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. 2nd

Edition, Sage Publications, London.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Great Britain: Ashford Colour Press.

Sandy, M., & Holland, B. (2006, Fall). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), 30-43.

Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-263. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/259121>

Schirmer, H. (2013, June). Partnership Steering Wheels: How the formation process of a cross-sector partnership can influence its governance mechanisms. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 50, 23-45.

Schön, D. A. (1992). The theory of inquiry: Dewey's legacy to education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 2, 119–139.

Schuylar, G. (1999). A historical and contemporary view of the community college curriculum. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1999(108), 3-15.

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

Seitanidi, M. M. (2010). *The politics of partnerships: A critical examination of nonprofit-business partnerships*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Seitanidi, M.M., & Lindgreen, A. (2010). Cross-sector social interactions. *Journal of Business*

Ethics, 94, 1-7. DOI: 10.1007/sl0551-011-0799-8

Selsky, J.W., & Parker, B. (2005, December). Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 849-873.

Seltzer, R. (2017, April 20). Illinois and everyone else. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/20/state-support-higher-education-increased-2016-not-counting-illinois>

Siegel, D. (2010). *Organizing for social partnership: Higher education in cross-sector collaboration*. New York: Routledge.

Sink, D., & Jackson, K. (2002, January). Successful community college campus-based partnerships. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(1) 35-46.

Smith, B.A. (2017, March 8). Task force sets out to improve Idaho's workforce. *Idaho Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://idahobusinessreview.com/2017/03/08/task-force-sets-out-to-improve-idahos-workforce/>

Snyder, T. D., De Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2019). Digest of Education Statistics 2017, NCES 2018-070. *National Center for Education Statistics*.

Sorgel, A. (2015, December 24). Pretty soon, old people will have all the jobs. *US News and World Report*. <https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015-12-24/older-workers-to-dominate-labor-market-by-2024>

St. Amour, M. (2020, March). How coronavirus and the recession will affect open-access colleges. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/03/19/how-coronavirus-and-recession-will-affect-open-access-colleges>

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2000). *Case studies*. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook*

- of qualitative research* (2nd ed.)134-164. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*. Guilford Press.
- State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEOA), April 2018.
- Stewart, T. & Alrutz, M. (2009). Meaningful relationships: Cruxes of university-community partnerships for sustainable and happy engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 5(1), 44-55.
- Strier, R. (2011). The construction of university-community partnerships: entangled perspectives. *Higher Education*, 62, 81-97.
- Swanger, D. (2016). Community colleges partners in community development: approaches to developing our regions. *Planning for Higher Education*, 45(1), 13+.
- Tandberg, D., & Laderman, S. (2018, June). MHEC policy brief: evaluating state funding effort for higher education.
- Turk, J. M. (2017). Identifying predictors of credential completion among beginning community college students.
- U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. (2014). *Projected population by single year of age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin for the United States: 2014 to 2060*. File: 2014 National Population Projections.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Spring 2018, Fall Enrollment component (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics 2019*, table 303.50. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/dt19_303.50.asp
- U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, Excerpt from Table 303.40 (2019, March). Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_303.40.asp

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2000). Evaluating university-community partnerships: An examination of the evolution of questions and approaches.

U.S. National Center for Statistics (2017). List of Tables and Figures. Digest of Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018070.pdf>

Van Horn, C. E. (2014). *Working scared (or not at all): The lost decade, great recession, and restoring the shattered American dream*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Van Horn, C.E. (2015). *Improving education and training for older workers*. AARP.

van Tulder, R., Seitanidi, M.M. & Crane, A. (2016). Enhancing the impact of cross-sector partnerships, *Journal of Business Ethics* (135)1. Retrieved from

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2756-4>

Warner, M., & Sullivan, R. (2004). *Putting Partnerships to Work: Strategic Alliances for Development between the Government, the Private Sector and Civil Society*. Sheffield, United Kingdom: Greenleaf Publishing Limited.

Watson, D. (2007). *Managing civic and community engagement*. Berkshire, England: McGraw Hill, Open University Press.

Weerts, D. (2005). Validating institutional commitment to outreach at land-grant universities: Listening to the voices of community partners. *Journal of Extension*, 43(5).

Weerts, D. & Sandman, L. (2008, Fall). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 32(1), 73–106.

Weiss, R.S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.

- Whissemore, T. (2014, October/November). Plus 50 initiative reaches more than 20,000. *Community College Journal*, 85(2), 10-12.
- Witt, A., Wattenbarger, J., Gollattschook, J., & Suppiger, J. (1994). *America's community colleges: The first century*. American Association of Community Colleges. ISBN 0-87117-267-4
- Yarnall, E., & Stites, R. (2016). A framework for evaluating implementation of community college workforce education partnerships and programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(9), 750-766. DOI: 10.1080/10668926.2015.1101405
- Yin, R.K., (1984). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Applications of case study research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). How to do better case studies. *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*, 2, 254-282.
- Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage publications.

Appendix A

Preliminary Organization Contact Phone Script

Hello. My name is Karen Gilbert and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education program at Virginia Tech. I am conducting research for my dissertation on leader perceptions of campus community cross-sector partnerships designed to support the older adult student population. I noticed on the American Association of Community Colleges' website that your school previously participated in their Plus 50 program. I would like to know if your school still has a similar-type program involving a partnership with another organization to support the education, training, or employment of members of the older adult student population.

(If no) Thank you for the information and I appreciate you taking the time to speak with me today.

(If yes) Could you briefly describe this program to me?

Can you please give me the name and contact information of the leader of this partnership from your organization?

The information you provided is very helpful. Thank you for assisting me with my research by answering these questions.

If you have any questions or concerns about my preliminary research request, you may contact the Western Institutional Review Board at either (800) 562-4789 or by email at help@wirb.com.

Appendix B

Introductory CSP Leader Phone Call Script

Hello. My name is Karen Gilbert and I am a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech working on my dissertation. I am researching leader perceptions of campus community cross-sector partnerships designed to support the older adult student population. (Name) at your organization identified you as a leader of a cross-sector partnership designed to support the older adult student population. I am interested in learning more about your program.

What is the mission of your program?

When was this program first started?

What community organization are you partnering with for this program?

Can you please give me the name and contact information of the community organization leader of this partnership?

As a follow-up to our phone conversation, I will be sending you and the community leader of this partnership an email inviting each of you to individually participate in a one-hour in-person interview or by using Zoom if needed. These interviews will be scheduled during the next 30 days.

The information you provided is very helpful. Thank you for assisting me with my research by answering these questions.

If you have any questions or concerns about my preliminary research request, you may contact the Western Institutional Review Board at either (800) 562-4789 or by email at help@wirb.com.

Appendix C

Email Script Requesting CSP Leader Research Study Participation

Dear (CSP Leader Name),

My name is Karen Gilbert and I am a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech in the Higher Education program. I am writing my dissertation about leader perceptions of campus community cross-sector partnerships. The purpose of this email is to formally request your participation in a one-hour in-person or Zoom interview about your perceptions of the cross-sector partnership you are involved in which supports the adult student population. I am referring to your partnership with (XYZ organization or school).

If you agree to participate in a one-hour interview with me, which will include a series of open-ended questions about your perceptions of the formation process of the partnership and the value created from the partnership, please let me know by responding to this email. Next, I will contact you by email to schedule your interview sometime within the next 30 days at your convenience. I will be traveling to your site to conduct the interview or conducting the interview virtually using Zoom (a video conferencing software program), if needed. I will send you the consent form in advance of the interview, which explains that your participation in this interview is voluntary along with other pertinent details.

I appreciate your consideration of my request for you to participate in this study of campus community cross-sector partnership leader perceptions for my dissertation. Please let me know if you have any questions. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

If you have any questions or concerns about my preliminary research request, you may contact the Western Institutional Review Board at either (800) 562-4789 or by email at help@wirb.com.

Sincerely,

Karen Gilbert

Appendix D

Follow-up Email to CSP Leaders

Dear (CSP Leader Name),

Thank you for responding to my request for you to participate in a one-hour interview with me about your perceptions of the cross-sector partnership you are involved with to support the adult student population.

(If no, end with closing signature)

(If yes)

I would like to know if you are available anytime on (set of dates) for your one-hour interview. I will accommodate your schedule. Please respond with your preferred date and time within one week and I will officially schedule our interview and reserve a room that is convenient for you at your location or I will arrange to interview you using Zoom.

I have attached a copy of the consent form for this interview. You can either return this signed form to me by email or give it to me in person at your interview. The form includes my request to audio-record your interview. The purpose of recording your interview is strictly to allow me to have a precise record of your remarks so that I can transcribe your interview for use in my data analysis process. The recording will be erased after my research is completed. Please let me know if you have any questions.

If you have any questions or concerns about my preliminary research request, you may contact the Western Institutional Review Board at either (800) 562-4789 or by email at help@wirb.com.

Sincerely,

Karen Gilbert

Attachment: Consent Form

Appendix E

CSP Leaders Interview Questions

1. Why did you decide to form this CSP?
2. How did you select your partner for this CSP?
3. What was the role of your organization in this CSP?
 - 3.1 What was your role as a leader in this CSP?
4. Describe how the formation process was carried out by your organization.
 - 4.1 What resources did your organization contribute to this partnership?
 - 4.2 When you were initially forming this partnership, how did you think your organization would gain value from participating in this CSP?
5. Describe the value created that resulted from your organization participating in this CSP.
 - 5.1 How did this result differ from what you expected to gain from this partnership?
6. How do you think your organization gained value from publicly being associated with your partner organization?
7. How do you think your organization gained value from the process of working together with your partner?
8. How do you think the mission of your organization was impacted by participating in this partnership?
9. How would you critique the effectiveness of this partnership?
10. What would you do differently if you were to form another cross-sector partnership in the future?
11. What plans do you have to form new partnerships with other organizations?
12. As a leader of your organization, what is your perception of participating in this CSP?

13. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experience of participating in this CSP?

Appendix F

IRB Approval Form

MEMORANDUM DATE:

April 9, 2019 TO: Claire Kathleen Robbins, Karen Jean Gilbert

FROM: Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (FWA00000572, expires January 29, 2021)

PROTOCOL TITLE: Leader Perceptions of Campus Community Partnerships in a Community

College Setting IRB NUMBER: 19-134

The Virginia Tech Institution Review Board (IRB), acknowledges the Amendment request for the above-mentioned research protocol. This acknowledgement recognizes the item(s) identified in the Special Instructions section. NOTE: Amendments that must be submitted to WIRB for review and approval include changes to funding, conflict of interest, ANY and ALL changes to study procedures and study documents. If your study received a Determination letter (qualified for Not Human Subjects or for an Exemption) please review the information at the end of your Determination Letter. If your study was approved by a Panel, WIRB provides guidance on making changes in their Guide for Researchers. Please refer to the section titled, Changes to Research / Additional Document Submissions in the following document:

<https://secure.research.vt.edu/external/irb/wirb-guide-for-researchers.pdf>

Appendix G

CSP Leader Interview Reminder Script

Dear (CSP Leader Name),

I am writing to remind you of the one-hour in person (or Zoom) interview we scheduled to discuss your perceptions of the formation process and the value created from your partnership to support the adult student population.

(If the interview is in person) Our interview is scheduled for (date) at (time) in the (X) room of the (x) building. I will arrive 30 minutes in advance of our interview to set up for the interview.

(If the interview is virtual) Our interview is scheduled for (date) at (time) via Zoom, a video conferencing software program. You will receive a separate email providing login information and instructions. If you do not receive this email by (date), please let me know.

Please let me know if you have any questions and thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Karen Gilbert

Appendix H

Participant Consent Form

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
Informed Consent for Participants
in Research Projects Involving Human Subjects

Title of Project: A Multiple Case Study of the Leader Perceptions of the Formation Process and Value Created by Cross-Sector Partnerships in Higher Education Between Campus and Community

Investigator(s): **Karen Gilbert** **karengilbert@vt.edu/540-641-4476**
Name **E-mail / Phone number**

I. Purpose of this Research Project

The purpose of this study is to fulfill my dissertation requirement for my doctorate degree in Higher Education. Results may be used for publication and my dissertation. Up to eight subjects of varying adult age are involved who are campus and community leaders of cross-sector partnerships at up to four different community colleges in North Carolina.

II. Procedures

You will be asked to complete a one-hour interview with the investigator. You will be asked a series of open-ended questions about your experience as a leader of a cross-sector partnership. The interview will take place at an office at your location, based on your suggestion for available office space and at a time that is convenient for you.

III. Risks

There is a minimal risk to you as a participant in this study of emotional distress caused by remembering unpleasant experiences during this study. You can end any discussion if needed or withdraw from the interview at any time if experiencing any emotional discomfort.

IV. Benefits

The intangible benefit of participating in this study is helping to build and inform the body of knowledge about campus and community partnerships.

No promise or guarantee of benefits has been made to encourage you to participate.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The data collected from you will not contain identifying information. All data collected will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office at Virginia Tech. Any identifiable data will be stored separately from coded data.

Only the investigator will have access to identifiable and/or de-identified data. At no time will the researchers release identifiable results of the study to anyone other than individuals working on the project without your written consent.

The Virginia Tech (VT) Institutional Review Board (IRB) may view the study's data for auditing purposes. The IRB is responsible for the oversight of the protection of human subjects involved in research.

VI. Compensation

There is no compensation to you for participating in this study.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

It is important for you to know that you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You are free not to answer any questions that you choose or respond to what is being asked of you.

VIII. Questions or Concerns

Should you have any questions about this study, you may contact one of the research investigators whose contact information is included at the beginning of this document.

Should you have any questions or concerns about the study's conduct or your rights as a research subject, or need to report a research-related injury or event, you may contact the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board at irb@vt.edu or (540) 231-3732.

IX. Subject's Consent

I have read the Consent Form and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

Subject signature _____ Date _____

Subject printed name

Appendix I

CSP Leader Interview Thank You Email

Dear (CSP Leader Name),

Thank you participating in an interview with me yesterday to discover your perceptions about the formation process and value created from your cross-sector partnership to support the 50+ student population. Your comments provided me with rich insight for my research. Once your interview is transcribed, I will email you a copy for your review.

Sincerely,

Karen Gilbert

Appendix J

CSP Leader Transcript Review Email Script

Dear (CSP Leader Name),

Thank you again for participating in an interview for my dissertation research. Please find attached a copy of the transcription of your interview. Please let me know within one week if you find any discrepancies that you think need to be corrected for accuracy of your interview. I appreciate you taking the time to review your transcript.

Sincerely,

Karen Gilbert

Attachment: Interview Transcript

Appendix K

Document Analysis Summary

The case descriptions in Chapter 4 and the case findings in Chapter 5 include results from the case documents and an explanation of how these results relate to the interview findings. The following chart is a summary of the coding conducted for each case document which was utilized in the case discussions.

Case	Document Type	Codes
1	Apprenticeship Partner Agreement	Partner identification, partner commitment, partnership purpose, financial value to partners, ethics and integrity of partners, cooperation, agreement to partnership terms, expectations of industry partners, cost equity, cost sharing, establishment of financial structure of the partnership, staffing structure and requirements, assigned roles, continuity, sustainability, assurance and trust, need for compliance
1	Current Partnerships Summary Document	Partner description, type of partnership, support, diversity, job creation and retention, community improvement, positive community traits, purpose of partnership, workforce development, emerging workforce issues, how mission is carried out, serving business and industry, job recruitment, types of investment, entrepreneurship, innovation, state involvement, strengthening communities, promoting tourism, types of information, state regulation, cooperation with other agencies, protect children, strengthen families, achieving self-sufficiency, vocational support services, types of populations served, stakeholder support types
2	Grant Application with CSP Description	CSP setting, CSP mission, urgent need for CSP, evidence of need for CSP, CSP mission, CSP purpose, CSP model used, history of CSP, benefits to stakeholders, how CSP works, benefits to partners, population served by CSP, problem (barrier to advancement), CSP plans, CSP logistics, synergy, impact of CSP, how CSP is unique, CSP implementation, CSP assessment, marketing, sustainability, sensitivity to stakeholder needs, partner roles, recruitment, how grant funds will be used, collaboration, structure

2	CSP Presentation to Community and Potential Stakeholders for Recruitment	Public understanding of issue, CSP strategy, solution to the problem, CSP timeline, seeking feedback from the community, maintaining CSP momentum, community change CSP background, purpose for formation, potential stakeholders, target population, background of the problem, role of CSP in building up the community, creating equity for stakeholders, increasing community vibrancy, opportunity, information for the community, information for stakeholders, new curriculum for program, identification of CSP partners, fostering partner buy-in, participant and stakeholder recruitment, CSP plan
2	CSP Presentation to Potential Industry Partners for Recruitment	Goals of CSP, CSP structure, recruitment strategy, CSP timeline, developing the labor market, engaging business and industry partners, CSP background, history of the problem, explanation of the problem, mission of the CSP, purpose of the CSP, identification of existing partners, CSP plan, CSP progress, recruitment of stakeholders and partners, marketing strategy, funding commitments, curriculum modifications, financial plan/strategy
2	CSP Marketing Materials	CSP progress, sustainability, public awareness of success/positive news, CSP program information to public, benefits to stakeholders, stakeholder experiences in the CSP, stakeholder gratitude, opportunity, hard to employ population (prison), uplifting experience, CSP logistics, impact on stakeholders (woman with a child), word-of-mouth marketing, gaining personal awareness of skills and strengths, challenges faced by stakeholders in program, benefits of participating (we all became like a family; gives an edge over other employees), purpose of CSP, problem (not making living wage, lack of skilled workers), gaining an understanding about local industry (tours, training), potential employer expectations, funding structure, CSP progress, assessment, potential future grant funding, CSP success, companies are making a LT investment in employees, first year trial run
3	Community Leader's Progress Report for Corporate Office	Increased need for CSP based on regional growth, new schools added to area, the importance of CSPs to the college for sustainability and future growth, CSP purpose, CSP history, building relationships, importance of background research (data, focus)

		groups, millennials), use of long-range planning, improved partner relations, improve perceptions of local employers, promote higher education, communication with public, marketing efforts, making curriculum more relevant to area needs, shows increases opportunities for partnerships between higher education and industry, spirit of collaboration between area community colleges, regional infrastructure improvements, positivity
3	Partner Pledge Form	Partner engagement, partner commitment, CSP program information, establishing relationships between partners and with stakeholders, investment in future workforce for each industry partner, options for participating as a partner, partner follow thru, CSP marketing
3	CSP Marketing Materials	CSP success, industry commitment to the community, CSP growth, opportunity for stakeholders, long-range goals, support for local education
4	Apprenticeship Partnership Agreement	Use of state standards, identification of partners, agreement of terms by key CSP leaders and stakeholder, special status of stakeholder (veteran), terms of the program, expectations of stakeholder
4	Employer Partnership Agreement	Partner commitment, understanding of role, CSP rules, guarantee of benefits to stakeholders, contract details, formal nature
4	CSP Marketing Materials #1	Positive results of CSP, public celebration of CSP achievements, CSP meeting its mission, long-term benefits of the CSP, benefits to stakeholders, supporting continuing higher education, CSP sustainability, evidence of CSP effectiveness, CSP purpose, recognition from State agency, expanded partner participation in CSP, excitement about CSP success, continuing collaboration, creation of a related new CSP, CSP effectiveness, positive attitude of CSP partners towards continued participation
4	CSP Marketing Materials #2	Lack of community awareness of issue of lack of skilled labor, tools to increase awareness such as job fairs, related issue of long commute times if work out of county/work life issue, increasing awareness about local employers, their history and type and job opportunities, community focus of industry partner, global nature of industry, industry's commitment to community and environment, empowering stakeholders, company

		culture, sustainability of CSP, collaboration with supporting the missions of community organizations
4	CSP Marketing Materials #3	Private investment in the CSP, connect students to training, career development, tuition support, flexible education and training, cultivate highly skilled workers, CSP history, grateful for funding, part of a federal program, support is a testimony to CSP, excitement, expanding CSP, private company is proud to partner with college, meeting needs of local industry, how the grant works, support of the environment and the community, support of STEM
4	CSP Marketing Materials #4	Resources offered by college, incredible opportunity for stakeholders, leader satisfaction, shared mission, mutual benefit

Appendix L

Summary of Leader Perceptions of Key Elements of the Formation Process

Abbreviations: CAML = Campus Leader Response COML = Community Leader Response

Leader Perceptions of the Key Elements of the Formation Process	Case 1 The Phoenix	Case 2 The Beehive	Case 3 The Compass	Case 4 The Treasure
Trust		CAML		
Leader Rank in the Organization		CAML COML	CAML COML	
Organization's Compatibility with the CSP Mission	CAML COML	CAML COML		COML
Based on Stakeholder Demand	COML			CAML
Having a Shared Mission	CAML COML	CAML COML	CAML COML	CAML COML
Meeting an Urgent Need	CAML	CAML COML	COML	CAML COML
Leader Familiarity with Partnering Leaders and Organizations	COML	CAML COML	CAML COML	COML
Leadership Style	CAML	CAML		COML
Involving Other Key Partners	COML	CAML COML		CAML
Availability of Resources to Contribute	CAML COML	CAML COML	COML	CAML COML
Establishing the Financial Structure		CAML COML	CAML	CAML COML
Leader's Having Prior Experience with CSPs	CAML COML	CAML COML	COM L	CAML COML
Leader's Values	CAML COML	CAML	COML	COML
Clearly Defined Partner Roles	CAML COML	CAML COML	COML	CAML COML
Use of a CSP Model		CAML COML		
Use of Long-Range Planning		CAML	CAML	CAML COML
Change in Leadership	CAML COML			
Necessitated Internal Restructuring and Rebuilding Within the Organization	CAML			CAML

Appendix M

Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 1: The Phoenix

Type of Value	Campus Leader 1	Community Leader 1
Associational Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in support and funding from the County Commissioners from CSP public cooperation and positive results • Working together publicly had a positive visual impact Showing proof of mutual support • Increased visibility of the college • Increased credibility of the program • Information shared with the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased credibility with local industries and building trust • Increased the visibility of the work of economic development to the local school system • Increased the credibility and visibility of the economic development organization • Raised awareness about the need for more skilled labor in the area • Increased ability to recruit new industry based on evidence of major efforts to build a skilled workforce • Industry partners were personally invited by the county manager lending credibility and high visibility to the program as well as increased support for the mission of the county • Program is fluid and changes based on what is learned showing increased ability to learn and change behavior • Full support of the county commissioners • People hear success stories making the organization a champion at home
Transferred Resource Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants • Funding and management of funds collected from industry partners • Marketing funds • Staff to carry out the marketing efforts • Staff to facilitate the CSP including leader • Increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for marketing efforts • Staffing to carry out the marketing • Partnership staffing including leadership • Funding from industry partners • Able to generate both public and private grants to support the partnership • Campus partner manages the design and delivery of the training program • Campus partner contributes resources to build the program such as infrastructure and staffing

	<p>enrollment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of new programs • Increased resources dedicated to new programs 	
Interaction Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to community partner's networks of companies and industry • Opportunities for learning about partners and community needs • Knowledge creation of an apprenticeship program model to use with other employment sectors • Knowledge creation of an internal model for how each division can participate in an external CSP • Leader focused on building up and supporting the internal team working with the CSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual talent from the college • Access to the network of the college—students, faculty, industry, community leaders • Using knowledge gained from this program to create similar programs for other sectors of employment such as tourism • Support for other programs from the campus partner, such as recruiting industry • Opportunities for learning about partners and community needs • Knowledge creation of an apprenticeship program model to use with other employment sectors • Changed behavior to doing more outreach and becoming engaged with the community instead of operating in silos
Synergistic Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful results of the CSP resulted in more political power • Increased long-term value from plans for future CSPs • The campus leader's spirit of altruism affects the behavior of the organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive organizational change resulted in a life-changing event for participants • Long-term value of increase in number of skilled workers for employers • Sharing leadership streamlined the coordination of this CSP • Process-based improvement was a CSP model for apprenticeship programs

	and the CSP in a positive way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSP was an innovative tool to make fast progress • Increased long-term value from plans for future CSPs • The campus leader's spirit of altruism affects the behavior of the organization and the CSP in a positive way
Leader Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gained personal and professional satisfaction from the value of the work to the community • Rewarding to make plans to help the hard to employ populations, such as the jail population going back to work upon release 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gained professional satisfaction from witnessing the life-changing impact of the program for participants
Relationship Between Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong working relationship impacted the ease of CSP formation and coordination • Willing to do the necessary behind-the-scenes work together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the campus culture since came from that side of the partnership • Efforts are aligned, working hand-in-hand to serve local industry and develop skilled workers

Appendix N

Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 2: The Beehive

Type of Value	Campus Leader 2	Community Leader 2
Associational Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased visibility from program marketing done by community partner • Credibility with local industries for working on the workforce shortage • Increased community awareness of the problem of a lack of skilled workers in the community • Local residents see the result and value of people getting better jobs, which gives the college credibility • CSP has the full support of the county commissioners • High visibility from special events such as Signing Day for participants to accept new jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial joint start-up funding by campus and community partners showed “proof of concept” to industry lending credibility to the program and facilitating industry buy-in to the partnership • Increased ability to recruit new industry • The CSP is a public display to residents that the county’s mission is to serve them and meet a need; the county is seen as a helper—not just an entity to pay taxes to, which builds trust
Transferred Resource Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Event space provided by the community partner • Event coordination provided by community partner • Joint funding by industry and county government; county does a double match of industry funds • Increased enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint funding by industry and county government • Shared leadership • Benefit from non-profit created to manage funds collected • In Year 2, the local school system also provided financial support after seeing benefit to participants

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program coordination by the community partner • Additional program staffing by the community partner • Shared leadership • Program marketing done by community partner • Benefit from non-profit created by community partner to manage funds • Meetings coordinated by community partner 	
Interaction Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to new student populations based on program design, such as the underemployed • Opens doors to industry network to be able to share information about other support programs like training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased ability to change industry behavior; a local industry expanded and added 400 jobs based on the strength of this CSP, adding economic vitality to the community
Synergistic Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to successfully use a CSP model from another community • Major new program development with investment in staffing and resources • Able to offer participants expanded career choices based on multiple job offers from participating industry which is a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to successfully use a CSP model from another community • Participants are better trained and prepared to advance within the organization which strengthens local industry and this tax base • Increase in residents' earnings results in higher quality of life—home ownership, major purchases increasing county tax base and reducing number of people on public assistance programs • Overall higher community health level • Program is almost self-sustaining due to innovative industry funding mechanism

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> process-based improvement Each successful CSP such as this leads to new CSPs and new ways of community leaders working together As a positive organizational change, students with a strong work history are dedicated to completing the training program and obtaining better employment Creating an innovative CSP generates excitement amongst leaders and the community' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved process of program funding being equitable to all industry partners Process-based improvement since the program could not be accomplished without the other partners Long-term potential of ending the cycle of generational poverty in the community Innovation in the expansion of this program to the construction sector which will open doors for people with background issues who are hard to employ Program has exposed county staff to many more industry staff leading to a process improvement of it being easier to work together; quick access to industry leaders for feedback; increasing the county's information base about employer needs; resource sharing such as employee wellness programs allows resource sharing to happen organically
Leader Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciates the family feel and close familiarity of working with area leaders Participation in this CSP has led to greater self-awareness of role as a leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leader has an increased sense of pride to be working for county government based on the success of this CSP

Appendix O

Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 3: The Compass

Type of Value	Campus Leader 3	Community Leader 3
Associational Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valuable information shared at meetings between partners and the opportunity to network • Increased credibility with local industries for successful programs • Increased community visibility of how the college works to support industry and the community • Increased public awareness of the lack of skilled workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises the awareness of the public about what the company does and the types of jobs available • The CSP has a strong brand so there is value to being publicly associated with this brand • Exposure to a cross-collaborative group of community leaders
Transferred Resource Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in the same building as the economic development organization so able to share some resources for this CSP such as space, information, and communication • Expansion in the number and types of courses offered • Increased enrollment levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus partner organizes and hosts the meetings; provides lunch • Campus partner originally provided program oversight; now handled by the economic development organization • Program funding
Interaction Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to communicate with the economic development organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company leadership learns the benefits of participating in CSPs • Access to other industry leaders

	<p>because they interact daily in a shared office building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gained a better understanding of the needs of industry by building relationships with them ● Able to better communicate to industry what the college has to offer them ● Opportunity to learn about industry needs ● Access to industry network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increased ability to change company behavior about fostering community relations
Synergistic Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Large investment made in new training resources ● Companies are more successful—more productive, more efficient, and more profitable-- raising the economic vitality of the community ● Gained political influence in regard to county funding of the college based on program credibility ● Internal processes were created and improved for new program idea development and follow-thru ● Shared leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Shared leadership ● Innovation with internal employee relations partnership ● Positive change for the organization to be an active member in the industrial leader community locally
Leader Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Relationship building and familiarity between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prefer to select partnership leaders who are committed to the

	leaders are very important for a CSP	<p>community because they will do the work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A great deal of leader work goes on behind the scenes showing high commitment to the CSP • Benefit of being familiar with each other and each other's organizations and needs
CSP Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a loosely defined and flexible CSP design allows for partner flexibility and the ability to make changes quickly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being on one CSP leads to participating in others, like a web effect • Allows the leader to make a lasting contribution to the vitality of the community • Worth the time investment to be involved in multiple CSPs because of leader relationship building

Appendix P

Summary of Leader Perceptions of the Value Created in Case 4: The Treasure

Type of Value	Campus Leader 4	Community Leader 4
Associational Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher visibility with local residents seeking employment • Increased public awareness about the lack of skilled workers • Gained visibility doing an initial survey of all employers • Project credibility gained from satisfaction of close-knit [international] employers in the area • New state support for spin-off pre-apprentice program • Received national recognition for unique program • Continual industry outreach increases visibility • Program marketing increases visibility of the college • College president sees value in this program adding internal credibility • Resulted in visibility beyond our area of organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company has a reputation amongst all apprentices in training for managing the program well • Helps with recruiting new employees • Helps support the organization's mission to support the community • Helps us be known for building people up • Showing we trust apprentices to represent the company and lead visitor tours gives positive public impression

	<p>wanting to learn about the program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps with recruiting new employers • Helps open doors with industry to other programs the college has to offer 	
Transferred Resource Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry pays for tuition of participants • Industry leader will volunteer with the program after retirement • Coordination of the on-the-job training at each industry • Start-up national grant funding • Opportunities to apply for local grants • State reimbursement of tuition for participants • Increased enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization-specific assets: Staffing-- Program Coordinator, Success Coach and Employment Coach provided by campus partner • Coordination of the academic side of the program • Outstanding training facility at the college • Complimentary resource value that the company's HR person now works for the college so have a good working relationship • Trained employees are better, more well-rounded, and happier employees overall • College completed or assisted with required reports • Campus leader had previous apprenticeship program experience
Interaction Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved relations with the profit/industry sector • Learning from industry contacts about best curriculum and class scheduling • Gain market intelligence about the needs of local industry • Developed a unique full-scale apprentice program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about other available training programs from the college • Personal experience and dedication of industry program coordinator boosts the program • Leader is new to being a mentor so increased technical expertise in this area • Offering a unique career opportunity to local residents • College is easy to work with and flexible for selecting classes • Helps with our succession planning and getting employees to stay

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to keep up with the times with technology having skilled workers
Synergistic Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is long-term value in having room for program growth and having ample employees to recruit new industries • Benefit from shared leadership for program coordination • Resulted in offering a full-scale apprenticeship program • Process improvement of developing an effective internal working partnership between three divisions • Resulted in a spin-off program of pre-apprenticeships for high school students involving two other community colleges • Upgraded facilities to support the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A positive organizational change has been that the apprenticeship participants are like a family and support each other • There is a culture of the value of apprenticeships within the organization • Benefit from shared leadership for program coordination • Process-based improvement of having skilled labor ready to work improves the product and production time • More flexibility than when working with a for-profit apprenticeship coordinating business • Finding new ways to attract talent • Program success helps build corporate support for funding new programs
Leader Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personally very satisfying to see the local impact of the program first-hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewarding as a leader from being a former apprentice—to give back and inspire others to sustain the program • Rewarding to be a mentor and lift other people up
Communication		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy process to communicate our needs to dedicated program staff at the college

Relationship-building		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have a great long-term relationship with the college• Staff at the college are easy to deal with
-----------------------	--	---