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CHAPTER ONE

Living Learning Programs (LLPs) are residential undergraduate learning environments designed to foster a seamless curricular and co-curricular experience (Zao & Kuh, 2004). According to the American Association of Higher Education, “more than five hundred institutions offer living-learning programs” (Dodge & Kendall, 2004, pg.150). In fact, Inkelas et al. (2008) identified seventeen different types of academic and thematic undergraduate LLPs offered at postsecondary institutions. Furthermore, scholars such as Inkelas et al. (2008) and Zao and Kuh (2004), contend that LLPs contribute to an undergraduate student’s cognitive development, positive social interactions with peers, and persistence to graduation. In addition, the literature also highlights the notion that LLPs that are collaboratively led by academic affairs, and student affairs units tend to be more influential on the undergraduate student learning experience, than LLPs that are governed by one particular unit (Inkelas et al., 2008).

Over the years, postsecondary institutions have used LLPs as a vehicle to revitalize undergraduate education and increase retention rates (Astin & Astin, 2000; Gabelnick et al., 1990; Shapiro & Levine, 1999). However, despite documentation on the impact of collaboratively –led LLPs on undergraduate student learning, little is known about how these holistic learning environments are created and sustained throughout the academic year. Conversely, literature also documents a structural and cultural division between academic affairs and student affairs units that may act as a hindrance to the effectiveness of collaborative efforts between both units (Astin & Astin, 2000; Blimling, 2001; Jackson & Ebbers, 1999).
Nevertheless, higher education leaders are being encouraged to engage in collaborative initiatives such as LLPs whenever possible (Astin & Astin, 2000; Blimling 2001; Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Tinto, 1997), despite the perceived lack of knowledge or skill set to facilitate a collaborative environment between two units that are consistently documented as experiencing historical divides. Because the success of collaboratively-led LLPs is partly co-dependent on the existing relationship between student affairs units and academic affairs (Astin & Astin, 2000), research is needed to examine how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore how postsecondary administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. Thus, two primary research questions and sub research question will guide this inquiry:

1) Are LLPs which are co-supported by academic affairs and student affairs units collaboratively led by those units?

2.) How do administrators of collaboratively-led LLPs facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

a. How do LLP administrators perceive the impact of the institutional environment on their ability to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?
Significance of the Study

Current studies exploring student affairs units and academic affairs collaborations tend to focus on the benefits of interdepartmental collaborations in higher education (Blimling, 2001; Jackson & Ebbers, 1999). Existing literature notes that the benefits of interdepartmental collaborations between student affairs units and academic affairs aids in increased motivation for collaboration, performance efficiency, increased effectiveness, improved communication amongst administrators as well as enhanced student learning (Kanter, 1994; Kezar, 2004; Pope, 2004). Cueso (n.d.) asserts that interdepartmental collaborations between student affairs units and academic affairs can create “combinatorial or synergistic effects that are likely to be exerted on student learning and development, thereby maximizing the impact and quality of the college experience” (p. 1). Astin and Astin (2000) contend that interdepartmental collaboration between both units in higher education has the potential to positively impact the student learning experience and institutional collegiality. As such, some noted higher education scholars have suggested that postsecondary administrators support the establishment of interdepartmental collaborations to enhance the student learning experience (Astin & Astin, 2000; Blimling 2001; Kezar, 2005; Tinto, 1997).

Despite the purported benefits of collaborative efforts between student affairs units and academic affairs on student learning, the literature suggests that a collaborative partnership between both units is difficult for administrators to establish and maintain (Astin & Astin, 2000; Blimling, 2001; Kezar, 2005; Tinto, 1997). According to Doz (1996), across industries, interdepartmental collaborations struggle in the formation stage,
and 50% of collaborations fail in implementation and sustainment. Kezar (2005) and Eckel (2004) assert that postsecondary institutions are typically not structured to support collaborative partnerships between two or more units. Within postsecondary institutions, departmental silos, limited institutional or departmental budgets, organizational hierarchies, and bureaucratic processes are all noted challenges that hinder the establishment and maintenance of a collaborative partnership in higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000; Kanter, 1994; Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Liefner, 2003). According to Brower and Inkelas (2010), the “budgets, staffing, and programming,” for LLPs, “have to be sustainable within the budgets, staffing, and programming of the institution as a whole” (Brower & Inkelas, 2010, p. 43).

As mentioned previously, the literature has included little to no discussion about the unique domains found in collaboratively-led LLPs. The literature also lacks discussion about the need to separate this partnership from group studies related to interdepartmental collaborations between student affairs units and academic affairs. Shapiro and Levine (1999) contend that LLPs deserve specialized attention in the literature and research when compared to other collaborative initiatives between student affairs and academic affairs, due to the program's need for investment and change within “multiple university systems: curriculum, teaching, and housing” (p. 37). While some research examines collaborative partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs units (Haynes & Janosik, 2012; Jackson & Ebbers, 1999; Kezar et al., 2002), little if any research specifically examines how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. The unique characteristics and intricate complexities of how administrators facilitate collaboration between both units will make
this particular study unique and a noteworthy contribution to the current literature on LivingLearning Programs.

**Definition of Terms**

To understand this research, it is important to provide shared definitions of key terms used throughout this study. There are two key terms associated with this study that consistently emerge in the literature with varying definitions. The definition of key terms such as living learning programs (LLPs) and LLP administrators is provided below. In addition, the definitions used for the two key terms in this study are found throughout the literature review process.

**Living Learning program (LLP)**

Living Learning Programs are undergraduate student experiences designed to integrate academic and social learning in a residence hall setting (Inkelas et al., 2008; Shapiro & Levine, 1999; Zao & Kuh, 2004).

**LLP Administrators**

LLP administrators are faculty, academic staff, and student affairs staff who work with a Living Learning Program (Shapiro & Levine, 1999; Smith et al., 1990; Inkelas et al., 2008; Tineray, 2004).

**Theoretical/Conceptual Framework**

Scholars often admit that the difficult task of exploring collaborative partnerships in research is determining how “collaboration” is operationalized (Doz, 1996; Hirsch & Burack, 2001; Wood & Gray, 1991). However, scholars such as Kezar (2004), Pope (2004) and Astin and Astin (2000) recommend that researchers consider principles
discussed in the shared governance theory and the collaborative leadership framework as potential demarcations for the “collaboratively-led” construct found in this study.

Gardiner’s (2006) shared governance framework includes six distinct characteristics that are ideal for defining the degree of collaboration between two or more units. Gardiner’s (2006) six distinct characteristics of shared governance include (a) climate of trust, (b) information sharing, (c) meaningful participation, (d) collective decision making, (e) protecting divergent views, and (f) redefining roles. Gardiner’s framework uses employees’ perceptions to determine the levels of trust and collaboration available to people within a company, institution, or organization. As employee perceptions are more positive, levels of trust, collaboration, and the pursuit of common goals and accomplishments all grow among employees, as well.

On the other hand, collaborative leadership is commonly known as a management technique in which leadership is distributed across hierarchal structures and between two or more groups to achieve a shared goal. Astin and Astin (2000) encourage postsecondary administrators to engage in collaborative leadership initiatives, in hopes of inspiring transformational change for students and the institution. According to Astin and Astin (2000), qualities of collaborative leadership that postsecondary administrators should consider adopting are (a) collaboration (b) shared purpose (c) respect with disagreement (d) division of labor (e) and a learning environment. Astin and Astin (2000) believe that collaborative leadership is often the key to transforming institutions, yet in practice and implementation, it is difficult to accomplish.

Through the conceptual frameworks of shared governance and collaborative leadership, this research developed a questionnaire influenced by both theories to aid in
identifying institutions with collaboratively-led LLPs as well as an institution that offers more than one collaboratively-led LLP. In addition, both frameworks are also used to analyze the data found in chapters four and five of the study.

**Summary of Methodology**

This study uses a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design to investigate and explain how administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. Administrators asked to participate in both the quantitative and qualitative phase of this study are faculty, academic staff, and student affairs, staff. In response to the first research question, LLP coordinators were asked to complete a questionnaire influenced by Venerable and Gardner’s (1988) six characteristics of shared governance. Data from the questionnaire was used to generate descriptive statistics and identify institutions with (1) ongoing collaboratively-led LLPs by academic affairs and student affairs units and (2) offer multiple collaboratively-led LLPs to undergraduate students. An institution was then selected for the qualitative second phase of the study. For the second phase of the study, the researcher choose to facilitate group interviews as one qualitative method for data collection. The target population for group interviews in the second phase, were student affairs and academic affairs LLP coordinators who were identified by the survey participant at their institution in the first phase of the study. Participants’ responses in the second phase of the study were used to address the study’s second research question. In addition, the collection of archived data and observations of LLP events (e.g., partnership meeting, co-sponsored curricular and co-curricular program events or connected LLP courses) was also requested by the researcher in the second phase.
Summary

In summary, the purpose of this study is to explore how administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs in the context of LLPs. The next chapter provides a brief review of the most relevant work in the three primary areas of this study: (a) Living Learning Programs (LLPs) in higher education, (b) collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs units on LLPs, and (c) theoretical frameworks of shared governance and collaborative leadership. In chapter three, readers will receive an explanation of the methodology used for the study, the development of the instrumentation, and additional details of the study’s research design. Chapter four will discuss the findings collected as a result of the study, and chapter five will connect the study’s findings to relevant research and literature as well as discuss contributions from the study to current and past literature.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study will touch on three primary areas: (a) Living Learning Programs (LLPs) in higher education, (b) collaborative efforts between academic affairs and student affairs units (c) the theoretical framework: shared governance theory and collaborative leadership. With a moderate amount of literature available for all three primary areas, this chapter provides a brief overview of the most relevant work in each area. Schumacher & McMillan (2006) argue that a literature review can be an essential part of the credibility of a study. Therefore, when conducting a literature review, it is important to select materials that (1) enhance the significance of the study and (2) assist the researcher in choosing an appropriate methodology. Consequently, the literature review process for this study required identifying guiding principles to aid in the selection of literature for this study.

The first principle includes reviewing the past and current literature outlining the historical background and evolution of primary areas in this study. For example, residential living-learning programs have an extensive history dating back to the 1200s (Chaddock, 2008; Ryan, 1999). Through a review of scholarly literature on residential LLPs, this study has an opportunity to reflect on the historical background of residential colleges and the evolution of residential LLPs over time.

The second principle includes an examination of empirical research exploring all three primary areas, similar concepts, and methodologies. For example, shared governance theory is typically used in research projects as a structural metric for relationships between an institution and constituents (Tierney, 2005). Reviewing empirical literature, i.e., scholarly work typically reviewed by peers and published in journals, books, and
dissertations helped in identifying credible sources and reflecting on methods and theoretical perspectives possibly applicable to the study.

**Evolution of Residential Living Learning Programs**

In contemporary structures of higher education, Living Learning Programs (LLPs) have recently emerged as a tool to increase retention rates and revitalize undergraduate student learning (Inkelas et al., 2008; Tinto, 1997; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). According to the American Association of Higher Education, “more than five hundred institutions now offer living-learning communities” (Dodge & Kendall, 2004, p.150). In their simplest form, LLPs are seamless curricular and co-curricular environments in which cohorts of students live and learn together (Inkelas et al., 2008; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Zhao and Kuh’s (2004) definition of LLPs highlights the importance of living arrangements and increased opportunities for faculty engagement both inside and outside of the classroom. Inkelas (2008) referred to LLPs as “intimate communities of membership” (p.9), used to merge curricular and co-curricular elements while augmenting the undergraduate student learning and development experience.

The terminology used to describe and/or define LLPs can vary depending on the institution. Throughout the literature, it is not uncommon to see LLPs referred to as living-learning communities, residential living-learning programs, academic clusters, themed housing, and much more (Inkelas et al., 2008; Tinto, 1997; Zao & Kuh, 2004). To help define LLPs, it may be best, to begin with an overview of residential colleges, learning community structures, and Living Learning Programs (Inkelas & Soldner, 2011).
Residential Colleges

Some researchers would agree that the concept of LLPs is nothing new (Chaddock, 2008; Inkeals & Soldner, 2011; Ryan 1999). In fact, the historical development of LLPs began as early as the 1200s and 1300s with the Oxford and Cambridge residential college model (Chaddock, 2008; Ryan, 1999). The Oxford and Cambridge residential college model offered a cohort of undergraduate students a four-year residential experience. Several faculty and staff live in the residential facility with students (Chaddock, 2008; Ryan, 1999). These residential facilities are equipped with a butler, kitchen staff, tutors, libraries, prayer rooms, classrooms, bedrooms and much more (Ryan, 1999). Although there were slight differences reported between the two residential college models, it is safe to say that both models focused on the holistic student development experience. The holistic student development approach throughout the literature focused on various aspects of student development such as (a) academic development, (b) social development, and (c) spiritual development (Chaddock, 2008; Ryan, 1999).

The prestigious reputation of Oxford and Cambridge inspired institutions such as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale to adopt a holistic residential curriculum and experience of their own (Ryan, 1999). However, regardless of reported success, the model did not come without critics (Ryan, 1999). Most critics implied that students were not receiving a holistic education as suggested by the residential colleges (Ryan, 1999). In 1828, Yale responded to criticism of its residential college experience in the Yale report, stating, “The young students of that era needed, a substitute …for parental superintendence… founded on mutual affection and confidence” between students and teachers (Ryan, 1999, p. 30). It is important to note the defense for the residential college model at this time demonstrated
a shift in theoretical perspective in which there was less attention on the student's spiritual development and more attention on the psychological development of the student (Ryan, 1999).

As societal pressures mounted in the 1900s due to World War II, postsecondary institutions began to witness an increase in student enrollment (Chaddock, 2008; Loss, 2012). Universities felt pressure to provide more classrooms and living space for incoming students while balancing a decreasing budget and little to no real estate (Chaddock, 2008). Institutions such as Amherst and Williams allowed students to live in rented rooms and living quarters off campus to compensate for the lack of on-campus residential living space (Chaddock, 2008). According to Chaddock (2008), some students in the 19th century preferred to live off campus, and a few institutions acknowledged the off-campus student population by creating off-campus student support services.

Learning Community Structures

As the deconstruction of residential colleges in the 19th century began, the evolution of non-residential learning communities emerged. Gabelnick et al. (1990) defined learning communities as:

Any of a variety of curricular structures that link together several existing courses-or actually restructures the material entirely – so that students have opportunities for a more in-depth understating and integration of the material they are learning, and more interaction with one another and their teachers as fellow participants in the learning enterprise. (p.19)
Learning communities began the work of Alexander Meiklejohn, an educational reformer/philosopher, and John Dewey, a pragmatist philosopher in the mid-1920s (Gabelnick et al., 1990; Smith et al., 2004). Alexander Meiklejohn’s philosophy on education focused on the relationship between democracy and postsecondary institutions. Meiklejohn argued that “education is… a means to prepare students to live as responsible citizens in the contemporary world” (Gabelnick et al., 1990, p.11). Later, Meiklejohn implemented his vision of the ideal college curriculum at the University of Wisconsin. The curriculum was referred to as the experimental college (Gabelnick et al., 1990). The experimental college design challenged students in developing a personal viewpoint of the world using concepts and ideas taught in the classroom (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

Although both Meiklejohn and Dewey are noted as the forefathers of the learning community movement, there were distinct differences in their philosophical approaches to education (Gabelnick et al., 1990). Meiklejohn focused on the concept of community while Dewy focused more on the individual student (Gabelnick et al., 1990). Dewy believed that postsecondary institutions need to focus on the development of the student from within (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

According to Dewy, “the progressive school, by contrast, recognizes that learning is an inherently social process. Students are seen coming to any educational setting with diverse aspirations and prior experiences that must be taken into account in structuring the educational environment” (Gabelnick et al., 1990, p. 16). Consequently, the 20th-century structure of the learning community tends to align more with the philosophical perspective of John Dewy (Gabelnick et al., 1990).
Overall, both philosophers came to the same conclusion, in which they challenged institutions and faculty to reconsider the fundamental structure and approach to undergraduate education. Their call for educational reform provoked institutions to move from a teaching paradigm and transition into a learning paradigm (Smith et al., 2004). Furthermore, the teachings and philosophies of Meiklejohn and Dewy were the catalysts to the learning community movement. In the 1980s, the implementation of learning communities became a national movement, with tremendous momentum and growth in the mid-1980s (Smith et al., 2004). Gabelnick et al. (1990) identified five different types of learning communities that emerged throughout postsecondary institutions in the 1980s: linked courses, learning clusters, freshmen interest groups, federated learning communities, and coordinated studies (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

In the linked courses model, cohorts of students register for two specific courses. Although the faculty for these specific courses teach independently from each other, both faculty members intentionally spend time coordinating course assignments and the syllabus to complement the work and theories taught in the classroom. The concept of learning clusters is similar to linked courses, but instead of two courses linking, three or more courses collaborate to build a multidimensional curricular experience. The majority of the content in the linked courses model centers on common themes, historical periods, or historical problems (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

Freshman interest groups (FIG) is a learning community model in which three or more classes connect, and the course enrollment size is small. Topics that are addressed in a FIG model focus on the necessities of the first-year students. The FIG model provides first-year students with an immediate network of peer and faculty support as students
transition from high school to the college experience. A requirement of the FIG model requires that all enrolled students meet with peer advisors throughout the academic year (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

In the federated learning community model, student groups of no more than 40 enroll in three connected courses with themes in addition to one seminar course. In the seminar, a master learner (faculty member with no other teaching obligations) pulls together the concepts from each of the three courses. The coordinated studies model is multidisciplinary and includes faculty from a variety of academic disciplines. Typically, a central theme is selected in which faculty teach a particular theme in a variety of ways, i.e., lectures, labs, or workshops. Also, faculty teaching the coordinated studies courses have no other assigned teaching load and participate in every aspect of the program (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

In 1999, various authors added residential LLPs to the learning community portfolio (Inkelas et al., 2008). According to Shapiro and Levine (1999), residentially-based learning communities drew from the characteristics of a residential college and a learning community by offering students an integrated, curricular and co-curricular experience (Shapiro & Levine, 1999). Lenning and Ebbers (1999) also discussed residential learning communities but focused on the communities’ noteworthy ability to impact undergraduate student persistence toward graduation and retention through structural elements. Love and Tokuno (1999) underscored the programmatic elements of residential learning communities and the communities’ ability to create inclusive environments for various underrepresented populations, i.e., first-generation students or students of color, while simultaneously addressing the students’ academic needs. In 2004,
the original authors of Gabelnick et al. (1990) amended their previous literature and finally acknowledged the residential learning community model.

**Residential Living-Learning Programs**

As concepts of residential learning communities evolved, so did the potential use of undergraduate residence halls as academic learning environments (Jackson & Schroder, 1987; Smith & Williams, 2007). Jackson and Schroder (1987) proclaimed that undergraduate students spent 70% of their time in residence halls and encouraged faculty and staff to capitalize on the time spent by students in the residence halls. As a result, the structural elements of a residential learning community brought academic elements into the residence hall, such as residential curriculums, designated classroom space and whenever financially possible live–in faculty (Gahagan & Hunter, 2010; Smith & Williams, 2007). The investment from various institutions to create LLPs inspired the need for an LLP typology, dedicated to assisting practitioners in their understanding and implementation of LLPs.

As noted in the literature, the style, design, and structure of a residential living-learning community can vary by the institution (Inkelas et al. 2008; Zao & Kuh, 2004). Most practitioners at postsecondary institutions struggle with selecting a structure for LLPs on their campus that addresses the needs of their student population (Inkelas, 2008). In one of the first of its kind, Inkelas et al. (2008) facilitated a study in which they created a typology report for LLPs and discussed the possible implications of structure on student learning. The study used Astin’s (1993) inputs–environments–outcome (I-E-O) model as a framework. The researchers identified three distinct types of LLPs, referred to in the study as clusters.
According to Inkelas et al. (2008), a cluster one LLP consisted of a small academic living-learning program with an average size of 48 participants. It was mainly orchestrated and funded by student affairs units and had little to no interaction with academic units. The majority of the emphasis for this cluster was indefinably programmatic with limited academic experiences. Alternatively, cluster two LLPs are medium-sized, with at least 100 enrolled students. It offered a variety of resources and activities and had a moderately collaborative partnership between student affairs and academic unit professionals. Students were exposed to programs centered on community service, multi-culturalism, or career workshops. Finally, cluster three LLPs were the largest, with at least 343 students enrolled in the program. Students received convenient access to study rooms in residence halls, had live-in faculty, and were provided additional support staff in an office located in the residence hall. Cluster three LLPs also provided a generous amount of course offerings and increased interactions with faculty both in and outside the classroom. In addition, cluster three LLPs were collaboratively supervised and funded by student affairs and academic units.

Inkelas et al. (2008) found that institutional size was negatively correlated with an LLP student’s growth in critical thinking skills. Although the study did not find a statistically significant difference between the critical thinking scores of students who participated in cluster one and cluster two LLPs, there was a difference in the critical thinking scores of LLP students who participated in a cluster three LLP. The findings suggest that larger LLPs supported by both academic and student affairs units assist in enhancing student cognitive development. Furthermore, this finding highlights a valuable
result in the study, illustrating the impact of student affairs and academic partnerships on learning for LLP students.

In the national study of living-learning programs (NSLLP) data (2008), Brower and Inkelas (2010) highly recommend that institutions consider structuring LLPs with strong student affairs (more specifically residence life) and academic partnership. According to Brower and Inkelas, LLPs with a strong partnership between both units tend to have (a) a well-conceptualized vision for the program and (b) clear academic learning objectives. Additionally, these LLPs take advantage of creating learning opportunities for students both in and outside of the classroom. These characteristics later translate into greater gains and high impact on student learning and development.

**Academic Affairs and Students Affairs Relationship in Higher Education**

The residential college model of higher education used in the 1200’s, allowed faculty to live with students and address all aspects of student development both in and outside of the classroom (Ryan, 1999). The live-in faculty component made it possible for faculty to exercise supervision and provide a combination of academic and social guidance for students when needed (Nuss, 2003; Ryan, 1999). In the 1800s, postsecondary institutions witnessed an increase in student enrollment, and as a result, the demand for more structured student accommodations and services also increased (Nuss, 2003). By the 1900s, the faculty questioned their role in managing a class curriculum, handling judicial cases, and concurrently influencing student learning and social development (Nuss, 2003). In 1925, a national trend began in higher education, in which institutions began to hire student affairs personnel to handle student development concerns
outside of the classroom, i.e., Greek life, student government, advising and other various functions known to most institutions today as the division of student affairs (Nuss, 2003).

Although the instigation of a division between student affairs and academic units is not identified in a particular year, Nuss (2003) notes a significant change in the 1960s between undergraduate students and universities that may be attributed to a difference of opinion regarding the role that academic units and student affairs professionals play in student success. According to Nuss (2003), the 1960s marked the year in which turbulent times within the nation may have influenced the relationships between higher education institutions and constituents. Student activists were energetically seen on campuses protesting racial injustices, U.S. involvement in the Vietnam conflict, and other matters related to inequality and higher education. As a result, the institution’s role as surrogate parents found in Ryan’s (1999) explanation of the residential college model diminished (Nuss, 2003; Smith & Williams, 2007).

Student affairs professionals transitioned from authority figures to educators as they demonstrated conflict resolution skills between students and the institution. Emphasis on rights and responsibilities became more apparent as faculty commissioned the government for the ability to exercise academic freedom within student learning (Nuss, 2003). At this time, institutions began to shift their perspective of students and began to lean more toward a contractual obligation between the institution and students. This contractual perspective meant that students needed to complete academic requirements and pay tuition to receive a degree and institutions only needed to provide a service. The creation of tuition refund policies, sexual assault procedures, and more was a reflection of the institution's mindset of business to consumer model (Nuss, 2003).
Over the years as student enrollment in higher education continued to grow, the need for more staff, faculty, and student services grew as well (Blimling, 2001; Nuss, 2003). With growth came the need to change staff and faculty roles and responsibilities as well as the institutional structure and culture, to fit the needs of a growing consumer: the students (Smith & Williams 2007; Strange, 2003). Blimling (2001) and Nuss (2003) state that student affairs was at one point seen as auxiliary/student services and a subsidiary function to the institutional mission and student learning was later seen as just a support system. Student Affairs eventually took on a more student administration and student development focus.

**Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Partnerships in Educational Reform**

Over the years reported observations about the state of higher education from critics appeared to be less than favorable (Eckel, 2000; Gabelnick et al., 1990; Smith & Williams 2007; Tinto, 2007). Consistent concerns raised in the literature referred to rising tuition costs, graduate preparedness for employment, and overall institutional structure and effectiveness. (Eckel, 2000; Nuss, 2003; Smith & Williams, 2007; Strange, 2003). As a result, various committees, state governments, and higher education organizations began to convene periodically to explore effective strategies for high impact programming dedicated to improving undergraduate education (Brower & Inkelas, 2010; Nuss, 2003). With increased attention on education reform, neither student affairs nor academic units could be complacent in their strategies and contributions to student learning (Nuss, 2003). Astin (1993) proposed that issues concerning postsecondary education are a university-wide problem and any initiatives created to address concerns should include all members of an institution, particularly student affairs and academic units. Tinto and Godsell (1993)
added to the conversation on higher education reform when they advised that undergraduate students will be successful when universities focus on creating academic environments that foster academic and social integration.

“Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning” (1998) was an article jointly published by the American Association for Higher Education, the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (AAHE, ACPA, NASPA, 1998). The article focused on recommendations for postsecondary education reform and insinuated that there is a need to shift the higher education paradigm once again and discover a holistic approach to student learning and development. Moreover, the article specifically referenced a partnership between student affairs and academic units as essential to a successful attempt at improving postsecondary education. Specifically, the article concludes that "...only when everyone on campus particularly academic affairs and student affairs staff share the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it" (p. 1). According to Astin and Astin (2000), the benefits of partnerships between student affairs and academic units is that it “empowers each individual, engenders trust, and capitalizes on the diverse talents of the group members” (p.21). Guarasci (2001) argued that there are tremendous gains in the academic growth and social development of undergraduate students when student affairs and academic units form alliances.

Although the recommendation for partnerships between student affairs and academic units consistently emerges in higher education reform literature, there is on the other hand documentation that highlights the historical divide between both units as well as potential challenges to interdepartmental collaboration. Magolda (2005) warns higher
education professionals that collaboration between student affairs and academic units is more complex than it may appear. Magolda (2005) asserts that postsecondary institutions should “Embark on joint ventures with care” (p. 16). According to Masterson (2008), “Faculty are by training and disposition skeptical. Before accepting a new way of doing things, they want evidence that the new way will be an improvement over what it replaces” (p. 26). At the same time, student affairs professionals may think of themselves as reinforcement for faculty as they enact the academic mission, but they are unfortunately not accustomed to working with faculty members (Masterson, 2008).

Jackson and Ebbers (1999) argue that the academic and social divide between student affairs and academic units is a major factor in preventing cross-collaboration between both units. The authors further contend that the divide mainly exists for several reasons: "(a) very little training in academic and student affairs collaboration is offered in graduate or postgraduate work, (b) very little substantive literature is available, and (c) it is unclear how to achieve this goal of collaboration. In many cases, the available personnel and/or resources on campus are not sufficient to deal with this situation" (Jackson & Ebbers, 1999, p. 380). The researchers conclude with thoughts similar to Matterson (2008), namely that resistance to collaboration is attributed to both sides of the house. Kezar (2003) also highlights challenges for successful partnerships between student affairs and academic units. Kezar (2003) argues that primary obstacles to student affairs and academic unit collaborations typically include cultural differences and the perception of student affairs as an ancillary function to the academic mission. Kezar (2003) also believes that an effective collaboration between student affairs and academic units is
impossible if the institutional environment is not conducive to identifying existing cultural and structural barriers.

Kezar (2001) reviewed a secondary dataset in which the Eric Clearinghouse on Higher Education, NASPA, and ACPA sought to identify collaborative initiatives that tend to be the most successful at postsecondary institutions, to what extent were student affairs and academic unit collaborations taking place, and why units chose to collaborate. The study surveyed 50 chief student affairs officers at various institutions. Overall, the study had a 49% response rate and identified first-year students and co-curricular activities as the most successful collaborations between academic units and student affairs units. Findings of the study also suggest that cooperation, student affairs attitudes, common goals, and personalities were all perceived to make the biggest difference in the success of a collaborative relationship. In the open-ended responses, most respondents mentioned the employment of new colleagues or leadership as a tremendous variable to assisting with institutional change. Respondents were also less likely to mention structural factors as being significant contributors to successful collaborations.

Perceptions of successful strategies identified a combination of both cultural and structural strategies as necessary to create an effective and successful collaboration. Respondents did, however, report that cultural approaches more often than structural strategies were significant factors in challenges to collaboration. Furthermore, respondents believed that restructuring joint committees, as well as support from senior administration, proved to be significant in their ability to create successful collaborations between student affairs and academic units. Finally, the descriptive statistics also suggested that the more cultural strategies used, the more successful the number of
collaborations on campus. Overall, tremendous variations were identified amongst institutional types, making this particular category difficult for the researchers to interpret. Through emerging literature similar to Jackson and Ebbers (1999) and Kezar (2003), the need to identify strategies used to accomplish successful partnerships and collaborations became evident.

As the momentum for educational initiatives requiring student affairs and academic unit collaborations/partnerships increased, so did the need to identify elements needed for a successful partnership. "Principles of Good Practice" for Academic and Student Affairs Partnership programs, is a qualitative research article that attempts to provide the knowledge base needed to evaluate collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic units. Whitt et al. (2008) identifies several practices within this study meant to assist in creating and maintaining effective academic and student affairs partnerships. Throughout the study, students and staff were interviewed at a variety of institutions. The rich data was then transcribed into seven key principles for an effective partnership.

The first principle was a reflection of a partnership's ability to advance the institution's mission. According to the authors, an effective partnership should be influenced by the institution’s mission and enhance the institution's commitment to student learning. The second principle is the program’s ability to foster a learning-oriented ethos, meaning that the partnership should encourage a seamless integration of learning both in and outside of the classroom. The third principle is the partnership's ability to build on and nurture relationships. An effective partnership is built on existing relationships between two departments with mutual interests. The fourth principle is the program’s
recognition and integration of institutional culture. The culture of an institution can have a tremendous impact on the development and goals of a partnership. The fifth principle is the program's value and implementation of assessment. Effective partnerships understand the value of evaluating the program's accomplishments as well as identifying its weaknesses. The sixth principle of the programs is the creative and effective use of resources.

With limited resources, now more than ever institutions have to meet their goals by being creative with the human capital, materials, and strategies that are available to them. Moreover, last but not least, the seventh principle is the program's demands and manifestations of leadership. An effective partnership is not only led by strong organizational leadership but also assists both partners in developing a shared leadership plan.

**Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Partnerships with LLPs**

Astin and Astin (2000) suggest that LLPs are a perfect venue for collaborative leadership and shared goals between student affairs and academic units. In LLPs, “Many different people can come together to teach in learning communities-faculty, student affairs professionals, librarians, graduate teaching assistants and student peer mentors. Learning community programs are often a team effort, setting up the conditions for interdependence and learning on the part of all the people who teach in them.” (Smith et al., 2007, p. 22). Hirsch and Burack (2001) identified LLPs as a high impact program where students learn and grow, but also espoused that LLPs are valuable professional development opportunities for faculty and staff associated with their implementation.
Haynes and Janosik (2012) identified the extrinsic and intrinsic benefits that faculty and staff experience as a result of working with an LLP. The study’s valuable contribution to existing literature addressed key sources of motivation for extremely valuable members of the LLP experience. Using a multistage convenience sampling technique with ACUHO-I members, the research yielded a total of 128 faculties and 140 staff who worked with LLPs at 42 different postsecondary institutions. The study found that both faculty and staff receive more intrinsic rewards than extrinsic motivation from participating in an LLP. Faculty and staff reported that their top five intrinsic benefits were (a) frequent conversations with students unrelated to class, (b) feeling like they were making a difference in the lives of students, (c) greater interaction with students, (d) furthering the mission of the institution, and (e) increased interactions with students affairs staff and faculty in other departments.

An additional finding of the study addressed the extrinsic incentives for both LLP faculty and staff. LLP faculty reported receiving monetary benefits and a decrease in workload as compensation for their involvement, whereas, student affairs professionals appeared to receive the ability to attend professional conferences as an extrinsic benefit. Overall, the study’s ability to identify the motivation of LLP faculty and staff aids institutions in recruiting key facilitators for a residential LLP by sharing the personal and professional gains to being an active collaborative partner.

There is little empirical data provided to support or clarify what an effective partnership between student and academic affairs units consists of for LLPs. Unlike any other collaborative initiative between student affairs and academic units, partnerships with LLPs typically require that students and staff share space in a facility, i.e., office space,
programmable space, classroom space. Most of the literature that does exist on the collaborative efforts of student affairs and academic units tend to focus on the historical, social, and academic divides that prevent collaboration and hinder combined efforts for student learning (Jackson & Ebbers, 1999). In addition, the literature does not address the potential and unique dynamics of the day-to-day operations for LLP administrators on LLPs. However, various researchers acknowledged (Astin and Astin, 2000; Kezar, 2003; Inkelas et al., 2001; Jackson & Ebbers, 1999) that developing effective partnerships between academic units and student affairs professionals is critical to improving student learning, to increasing retention for universities, and specifically for maximizing the potential impact of LLPs on student learning.

**Shared Governance Theory**

Several researchers would argue that collaboration between student affairs and academic units is essential to an effective LLP (Astin & Astin, 2000; Inkelas et al., 2008; Tinto, 2007). However, several researchers would also agree that collaboration is difficult to evaluate and define (Doz, 1996; Hirsch & Burack; 2001; Wood & Gray, 1991). Wood and Gray (1991) suggest that interdepartmental collaborations and alliances are best explained as “a process in which a group of autonomous stakeholders of an issue domain engages in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (p.146). Conversely, Doz (1996) highlights the inability of past and present literature to empirically capture the interdepartmental process and dynamics of collaboration. According to Doz (1996), most research captures factors of cooperation or rather contractual arrangements between two or more departmental units or organizations, not true authentic collaboration.
Despite existing research, corporate industry researchers developed theories over the years that focus on collaboration efforts within organizations. A theoretical perspective commonly used to measure collaborative efforts within organizations is shared governance theory (Eckel, 2000; Gardiner, 2009; Tierney, 2005). According to Gardiner (2006), shared governance is “a process of making decisions that involve the broad participation of diverse groups” (p. 62). Shared governance is a fluid and ongoing process, subject to continual efforts of coordination and evaluation to reach the desired outcome (Scott & Caress, 2005). According to Scott and Caress (2005), there are multiple benefits of using shared governance as a collaborative model. One benefit is that it dismantles hierarchal perceptions of management and empowers all stakeholders in the facilitation and decision-making process of a particular goal, initiative, or project. In addition, Scott & Caress (2005) suggest that shared governance assists interdisciplinary teams in working collaboratively and providing an efficient and effective service.

Throughout the literature, there are multiple variations of the shared governance model. The Gardiner (2006) article Transactional, Transformational and Transcendent Leadership: Metaphors Mapping The Evolution of the Theory and Practice of Governance references an earlier concept of a shared governance model developed by Veneable and Gardner (1988). Veneable and Gardner’s (1988) shared governance model identified six distinct characteristics used to explore the relationship between constituents and organizations: 1) a climate of trust, 2) information sharing, 3) meaningful participation 4) collective decision making, 5) protecting divergent views, and 6) redefining roles (Gardiner, 2006). Through the perceptions of employees, Veneable and Gardner’s (1988) shared governance model typically determines the levels of trust and collaboration
available to people within a company, institution, or organization. The higher the perceptions, the greater the levels of trust and collaboration amongst employees. In addition, the group is also more likely to pursue common goals and accomplishments together (Gardiner, 2006; Gardiner, 2009).

**Defining the Value of Shared Governance Characteristics in Interdepartmental Partnerships**

Several researchers throughout the literature define and highlight the importance of each of Veneable and Gardner’s (1988) characteristics of shared governance to interdepartmental collaborations. For instance, a climate of trust refers to authentic engagements within a group or individual setting. Pope (2004) admits the vague and often complex ability to define a “climate of trust.” According to Pope (2004), trust is often a missing construct when assessing interdepartmental collaborations within higher education. Pope (2004) also argues that trust is essential to improving the effectiveness of interdepartmental collaborations and shared governance.

Information sharing requires full and timely disclosure of all relevant information from all involved parties. Tierney (2005) asserts that information sharing is an undeniable asset to successful shared governance partnerships. Tierney expounds on the idea that communication is all too often symbolic of systemic issues within a partnership, in which broken lines of communication can later translate into failed collaborations.

Meaningful participation is valuable within the shared governance model. The term extends beyond an occasional meeting between two or more constituents. Meaningful participation allows for clear lines of communication and outcomes supportive of the initial goal or intent. Hirsch and Burack (2001) noted that "people do not
usually collaborate unless they share common concerns and believe that they will be able to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively as a result" (p. 57).

A collective decision is accomplished through team efforts. It acknowledges the expertise and contributions of all constituents involved and results in consent from all parties involved, including even those who may have disagreed with the final decision initially, knowing that all thoughts and opinions were considered throughout the process. Eckel (2000) declares that one of the most important factors to a successful interdepartmental collaboration and shared governance is the creation of a structure and process that allows many constituencies to make mutually acceptable decisions. Birnbaum and Shushok (2001) contend that in response to external and internal pressure for change in higher education, the administration would be wise to allow all constituents an opportunity to provide input to an institutional decision, which later creates the byproduct of true institutional change.

Protecting divergent views enables the growth of an environment conducive to a community of scholarship while also promoting a free exchange of creativity. Tierney and Minor (2004) shared their perspective on the value of diverse opinions and thought. According to Tierney and Minor, faculty and staff can sometimes see views opposite of their own as a threat to power when in reality a difference of opinion is a circumstance of a vibrant and growing organizational culture. Furthermore, a difference of opinion aids in creating an environment that is conducive to shared decision making.

Blimling (2000) and Kezar (2003) discuss the value of flexibility regarding role identification. Both authors emphasize the importance of departmental units valuing and knowing the potential and current contribution each department brings to student learning.
Redefining roles permits all constituents an opportunity to disaffiliate from traditional roles and expectations and explore innovative ways to achieve a shared goal.

Overall, the literature suggests that shared governance is more successful if amended to the context in which the concept will be used (Kezar, 2005; Tineary, 2005). For the purpose of this study, it would be best to review the shared governance model specifically in higher education.

**Shared Governance within Higher Education**

Eckel (2000) implies that much of what is known about shared governance in higher education is influenced by a 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (AAUP, 1995), jointly written by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). The Statement outlines suggested roles for trustees, faculty, and administrators in institutional governance decisions (Eckel, 2000). Eckel (2000) contends that the statement may be more confusing than helpful in defining shared governance in higher education. In fact, the vagueness of the statement allows any constituent to make the case that various decisions fall within their purview (Eckel, 2000; Tierney 2004). Furthermore, Eckel (2000) proclaims that the statement does not clearly articulate the various structures or potential decisions made within higher education. Futhermore, Eckel (2000) suggests that the document is not inclusive of other positions such as student affairs staff or non-tenured faculty (Eckel, 2000; Tierney 2005).

Eckel (2000) identified the expectations and pressure placed on shared governance strategies by higher education institutions to quickly resolve complicated institutional
environments and challenges. By adopting an interest group struggle framework, the study looked at four institutions’ ability or inability to implement shared governance when making the difficult decision to discontinue academic programs. The researcher held structured interviews with open-end questions to learn more about the shared governance process at each institution. In addition, Eckel (2000) collected archived data among other institutional publications and resources to assist in learning more about the process. The findings of the study endorsed the notion that faculty are cooperative, especially when the decision can impact their colleagues. Second, the results also revealed that faculty are not solely responsible for the success of shared governance process within higher education. Overall, Eckel (2000) concludes with four recommendations for AUUP College and University governance guidelines on discontinuing academic programs: (a) faculty should be involved early on and in meaningful ways, (b) faculty should provide "considerable advice" on the long- and short-term effects of the closures, (c) tenure should be protected, and (d) faculty should have "primary responsibility" for determining where closures occur.

Reflective of the 1966 statement, research on shared governance within higher education replicates a triangle of constituents within the shared governance process: trustees, faculty, administrators, (Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Tierney, 2005) and students. However, Tierney (2005) encourages researchers to stray from the common structural analysis of governance and consider other venues of shared decision making when selecting a unit of analysis. According to Tierney (2005), the challenge that some shared governance studies face is their unwillingness to move from linear and hierarchical sequences of shared decision making. Shared governance can take place on multiple levels and does not always require a board or committee commission. Kezar (2004) holds
similar sentiments in which she recommends that researchers progress toward a collaborative model of shared governance that is inclusive of trust and relationships.

**Collaborative Leadership**

Leadership is often conceptualized in a variety of different ways (Raelin, 2006). However, in its simplest form, “leadership” is characterized as an influential relationship between a leader and their followers, in which the end goal is designed to encourage change for a shared purpose (Astin and Astin, 2000; Rost, 1991; Yukl, 2006). According to Rost (1991), every form of leadership should include four essential elements: (a) an influential relationship, (b) leaders, and followers, c) an intent to make real changes, and (d) the development of a mutual purpose. Furthermore, a review of the literature highlights two distinct types of leadership: hierarchal leadership and individualistic leadership (Astin and Astin, 2000). According to Astin and Astin (2000), hierarchical leadership is often identified as an authoritarian role in which power is assumed through a professional position. On the other hand, individualistic leadership is acquired through status, accomplishments, and accolades. Consequently, the absence of collaboration as a characteristic of leadership is not uncommon. Ironically, although collaboration does not always emerge as a top characteristic of leadership, its absence is quickly detected in practice and implementation (Astin and Astin, 2000).

Similar to the multitude of ways in which leadership is defined, there are indeed as many ways to define collaborative leadership. Lovegrove and Thomas (2013) contend that collaborative leadership is typically known as a management technique in which leadership is distributed across hierarchal structures and organizational boundaries. Through collaborative leadership, all members at any level of an organization are
empowered to participate in leadership efforts and have equal rights in decision-making needs for an organization or shared goal (Raelin, 2006).

Raelin (2003) made significant contributions to collaborative leadership literature with the identification of three major principles and four operational perspectives. According to Raelin (2003), the absence of specific principles and perspectives could translate into a failed attempt at a collaborative process. The first principle of collaborative leadership states that collaboration begins with dialogue and nonjudgmental requests. Secondly, collaborative leadership requires all members to reflect on any potential biases they may own. In the final principle, members should entertain the possibility that something new or unique might arise and could redirect the focus of the initiative or project.

Furthermore, Raelin (2003) suggests that there are four operational characteristics of collaborative leadership which are vital to the establishment of collaborative leadership in practice: First collaborative leadership is concurrent and should be considered a plural phenomenon. There can be more than one leader at a time. Collaborative leadership is also collective, meaning it is not influenced by an individual. Instead, it is developed through a process of individuals working together for a shared purpose. Thirdly, collaborative leadership is mutual, demonstrating an openness from members to give and receive feedback in an environment where every opinion and contribution matters. Finally, collaborative leadership is compassionate and requires a commitment from all members to respect each other.

Overall, in recent years, interest from organization leaders in the collaborative leadership framework has become increasingly popular as organizations become more
invested in leveraging the talents and contributions of all members of their team to accomplish a particular goal.

**Collaborative Leadership in Higher Education**

New approaches to improving student learning have inspired higher education administrators to consider other forms of leadership to achieve the goal (Raelin, 2006). According to Astin and Astin (2000), postsecondary administrators have an opportunity to transform the undergraduate learning experience through collaborative leadership efforts. However, like Raelin (2006), Astin and Astin (2000) strongly encourage that postsecondary administrators must consider the awareness and implementation of specific group characteristics prior to embarking on collaborative initiatives. For instance, according to Astin and Astin (2000), group qualities for collaborative leadership in postsecondary environments should consist of (a) collaboration, (b) a shared purpose, (c) respect with disagreement, (d) division of labor, (e) and a learning environment.

According to Astin and Astin (2000), collaboration is the foundation of collaborative leadership; it engenders trust and acknowledges the diverse talents and contribution potentially offered by group members. Shared purpose provides meaning to the collaborative efforts provided by the group. This characteristic speaks to the goal of the project, the desired outcomes, and the amount of energy needed by group members to accomplish a goal. Astin and Astin (2000) warn that in many regards; this can be considered the hardest part of collaborative leadership efforts. Reaching a common consensus amongst multiple group members may be a challenge, in which members should be prepared to spend a considerable amount of time discussing as a group.
Disagreement with respect acknowledges that conflict between student affairs and academic professionals are inevitable as they both fight for scarce resources and power (Shafritz, Ott & Jang, 2005). However, the expectation of and preparation for differing opinions during a collaborative initiative should aid members in creating a collegial environment designed to foster respect and trust amongst group members. Division of labor requires a significant contribution of effort from all members. Additionally, all members must have clarity regarding not only their responsibilities but also the responsibilities and contributions of their team members. One of the most important group leadership characteristics is the creation and sustainment of a collaborative learning environment. It is a valuable experience when collaborative leadership group members begin to view the initiative as space not only where they contribute to learning, but also as a place where they can learn about each other, themselves, and the shared goal. In addition, members will also acquire a shared knowledge, interpersonal competencies, and the technical skills needed to function as a group.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Collaborative partnerships between student affairs units and academic affairs typically face the inertia of the hierarchical roles and power differentials between faculty and staff, sometimes making collaborative efforts between both units difficult to achieve in the contemporary structures of postsecondary institutions (Blimling, 2001; Brower & Inkelas, 2010; Jackson & Ebbers, 1999; Magolda, 2005). However, according to Inkelas et al. (2001), an LLP collaborative partnership between student affairs units and academic affairs may bypass the negative relational attributes described in the literature and potentially yield higher student success rates than LLPs that are governed by one particular unit. Although existing research on LLPs and interdepartmental partnerships is extensive (Inkelas et al., 2001; Kanter, 1994; Kezar, 2004; Zao & Kuh, 2004), few studies have solely focused on the exploration of how collaboration is facilitated between academic affairs and student affairs units in the context of an LLP environment.

For this reason, chapter three will outline the methodology used throughout the study to explore how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs units. In addition, the methodology used in this study will specifically address the following research questions:

1.) Are LLPs which are co-sponsored by academic affairs and student affairs units collaboratively led by those units?

2.) How do administrators of collaboratively-led LLPs facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?
a. How do LLP administrators perceive the impact of the institutional environment on their ability to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

**Research Design**

The research design used for this study was a sequential explanatory mixed methods design, used to investigate and explain how collaboration is facilitated between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. The first phase of the study was quantitative and relied on the contextual accounts of LLP coordinators, collected through a survey. One LLP coordinator per institution was asked to complete the survey. LLP coordinators, for this study, are defined as faculty, academic staff or student affairs staff, whose primary role includes the coordination of some or all LLP efforts at their institution. The responses from the survey helped the researcher in identifying whether or not LLPs were collaboratively led initiatives as well as identify an institution with (a) ongoing collaboratively-led LLPs by student affairs units and academic affairs and (b) multiple collaboratively-led LLPs available to undergraduate students for the second phase of the study. A survey is appropriate for the first phase of the study because it allowed the researcher to collect significant amounts of data from multiple participants at a time without the need for the researcher to be present at the time of survey completion (Dilman, 2014). The survey was also beneficial for providing the researcher with a snapshot of how collaboration was facilitated between both units at multiple institutions.

The second phase of the study included a site visit and group interviews with LLP coordinators selected from an institution that was identified within the first phase of the study. This approach intended to explain how collaboration is facilitated between student
affairs units and academic affairs at a single institution. The institution selected for the second phase of the study demonstrated relatively high collaboratively-led scores between student affairs units and academic affairs. The facilitation of group interviews for the second phase of this study was appropriate because it allowed the researcher an opportunity to collect multiple streams of data within a limited period. In addition, according Stake (2005), site visits and group interviews are extremely valuable in allowing the researcher to examine institutional culture, departmental structure, program facilitation, and various other domains that may be influential to the phenomenon being explored and not otherwise accessible for data collection through a survey or explored in any other form of quantitative data collection.

Overall, the sequential explanatory research design is ideal for this study particularly due to the design’s ability to explore the quantitative results collected in the first phase. According to Ivankova et al. (2006), the sequential explanatory design is beneficial in providing a general understanding of the research problem in the first phase of the study and a more refined explanation of the results in the second phase of the study.

Consequently, at the core of the research design is a social constructivist paradigm, which refers to the understanding that data collected throughout the study is constructed through the experiences and contextual accounts of the administrators who participate in the study. With that in mind, the researcher acknowledges that participants will provide data in both phases of the study based on their perceptions and experiences.
Research Phase One

Participant Selection

Smith et al. (1990) assert that it takes a team approach for an LLP to be effective. O’May and Buchan (1999) claim that when evaluating collaborative efforts between two or more units, it is best to select participants who are closest to the point of service. According to Shapiro and Levine (1999) and Inkleas et al. (2008), participants closest to the point of service for LLPs would be faculty, academic staff, and student affairs staff who are actively engaged in the coordinated efforts for one or more LLPs. Using the principles found in O’May and Buchan (1999) and Shapiro and Levine (1999), LLP coordinators employed by either academic affairs or students affairs unit could participate in either phase of the study as long as part of their primary job responsibilities were in support of one or more LLPs at their institution.

For the first phase of the study, LLP coordinators were selected as the key administrators needed to complete the survey. LLP coordinators were chosen as the target population because of their intimate knowledge of an institution's LLP program. To date, there is no formal list identifying the names of institutions with LLPs or LLP coordinators; as a result, a multi-stage convenience sampling technique was used through utilization of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) membership directory.

ACUHO-I was selected by the researcher as an ideal platform to solicit the involvement of LLP coordinators for this study, because of the organization’s mission statement. ACUHO-I is a national organization focused on assisting postsecondary
institutions in creating residential curricular and co-curricular environments. Currently, ACUHO-I has more than 1,000 affiliated member institutions and a specific sector that focuses on LLPs. The use of the ACUHO-I membership directory ensures that participants will be knowledgeable of the phenomenon being studied in this research and increases the probability of selecting an LLP Administrator who embodies the job responsibilities and knowledge base needed to complete the survey.

At the end of the survey, participants were asked for permission to contact them via email if their institution demonstrates the needed selection criteria and is selected for further data analysis. Three institutions demonstrated a high degree of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. Moreover, the institution that was selected for the second phase of the study demonstrated a willingness to meet with the researcher within a designated time frame suggested by the researcher.

**Data Collection**

A survey was in the first phase of this study. Quantitative data collection is designed to provide quantifiable measures of information through surveys, experiments, and collections of historical data (McMillan & Schumacher, 2014). This study used a survey to investigate the presence and degree of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs who collaboratively lead LLPs. Using the principles of survey construction found in Dilman et al. (2014) and Fowler (2013), the survey was developed and organized into two distinct areas: (a) demographic information about the respondent and the institution and (b) respondents’ perceptions of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs on LLPs.
The questions throughout the survey also aligned with the study’s research questions and the theoretical framework. For example, the survey is influenced by Venerable and Gardner’s (1988) six characteristics of shared governance and Astin and Astin’s (2000) characteristics of collaborative leadership. Both of the theoretical frameworks helped operationalize the collaboratively –led construct used throughout the study. For the purpose of this study the collaboratively-led construct was operationalized in three domains: how often LLP administrators from differing units (a) jointly shared LLP work-related responsibilities, (b) jointly discussed LLP related tasks, and (c) jointly participated in a shared decision-making process. Each question provided 10 to 15 opportunities for survey respondents to identify moments of collaboration between LLP administrators. Question 24 provides an example of one such opportunity: if the response was demarcated on the survey as “both student affairs and academic LLP Partners,” the response was categorized as a collaboration, and the institution was given one point for each response labeled “both.” For questions 9 and 18, if the survey participant marked “Yes” for both LLP administrators jointly discussing or deciding on various LLP-related responses, the response was categorized as a collaboration, and the institution received another point for each collaborative response. Please see Appendix D for more details on collaboratively led survey questions and point values.

Dillman et al. (2014) and Fowler (2013) also strongly recommend that researchers place a considerable amount of time designing the layout of the survey. Both authors advise that the layout of a survey is critical, mainly because the layout contributes to a participant’s willingness to complete a survey. Both authors suggest that because the survey is self–administered, the researcher cannot clarify questions or definitions of the
main terms used throughout the study. As a result, the aesthetics of a web survey can communicate meaning through words and graphics, as well as assist respondents in navigating a survey. When designing the visual presentation of the survey for this study, it was important to the researcher to create a survey that would encourage the participant to complete the survey. As a result, participants were given the ability to take the survey through multiple electronic avenues, i.e., web and mobile. Dillman et al. (2014) encourage researchers to select mixed mode data collection to appeal to all potential participants and thereby increase the survey response rate.

Another example of survey construction strategies used to encourage participant completion was the number of closed and open-ended questions included in the survey. On the survey, there are four open-ended items that require descriptive responses. The open-ended questions were meant to evoke as much description from respondents as possible. Providing open-ended items on the survey is a valuable strategy because these questions can potentially capture a respondent's thoughts without influencing their response or constraining the respondent to limited responses (Dilman et al., 2014). Accordingly, the survey provided a limited number of open-ended questions on the survey.

On the other hand, closed-ended questions are ideal for motivating respondents to respond (Dilman et al., 2014). Eleven out of the 15 items on the survey are close-ended questions. The close-ended questions are a mix of both nominal and ordinal data collection. The benefit of the close-ended strategy is that the questions were designed in varying formats and structures, providing participants with options that are less difficult to answer. For example, questions two and four on the survey are ordinal close-ended
questions that choose to implement a visual analog-slider scale versus a drop-down menu. The visual analog style is described as fun and interactive for respondents and may, in turn, increase a respondent’s willingness to complete the question.

Furthermore, Fowler (2013) suggests that a necessary component to survey construction includes feedback related to the content and survey design from experts before the distribution of the survey. According to Dilman et al. (2014), an expert review is beneficial in recommendations on the appropriate language or measurement of various concepts used throughout the survey. Dilman et al. also suggest that expert reviewers should be inclusive of participants who are experts in either the field of study or survey construction.

Prior to the distribution of the survey, the researcher conducted an expert review through cognitive interviews with two student affairs LLP administrators and two academic affairs LLP administrators in April 2017. Participants in the cognitive interviews identified as full-time professionals whose primary responsibilities include the coordination efforts of all or some LLPs at their institution. The administrators also affirmed that the LLPs at their institution are collaboratively led by student affairs units and academic affairs. The LLP administrators who participated in the cognitive interviews were asked via email to complete the survey.

Participants in the cognitive interview agreed to meet individually via phone and discuss with the researcher, survey construction as well as any additional feedback that the participants wanted to provide. Results from the cognitive interviews revealed that the timing needed to complete the survey was ideal for all participants and took no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. In addition, participants mentioned an appreciation for the
number of close-ended versus open-ended questions provided on the survey. Fowler (2013) states that participants will be more likely to complete the survey if limited in the number of questions asked and in the time it takes to complete the survey.

In conclusion, cognitive interview participants also agreed that the terminology used in the survey applied to their positions and other similar positions that they are aware of at various institutions. In closing, final thoughts from participants alluded to June as an ideal time to distribute the survey. According to participants, the months of July and August are typically peak work-related months for administrators in their position.

Survey Distribution

On Wednesday, June 28, 2017, ACUHO-I administrators distributed a cover letter and qualtrics survey link via email to 2,171 members found in their directory. After accounting for various issues such as non-completion and sending errors, 1,683 members received the survey.

A second effort to distribute the survey via email, through the ACUHO-I directory took place on Wednesday, July 26th. On July 26th a reminder email was sent to all ACUHO-I members, and only 1,663 emails were deemed deliverable. On Friday, July 28th, the survey ended, and potential respondents no longer had access to complete the survey.

In total, 132 respondents attempted to complete the survey. Eighty-one responses were eliminated because the respondent did not provide their position title and/or institution name. Position title and institution name were necessary pieces of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of invitations sent</td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of surveys completed</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of fully completed surveys</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incomplete responses</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 1 Survey Participant Summary
to the researcher in hopes that the information would assist in identifying if participants in the first phase of the study were LLP coordinators and familiar with the content found within the survey, as well as aid the researcher in identifying an institution with collaboratively led LLPs for the second phase of the study. After eliminating responses due to missing pertinent information, another six institutions were eliminated due to institution duplication.

Three of the duplicated institutions were found in the dataset multiple times but were completed by different coordinators at the same institution. The survey was explicitly designed to collect responses from one coordinator per institution. For schools that were listed more than once by different coordinators, the researcher reviewed the respondent's position title, and number of LLPs offered. The response from the more senior level respondent was kept in all instances of a duplicated response.

Another criteria used for response elimination was the survey time stamp. Two institution responses were completed by the same coordinator at different times. In these cases, the researcher reviewed both responses and eliminated the response that appeared to be completed at an earlier date. The most recent response was kept for data analysis.

Out of the six eliminated responses, one institution was eliminated due to the response for types of LLPs offered. For that institution, the response reflected that only one thematic LLP was offered at the institution. However, the duplicated responses listed more LLPs that were a combination of both thematic and major-based. As a result, the response that indicated only one LLP was eliminated.

Overall, the quantitative data collection provided the descriptive statistics needed to ensure that the participant was an LLP coordinator in the first phase of the study and
helped identify an institution for the second phase of the research. The selected institution displayed evidence of (a) an ongoing collaboratively-led LLP by academic affairs units and student affairs units as well as (b) institutions that offer multiple collaboratively-led LLPs for undergraduate students. At the end of the survey, participants were asked for permission to contact them via email if their institution demonstrated the necessary selection criteria and was selected for further analysis.

**Research Phase Two**

**Participant selection**

Through data analysis of survey responses, three institutions emerged as having a relatively high degree of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. In addition, the LLP coordinators who completed the survey administered in the first phase of the study provided their contact information at the end of the survey signifying their willingness to participate in the second phase of the research study, should their institution emerge as a strong candidate for further exploration.

An email was sent to all three LLP coordinators. The email discussed the researcher’s intent to facilitate semi-structured interviews with participants, collect archived data related to LLP administrator partnerships, and observe LLP administrator meetings/events during an on-site campus visit if possible. A Qualtrics link was embedded in the email and allowed the participant to agree or decline continuation in the second phase of the study. One LLP coordinator’s response demonstrated a willingness within the designated timeframe suggested by the researcher.

In follow-up emails between the researcher and the LLP coordinator, a snowball sampling technique was implemented to gather additional names and professional emails
of student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators and faculty who worked with
the day to day operations of all, some or one of the LLPs at the selected institution.
Additionally, identified LLP administrators were sent an email including the embedded
link to the consent form. The email outlined a description of the study and expectations of
continuing phase of the research, such as the researcher’s intent to record all interviews
and keep anonymous all identifying information of the participants and institution in any
written or oral presentations of the study. Toward the end of the email, participants were
given an option to accept or decline the invitation to continue in the study.

Data Collection

In the second phase of the study was designed to explore of how collaboration is
facilitated between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs.
In September, the researcher traveled to the selected institution for a site visit. The
researcher used multiple sources of evidence, often referred to as triangulation, to identify
how collaboration is facilitated between both units. Triangulation requires the researcher
to pull from multiple modes of data collection such as semi-structured interviews with
LLP administrators; observing co-sponsored LLP curricular and co-curricular programs,
in addition to joint LLP administrator meetings; and collecting archival documents,
including memos and minutes of meetings. Based on responses from the LLP
administrators, the researcher was able to organize the facilitation of three group
interviews and five individual interviews with a total of thirteen participants. The
researcher observed one hall director and LLP partner meeting and was given multiple
promotional items and brochures for LLPs at the institution.
As suggested by Maxwell (2012), the group interviews were semi-structured interviews in which questions were developed prior to the site visit in an effort to guide the conversation and intentionally connect responses to the research questions and theoretical framework for this study. See Appendix F for semi-structured interview questions. Interviewing LLP administrators from both units helped the researcher develop an all-inclusive depiction of how collaboration is facilitated between student affairs units and academic affairs at the selected institution.

Data Analyses

Prior to placing the survey data gathered in Qualtrics into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the researcher added the Carnegie classification information for each institution listed. The Carnegie classification framework for higher education was used to identify comparable institutional traits for domestic universities and colleges found in the dataset. In total, five Carnegie classifications were used for coding the institutional data: institution type, which labels an institution as public or private; basic classification description, which identifies the type of frequently granted degrees given at the institution; size and setting, which refers to the amount of commuters and on-campus student population at the institution; and undergraduate student profile and enrollment classification, which identifies the total number of students enrolled and their academic status. Once the Carnegie classifications were added to the dataset, the information was then imported into SPSS and used to generate a descriptive statistic. Examples of the demographic information calculated through SPSS include the number of institutions that are public and private as well as the average number of LLPs offered at institutions.
Statistical measures were used to calculate collaboratively-led domain scores and the collaborative composite scores. The collaboratively-led and composite score is a derivative of the collaboratively-led construct. Collaboratively-led domain questions were represented in questions 9, 18 and 24 on the survey. Using frequency measurements, each LLP-related task that was identified as collaboration was given one point. On question 24, respondents were provided 15 opportunities to select one of the following options: student affairs LLP administrator, academic LLP administrators, or both. If “both” was demarcated on the survey response, the response was then categorized as a collaboration and received one point per collaborative response, with a possibility for 15 points in total.

For LLP-related tasks listed under the shared responsibilities, jointly discussed, and jointly shared decision-making domains, participants were given the option to select yes or no. If the survey respondent marked “Yes” for both LLP Administrators jointly discussing or deciding on various LLP-related responses, then the response was categorized as a collaboration and received one point per collaborative response. For question nine, there were ten opportunities to mark yes or no and receive a total of ten points; for question 18, there were 11 opportunities to select yes or no and potentially receive 11 points. Overall, the scores measured the degree of collaboration between both units in each domain. Please see Appendix D for collaboratively-led domain survey questions and point value, as well as tables 8, 9 and 10 for collaboratively-led domain scores.

Once collaboratively-led domain scores were calculated, an additional calculation referred to as the “collaboration composite score” was developed for each participant. The
collaborative composite score was the sum of each institution’s domain scores. In total, the participant could achieve 36 points for the collaboration composite score. The collaboration composite score is intended to represent the degree of collaboration between both units at a given institution and across all three collaboratively-led domains.

In the second phase of the study, a theme analysis of qualitative data was completed, in which the researcher examined the data multiple times and could no longer determine further interpretations or alternative conclusions from the data (Maxwell, 2012). The systematic coding approach is consistent with inductive analysis and requires the researcher to play close attention to all data and support documents (Maxwell, 2012). In facilitating this type of analysis, three steps were utilized. The first step included disaggregating the data into units. This process required the researcher to reevaluate the data by listening to recordings and re-reading transcripts. While the researcher combed through the data, similar sentences and words were placed together to create units. The second step in the process was the development of emerging themes found through the data. This process involved the creation of a matrix in which keywords and sentences were gathered from the first step. The third step was identifying and labeling the emerging themes from the data. The critical part of completing this step was ensuring that the themes connected to the theory and research questions of the study.

Overall, the qualitative data analysis generated four emergent themes that were extracted from group interview responses: (a) a mutually supportive relationship between the institution and Living Learning Programs, (b) collaborative networks (c) the LLP coordinator position, and (d) mechanisms used for collaboration. All four factors are discussed in detail in chapter four.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Despite evidence that interdepartmental collaborations in higher education can be beneficial to enhancing student learning, the literature suggests that sustaining collaborative relationships specifically between student affairs units and academic affairs can be difficult for postsecondary administrators to achieve (Astin & Astin, 2000; Bliming, 2001; Kezar, 2005; Tinto, 1997). Given the potential impact of collaboration amongst LLP administrators on student success (Astin & Astin, 2000; Bliming, 2001; Kanter, 1994; Kezar, 2004; Kezar, 2005; Pope, 2004; Tinto, 1997), the primary purpose of this research is to explore how collaboration is facilitated between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs.

Although the literature highlights the potential for a significant impact on undergraduate learning through cross-collaboration between both units, this research attempts to avoid making any assumption that LLPs are collaboratively-led by student affairs units and academic affairs. As a result, to begin the exploration of this phenomenon collaborative leadership and shared governance theories will provide a contemporary lens to review how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. In addition, this study used the following research questions to guide the data analysis for this study:

Research questions:

1.) Are LLPs which are co-supported by academic affairs and student affairs units collaboratively led by those units?
2.) How do administrators of collaboratively-led LLPs facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

a. How do LLP administrators perceive the impact of the institutional environment on their ability to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

Characteristics of the Sample

Before investigating a response to the research questions for this study, the researcher executed a descriptive analysis of survey participants. Targeted participants asked to complete the questionnaire are LLP coordinators who are either a student affairs staff member, academic staff, or faculty member and whose primary job responsibilities include the coordinated efforts of all or some LLPs at their institution. Based on the data collection, 45 LLP coordinators, each from different institutions, completed the questionnaire. Eighty percent of the participants were from public universities, and twenty percent were employed by private institutions. Tables 1 through 7 on page 121, provides a summary of the characteristics of each participant's affiliated institution. In addition, according to the data on average, the participants who completed the survey served in their role as an LLP coordinator for at least 4.64 years and were also primarily employed by a student affairs unit.

Furthermore, the results revealed that the LLP coordinator position played a critical role in facilitating collaboration between LLP administrators in both units. Of note, an example of the facilitated collaborative efforts orchestrated by LLP coordinators is demonstrated in 93% of coordinators who report that one of their primary job
responsibilities is creating and sustaining interdepartmental partnerships between student affairs and academic LLP administrators. In addition, 88% of LLP coordinators reported that they facilitate LLP partner meetings, and an additional 84% of LLP coordinators reported that their duties include training LLP student affairs staff.

**Collaboration Analysis**

In addition to exploring the characteristics of participants, a preliminary review of data associated with the collaboration construct was necessary prior to completing the data analysis. A review of the *collaboratively-led* construct was vital in responding to the first research question for this study to identify whether or not LLPs were indeed collaboratively led by both units. *Collaboratively – led*, for the purpose of this study, was operationalized in three domains: how often LLP administrators from differing units (a) jointly shared LLP work-related responsibilities, (b) jointly discussed LLP related tasks, and (c) jointly participated in a shared decision-making process. Each survey participant received a score for the degree of collaboration between both units for each collaboratively-led domain. The score was generated based on a one-point value system assigned to each LLP-related task (for a description of calculation, please see chapter 3). Once collaboration scores were calculated for each domain, an additional calculation referred to as the “collaboration composite score” was developed for each participant. The collaboration composite score was the mean of each institution’s domain scores. The collaboration composite score is intended to represent the degree of collaboration between both units at a given institution and across all three collaboratively-led domains.

In total, an institution could receive a maximum collaboration composite score of 36. None of the institutions within the dataset achieved the maximum score for
collaboration. In fact, the highest collaborative composite score received was 29. The mean collaborative composite score was 18 with a standard deviation of 5.28. Please refer to Table 11 for collaborative composite score data by institution.
Table #2

Collaboratively-Led Domain Scores by Institution

(*) marks the institutions with the three highest collaboration composite scores found in the dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postsecondary Institution</th>
<th>Joint responsibilities (15)</th>
<th>Joint Discussion (11)</th>
<th>Joint Decision Making (10)</th>
<th>Collaboration Composite Score (36)</th>
<th>Percentage for degree of collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution J&amp;E*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Q</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Z</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution BB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution CC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1 is a numerical representation of the degree of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs by institution. Institution name is listed in the far left-hand column. Columns two through four represent the degree of collaboration between both units per institution and specific to a collaborative domain. The number listed in parenthesis under the collaborative domain title is the total number of potential collaborative items for each domain placed on the survey. Column five is the mean collaborative composite score for each institution and represents the total degree of collaboration between both units and collaboratively domains combined. Column six is the percentage of the collaborative composite score. At the end of the table, the total score and percentage for all institutions and specific to each collaboratively-led domain listed at the bottom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postsecondary Institution</th>
<th>Joint responsibilities (15)</th>
<th>Joint Discussion (11)</th>
<th>Joint Decision Making (10)</th>
<th>Collaboration Composite Score (36)</th>
<th>Percentage for degree of collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution DD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution EE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution FF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution GG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution HH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution JJ*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution KK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution LL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution OO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Percentages

|                        | 29% | 66% | 42% | 44% |

Table # 3
Composite Collaboration score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase One Findings

The questionnaire administered in the first phase of the study was designed to explore the first research question: Are LLPs that are co-supported by academic affairs and student affairs units collaboratively led by those units? On the survey, respondents were provided an opportunity to select one of the following options: student affairs LLP administrator, academic LLP administrators, or both for LLP-related tasks listed in the (a) shared responsibilities domain. For the LLP related tasks listed under (b) jointly discussed, and (c) jointly shared decision-making domains, participants were given the option to select yes or no.

Findings from the data analysis revealed that the answer to whether or not LLPs are collaboratively-led by both units is yes and no. Based on the data, student affairs and academic affairs LLP Administrators demonstrated a willingness to jointly participate in all three collaborative domains for LLP tasks, except for items that were related to curricular and judicial engagement with LLP students. In fact, what emerged from the data was a clear division in the distribution of efforts between LLP administrators.

For example, 100% of student affairs LLP administrators were reported as being solely responsible for applying judicial sanctions when needed and 86% of academic LLP administrators were responsible for teaching the LLP connected course. Furthermore, a gradual decline in percentages is visible when administrators were asked if LLP coordinators jointly discuss and/or jointly participate in a decision-making process for curricular or judicial LLP related task. For instance, only 8.9% of LLP administrators were reported as sharing responsibilities to teach the LLP connected course, 20% review LLP student conduct issues together as well as academically and socially advise LLP
students, and only 15.6% jointly share responsibility in applying disciplinary sanctions to LLP students when needed. Regarding items listed in the jointly shared decision-making domain, only 10.3% of LLP administrators shared decision-making for LLP academic student sanctions as well as for LLP student judicial sanctions, and another 26.3% shared that they participate in a joint decision-making process for LLP connected course content.

Overall, there were no LLP-related tasks that emerged with equally high percentages in each domain. However, the only item that seemed to receive high collaborative scores in all three domains was LLP co-curricular programming. According to responses, 100% of LLP administrators jointly discussed LLP co-curricular programming, 69.8% shared the responsibility of coordinating/facilitating co-curriculum programming, and 82.5% shared decision-making responsibilities for LLP co-curricular programs.

Institution selection

For the second phase of the study, identifying an institution with on-going collaboratively-led LLPs was important. Through a multi-layered analysis of the collaborative composite score and scores associated for each collaboratively-led domain, three institutions emerged as scoring relatively high in the degree of collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs in the context of working with LLPs. Please see table 2-1 for the collaborative scores of the top three institutions marked by an asterisk.

A descriptive analysis of the criteria listed above revealed that all three institutions were strikingly similar in comparison to each other. For instance, all three institutions were public universities that offered thematic and academic LLPs for undergraduate
students. All three institutions were highly research-driven or doctoral granting schools, and all three exhibited a medium to large-sized undergraduate population. The LLP administrators at the top three institutions were also similar. For example, the LLP coordinators at all three institutions reported that student affairs LLP administrators were 100% responsible for reviewing LLP student conduct issues and applying disciplinary sanctions when needed, and academic LLP administrators were reported as being 100% responsible for teaching the LLP connected course. Furthermore, the role and responsibilities of the LLP coordinators for the top three collaborative institutions were also very similar. One characteristic, in particular, was that all three LLP coordinators were student affairs professionals who were employed by the office of residence life and housing.

Due to the similarities found between all three institutions, in the end, the institution chosen to participate in the second phase of the study demonstrated a willingness to participate in the second phase of this research and had more availability to complete group interviews with the researcher.

**Second Phase findings**

To keep the names of the institution and participants confidential, the researcher provided each with a pseudonym. For the purpose of this study, the institution pseudonym is J&E University. J&E University is home to more than 36 academic and thematic undergraduate LLPs and has an estimated enrollment of 3,500 undergraduate students in the Living Learning Program. According to Inkelas et al. (2008) typology report, the LLPs at J&E University would be described as cluster two LLPs, with at least 100 undergraduate students enrolled in each LLP offered at the institution. An additional
characteristic of a cluster two LLP that is also an appropriate description for LLPs at J&E University is that the LLP demonstrates a moderately collaborative partnership between a student affairs unit and academic affairs administrators.

In addition, a unique structural attribute of the institution is a bifurcated reporting system for Living Learning Programs (LLPs). At J&E University, 17 of the 36 LLPs primarily report to an academic affairs unit, and the other 19 Living Learning Programs report to a unit within student affairs. The primary reporting unit for each set of LLPs functions as the primary coordinating unit. The primary unit is responsible for a significant portion of the LLP operational budget, training for both student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators and acts as the leading architect of collaborative efforts between both units.

This bifurcated structure allowed the researcher an opportunity to compare how collaboration is facilitated between student affairs units and academic affairs LLP administrators who report to two different divisions. In addition, a total of thirteen LLP administrators from J&E University were interviewed during a site visit. Each participant is pseudonym is labeled in the order in which participants were interviewed. Moving forward, the following research questions are used to guide the analysis for the second phase of the study:

2). How do administrators of collaboratively led LLPs facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?
a. How do LLP administrators perceive the impact of the institutional environment on their ability to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

In response to the guiding research questions for the second phase of the study, a theme analysis of group interviews designated the following four emergent factors used by LLP administrators to facilitate collaboration between both units: (a) a mutually-supportive relationship between the institution and Living Learning Programs, (b) collaborative networks, (c) the LLP coordinator position, and (d) mechanisms used for collaboration. In addition, this section will also address additional institutional characteristics that present significant challenges in the ability for administrators to facilitate collaborative efforts.

**Mutually supportive relationship**

“We have a focus on our first-year retention numbers at this institution, and there is institutional buy-in from our Provost of nudging that number with LLPs.”

According to the data analysis, a mutually supportive relationship between LLPs and the institution creates a bilateral commitment from LLP administrators in both units to engage in the facilitation of collaborative efforts. As identified by the participants in the study, a mutually supportive relationship is the Living Learning Program’s ability to advance the mission and strategic plan of the institution thereby generating institutional support from a high-level administrator for LLPs. Institutional support for a high-level administrator can be a significant financial investment for the LLP or a policy created to support the LLP. The first indicator exposing the existence of a co-dependent relationship
between LLPs and the institution emerged through commentary shared by Participant One:

“"We are really fortunate at this point that the institution has really bought in and understands the value of integrating the classroom and the out of classroom experiences.”

Through further investigation, it appears that LLPs at J&E University has a history embedded in the fabric of the university. However, as the needs of prospective and current students changed over time, so did the institution’s attitude toward LLPs. In recent years, J&E University began to explore best practices that would aid the university in increasing retention rates amongst undergraduate students as well as in raising the academic profile of their incoming cohort. Through assessment efforts and scholarly literature, LLPs emerged as a best practice that could assist the institution in achieving one or both of their educational priorities.

According to participants, both LLP reporting structures were classified by high-level administrators as an initiative that could bridge gaps in the curricular and co-curricular undergraduate learning experience while simultaneously addressing one or both educational priorities for the institution. This discovery led to both LLP structures receiving institutional support, which further resulted in greater gains in the program’s ability to serve students as well as collaborate with other on-campus partners. Two LLP Administrators at J&E University validate the reality and benefits of a mutually supportive relationship between LLPs and the institution in their statements provided below:
Participant One: “We demonstrate through current student data and national literature that students who live with us and participate in our LLC’s for two years had higher retention rates and graduation rates, were more engaged in campus activities and resources and were much more likely to realize that faculty were resources. These are all key indicators of success for our students. Because we tell our story as a unit really well and have a VP of Student Affairs, who gets it. So much so that we have moved to having second-year students required to live on campus. That would not be happening if people questioned our value and how we contribute to student success.”

The mutually supportive relationship between the academic affairs operated LLPs, and the institution is also demonstrated through the remarks of Participant Two:

“The driving factor was that we were losing a pocket of students that were academically motivated, achieved a lot but were not a certain profile that would get into a competitive program at our institution, but instead they were getting into similar programs at other institutions. As a result, we were losing students. Now part of the institution's strategic plan is to raise the academic profile of their students and critically engage, challenge and retain those students. So our LLPs are used as a recruitment and retention tool to assist with that.”

To that end, a mutually supportive relationship between LLPs and the institution aids in facilitating collaboration between both units specifically because of the endorsement from a high-level administrator. The awareness of a high-level administrator’s approval seems to create a perception amongst LLP administrators that collaborative efforts between both units are an added value to the institution and the
students enrolled in the program. As a result, LLP administrators seem more committed to supporting the mission and goal of an LLP as well as to their contribution to creating this co-authored educational experience. A glimpse of this perception is seen in a response given by Participant Ten, in which the participant was asked about their motivation to complete the work they do for LLPs?:

“Personally what really stood out to me in my training, is that I was told I have to deliver our promise, what do we promise students, what are we telling them when they signed up for an LLP, what did we promise the institution that we would do for students enrolled in the LLP and with the assistance of my LLP Partner, are we executing that.”

**Collaborative networks**

“We have the support from the institution that gives us funding and gives us the attention that we need so that we can access our academic partners, which leads to a pretty good understanding from our partners on how we can collaborate.”

Scholarly literature often labels hierarchical structures and power differentials as one of the leading causes of failed cross-collaborative efforts between student affairs units and academic affairs. However, according to participants in the second phase of the study, collaborative networks between LLP Administrators in both reporting structures are beneficial to the creation and implementation of an LLP. Furthermore, these collaborative networks also negate any adverse influences of existing hierarchical structures.
Collaborative networks is not a concept that is new to the literature on facilitating collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. Kezar (2005) uses the term “networks” to describe a set of ongoing relationships designed to achieve and support a particular goal. According to Kezar (2005), networks between academic affairs and student affairs units can operationalize in varying forms and with differing functions. At J&E University, collaborative networks center around ongoing relationships between an LLP coordinator in the primary reporting unit and an on-campus partner invited to support the mission of an LLP. Based on participant responses, collaborative networks are also beneficial, through practice and implementation, in integrating existing hierarchal structures between two or more units.

For instance, the student affairs-operated LLPs are described by participants as a retention initiative specifically for first and second-year students who live in on-campus residential facilities. As a result, the collaborative network for the student affairs-operated LLPs demonstrates a commitment to negotiating and identifying additional academic support services that can be offered in the residence hall. An ongoing elaborate three-part collaborative networking model is designed by the primary reporting unit to help identify specific partners and develop a co-authored curricular and co-curricular LLP experience for undergraduate students throughout the year.

The first level of collaborative networking within the student affairs-operated LLPs is composed by the unit’s associate director and is in collaboration with the associate deans, dean, faculty, and academic staff of a supporting college. In this level, the primary function of the collaborative network is the creation of a memorandum of understanding that outlines the learning outcomes for the LLP, the financial contributions
from both units towards the LLP, the designation of staff time, and the expectations and additional resources from both units. The description of this networking level is discussed by Participant One, who explains the role of the associate director and academic partners at this level:

“So the Associate Director role does a lot of work with our academic deans or associate deans, from that bigger picture perspective, so if we are having to negotiate memorandums of understanding, if we are launching new programs, the associate director kind of shepherds that process along. Once we get to the more day to day operations of a program that is typically when the Assistant Director steps in to manage that.”

The second networking level is coordinated by the assistant directors of the primary unit in collaboration with campus partners. At J&E University, there are five assistant directors within the student affairs-operated LLPs. Each assistant director facilitates marketing and recruitment efforts for the program, LLP partner meetings, training for both student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators. Additionally, the assistant direct connects faculty to LLP programming events as needed. Participant Three describes the networking relationship between an assistant director and the campus community in their comment transcribed below:

“Assistant Directors are assigned a certain number of LLPs and act as a liaison and the coach. They are the lynch to catch if something is not working right, they deal with programming, day to day partner relationships, bringing in resources for LLPs, marketing, recruitment and LLP student counsels.”
The third collaborative network is between the resident hall director and the academic LLP administrator. Resident directors are master’s level professionals—typically recent graduates—who supervise resident advisors (undergraduate student staff) and address and support the day-to-day needs of students who live in residence halls. The LLP partners, however, are faculty or academic staff who work for an academic unit on campus. At J&E University, the LLP academic administrator for the student affairs-operated LLPs is often an academic advisor. Academic advisors tend to be a natural fit because they obtain the institutional knowledge needed to make academic and career connections for LLP students. In the remarks below, provided by participant one, the collaborative relationship between the hall director and LLP Partner is explained as:

“The typical role of our partner is to partner with our hall directors to figure out what that student experience is going to look like for the year and that is co-authored. We have really strong staff who are experts in building community and their generalist and can support students in lots of different ways. However, they are not sitting in academic units thinking about what a student might be experiencing in their coursework or what are the supplemental experiences that are going to be really impactful, like do they need to get internships or study abroad or how do you get them connected with alumni. All of that our academic partners are responsible for, and it is a strength of theirs because they are situated in that discipline.”

**Collaborative Networks for Academic affairs LLPs.**

The collaborative networks for academic affairs-managed LLPs look slightly different from the networks of their student affairs counterparts. For instance, participant two stated:
“Because it is a program used to recruit and retain a specific type of student, with a different academic profile, the activity is different, and the attitude to work with our students is different, and the focus is on providing a seamless integration of the residential and classroom experience.”

Due to the programs focus to enhance the curricular experience, the LLP academic partner for the academic affairs operated LLPs are tenured faculty or professional degree holding partners. Their responsibilities include teaching any connected courses as well as facilitating co-curricular programs that complement the classroom experience. Participant Three explained in their comment below how the LLP academic administrators for their LLPs complete other duties to support the mission of the LLP:

“There are some of our partners also have a collateral assignment with the college in which they work for. Sometimes the LLP academic partner is also assigned to recruit for the college or complete first and second year advising.”

The student affairs LLP administrators for the academic affairs-operated LLPs are also different when compared to the student affairs administrators of their counterparts. Participants in the second phase of the study identified student affairs LLP administrators as full-time professionals in enrollment management, the housing assignments office, the office of residence life, or the office of student involvement. Overall, collaborative networks are instrumental in assisting administrators in disrupting stereotypical behaviors such as bureaucratic processes and siloed units.
qualities that are often identified in the literature as detrimental to cross-unit collaborations in university settings. Instead, collaborative networks empower administrators to formulate ongoing relationships that foster collegial environments conducive to collaboration.

**The LLP coordinator position**

“The reality of our work is that we are all so busy if we just organically rely on the collaborative relationship to happen; it just won’t happen.”

Through the data, two specific types of LLP coordinator positions were identified as essential to facilitating collaboration between administrators in academic affairs and student affairs units. The two LLP coordinator positions are the assistant director and associate director positions for each LLP reporting structure. Identifying types of LLP coordinators was not an option on the questionnaire provided in the first phase of the study. As a result, this finding is extremely valuable in selecting key personnel and the characteristics needed to facilitate collegial environments between LLP administrators in both units.

As mentioned in the collaborative networks discussion, assistant directors for both LLP reporting structures are described as full-time professional staff who maintain the ongoing collaborative networks for LLPs. Based on participant responses, assistant directors provided suggestions for added resources to an LLP and worked through any conflict as a result of differing opinions or hierarchal structures. In addition, when needed, assistant directors for the student affairs-operated LLPs coordinate LLP academic partner meetings once a month.
Participant Ten mentions the assistant director role when asked if they felt supported in their role as an LLP administrator: “I feel supported by our assistant director; they are someone to bounce ideas off of and sits in on meetings for extra support.” Participant Eleven remarked, “I feel supported by the assistant director because they kind of know the academic side and the residence life side. It is nice to have an extra layer of support.” Last but not least, Participant Eight stated, “We have a faculty member at our programs at least once a month because of our Assistant Director.” Overall, assistant directors appear to be an integral team member for Living Learning Programs at J&E University. Their direct engagement with LLP administrators from both units, as well as other members of the campus community, aid administrators in sustaining the facilitation of collaborative efforts between student affairs units and academic affairs throughout the academic year.

On the other hand, the associate director position was also presented through participant commentary as one of the most critical LLP coordinator roles in both LLP reporting structures. Based on participant responses, the attitude, personality, professional background, and even the educational philosophy of associate directors appears to guide the selection of collaborative networks for the LLPs they coordinate. For example, Participant Seven described the associate director role as:

“The Associate Directors’ primary role is providing leadership for the academic initiatives team. That is inclusive of five full-time professionals who are really focused on the day to day operations of the program and the academic success of students in the residence hall.”
An additional description of the associate director role as a visionary leader is also mentioned by Participant Three, who stated:

“The Associate Director sets the tone for big-picture expectations for what the learning communities or what that experience looks like for our students. Making sure that there is consistency across the different communities. So ensuring that we are delivering on some baseline learning outcomes.”

Through further investigation, professional attributes of the associate director role emerged through the remarks of participants in the second phase of the study. According to Participant One, associate directors need to possess an ability to navigate through the intricate nuances of facilitating collaboration between a student affairs unit and academic affairs:

“So the role of the associate director is a lot of translation. So reading a situation, doing some investigation to get at the heart at what might be going on with the dynamic and then trying to work with a team to help them get that perspective and vice versa. The ability to find the win-win. So kind of identifying where there are shared goals, how do we leverage the expertise that we bring, but also realize that there are huge contributions our partners can make and we really can’t embark on this work without them.”

Based on previous discussions of emerging themes found with the data, the ability to navigate the cultural differences within both units appears to be an essential skill set for
administrators interested in facilitating collaborative efforts between both units.

According to Participant Three, that skill set is perhaps obtained through prior work-related experiences:

““The associate director for the student affairs operated LLPs came up through a pretty traditional student affairs path in which they did their graduate work in higher education administration and worked in a department of housing and then made the transition in working for a college of engineering. Doing some living-learning work with them and some cultivation of pipelines for women in STEM fields. I think having had that experience, the associate director has an appreciation for the work that LLP academic affairs partners do, in addition to being aware of some of the unique barriers that academic partners have, and student affairs professionals are fortunate enough not to face.”

Participant Two stated:

The associate director for the academic affairs LLPs “worked for three years as an hall director. That is where they found their passion for working with living-learning communities” Overall due to the previous worked related experience the Associate Director for the academic affairs LLPs, strongly believes that we are just doing student affairs work in an academic affairs center.”

Through past professional experiences, both associate directors see value in the contributions of LLP administrators from both units. As a result, the associate director for
the student affairs-operated LLPs made an executive decision to no longer launch LLPs that do not have an academic partner.

“My favored relationship is to always have an academic partner because I really believe strongly that there is expertise and content that an academic partner can help bring that we can’t. I think there is something to be said to provide our students with access to academic staff and faculty, who come from the discipline and help round out that experience.”

Overall, the LLP coordinator position appears to be a tremendous asset to the institution by establishing, implementing and maintaining these collaborative partnerships between student affairs units and academic affairs within the context of LLPs. Based on participant response, much time, effort, and skillset are necessary for LLP coordinator to facilitate collaboration between both units.

**Mechanisms for collaboration**

“It helps when both parties have an understanding of basic lines of communication.”

An unexpected but fortunate consequence of the data analysis was the identification of mechanisms used by LLP coordinators to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. This addition takes the data beyond the perceptions of LLP administrators and provides tangible mechanisms used to achieve facilitation of collaboration between both units. In response to the question “What are some challenges you may face as LLP administrator to collaborate with other units?”
Participant Nine provided a comment that illustrated the need for mechanisms used between LLP academic affairs and student affairs administrators:”

“I think ultimately at the end of the day we want the same goals as our partners. To create a meaningful student experience. However, the ways that we want to go about achieving these goals can be different in our priorities and how we strategize to achieve that end goal.”

Through remarks provided by participants in the second phase of the study, five key mechanisms were identified as a best practice for the facilitation of collaboration between both units and in the context of working with LLPs. The mechanisms for collaboration are memorandums of understanding, role clarity documents, vision planning meetings, shared facility space, partial meal plans, and LLP partner meetings.

**Memorandums of Understanding.**

The associate directors for both the academic affairs and student affairs-operated LLPs consistently referred to the use of memorandums of understanding when discussing the initial implementation of a partnership between student affairs units and academic affairs in support of an LLP. Based on participant responses, memorandums of understanding are used to outline the negotiation of financial and staffing resources from both units towards the LLP. A memorandum of understanding can be as detailed as necessary and include items such as hours spent towards an LLP by designated staff, the job description of assigned staff, the type of resources a partner is expected to contribute to an LLP, or the specific dollar amount provided by each unit towards the LLP, in addition to how monetary contributions should be allocated.
Within both LLP structures, memorandums of understanding are jointly developed by the associate directors of both LLP programs and the dean or associate deans of the academic college supporting the LLP. Based on participant responses, both LLP structures experienced one notable challenge with the memorandums: once created, partners rarely revised or updated the memorandum throughout the LLP’s existence. Participant Twelve states:

“One year we had 15 students and a couple of thousand dollars dedicated towards the LLP student experience, the following year we increased our student enrollment to 40 students but did not increase the budget. Programming was a little harder that year.”

**Role Clarity documents.**

Role clarity documents are shared with student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators in the student affairs-operated LLPs. Typically a role clarity document is used when onboarding resident directors and academic LLP administrators. LLP administrators may need a role clarity document for a variety of different reasons. For instance, Participant Nine states that the role clarity document was helpful for them because:

“I never heard of a Living Learning community before I came, I got my job as an advisor, and I just landed in the role because my predecessor took on other roles.”

Through role clarity documents, LLP coordinators outline the expectations related to the day-to-day operations for LLP administrators in both units. According to
participants, the document can in many ways resemble information placed in the memorandum of understanding but with fewer details. Participant Eight mentions how helpful the role clarity document was for them

“I think because every community is different and is kind of very specific to the community, identifying what the roles are and who’s doing what or who is responsible for what is important. I don’t want to step on anyone's toes and need to know where I fit in.”

**Vision planning meetings.**

Vision planning meetings are a mechanism specifically used by student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators who work with the student affairs-operated LLPs. Vision planning meetings are beneficial to administrators from both units specifically in helping to create a curriculum for the LLP student experience throughout the academic year. Typically, vision planning meetings are scheduled to take place during the summer when students are not in the residence halls and prior to the start of the next academic year. Although the meeting is scheduled to happen in the summer, the content produced in the meeting is expected to be useful in the fall and spring semester. As a result, the curriculum is intentionally designed to be flexible and can be revised by administrators from both units throughout the academic year. Participant One describes their reasoning in using vision planning meetings as:

“By August 1st we need a roadmap for the year. Hall Directors and LLP Partners are dealing with student crises through the year and a lot of other challenges, so developing a co-authored plan is helpful before other
important details of the year begin and need some, if not all of our partner's attention. However, the curriculum is flexible, but we want to at least start with the baseline plan.”

According to participants, LLP administrators are instructed to develop the following during their vision planning meetings: a welcome event to take place once the students arrive on campus, an LLP orientation event, two programmatic requirements every month, a monthly communication plan to LLP students throughout the year, and a capstone event for students to complete at the end of the academic year to help make meaning of the LLP experience. Participant Eight shared their assessment of the vision planning after meeting with their LLP partner:

“This is the first institution where I have worked at, where LLP curriculum is created between the hall director and academic partner and it is very robust. A lot of resources and hours go into it.”

Shared facility space.

For both the student affairs-operated LLPs and the academic affairs LLPs, shared facility space was a benefit to both the community and the LLP academic partner. Although residential, classroom and programmatic space is limited on campus, LLPs were intentionally placed, when possible, in residence halls that provide sizeable programmatic space or even flexible office space. These identified shared facility spaces are an opportunity for LLP administrators to present curricular and co-curricular services to students in the residence halls. Participant Three discussed the intentionality behind deciding to find shared facility spaces for LLPs whenever possible:
“When possible we place our learning communities in a residence hall that has a flex office and allows our academic partners an ability to hold private office hours with LLP students if needed. Also, large programmatic space is helpful. The challenge, however, is when those spaces are not available, and you have to attempt to build community outside of the location that the LLP is housed in.”

Participant Nine further mentions the value of using a shared facility space:

“Once a week I come into the residence hall and do drop-in advising hours so that students do not have to make an appointment, they just stop by.”

**Partial meal plans.**

Partial meal plans were specifically used as an incentive to help foster collaborative relationships between LLP administrators who work with the student affairs-operated LLPs. Students at J&E University are required to obtain a meal plan as an undergraduate student that lives on campus, and resident directors receive a meal plan as a condition of their employment. As a result, partial meal plans are only given to the academic administrators who support the LLP. Although this is a small stipend, having the meal plan allowed academic LLP administrators to engage in opportunities to build community with students and staff in an informal setting. Participant Three stated:

“Our partners are given a very small meal plan. Fifteen meals per semester so that they can meet with students or hall directors over lunch if needed.”
LLP partner meetings.

LLP Partner meetings is a mechanism that takes place monthly with the assistant directors of the student affairs-operated LLPs and all of their academic LLP administrators. Below, Participant Three shares their thoughts on the purpose of LLP Partner meetings:

“Partner meetings are where we bring all of our LLP academic partners, together and share best practices, some important details that impact the program like the recruitment cycle, the admissions process, and the logistics that they need to be in the loop on.”

Based on participant responses, the value of LLP Partners is not only to disseminate valuable information to members of their collaborative networks, but it is also an opportunity to continue to foster a collegial environment throughout the year.

Overall, each mechanism aids LLP administrators in facilitating collaboration by providing specific platforms and structures that strongly encourage administrators to collaborate throughout the academic year. This finding is significant to administrators who are interested in facilitating collaboration between both units and are unsure which strategies can be used to begin to foster collegial environments.

Challenges and Characteristics of the Institutional Environment

As mentioned in prior sections of the data analysis, institutional buy-in from high-level administrators played a significant role in an LLP administrator’s ability to facilitate collaboration between both units. However, additional findings suggest that there are institutional characteristics that present considerable obstacles to an administrator’s ability
to foster a collegial environment amongst LLP administrators in both units. For instance, although high-level administrators at J&E University see LLPs as a high-impact practice, some of the academic LLP administrators who are part of the collaborative network used to co-author the LLP student experience are faced with unfortunate time constraints due to a newly-implemented work labor law.

In recent years, the Department of Labor made changes to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), which placed higher education administrators in the position to reclassify positions and determine which occupations employed by the institution are eligible for overtime payments (Honorée & Wyld, 2005). Under the new regulations, employees above or below a specific level of financial compensation were categorized as non-exempt (entitled to overtime compensation) or exempt (ineligible for overtime compensation).

At J&E University, administrators determined that academic advisors are to be considered as non-exempt employees and eligible for overtime payments. However, according to the law, it is the institution’s choice to govern the law how they see fit. For example, administrators can choose to increase the salary of non-exempt staff to a salary that would move an employee to exempt status, or the institution could leave an employee at non-exempt status but then limit the number of opportunities for a non-exempt employee to receive overtime.

At J&E University, the decision to leave academic advisors at non-exempt status but limit their hours diminished the value that academic advisors contribute to the LLP student experience and placed advisors under significant time constraints, limiting their ability to serve as the academic partner with LLPs. More specifically, this presents a
substantial disadvantage for the student affairs-operated LLPs, who disclosed during group interviews that at least 80% of their LLP academic partners are advisors.

“A challenge is staff time and some of our advisors having to go hourly due to changes in the law. A lot of our academic LLP partners are advisors are now hourly, and now our advisors have to figure out how they're managing their time in the evenings or during the day.”

Another institutional environmental characteristic that at times presented challenges for administrators to facilitate collaboration between students affairs units and academic affairs is identified as conflicting and competing priorities for both units.

“The priorities of a college unit can change pretty quickly, and it's not always the staff member who is that position, it could be the person who is supervising them that can change the expectations, sometimes the change can cause the program to move from being very student-centered to being much more focused on the graduate studies or clinical and straight focused.”

As a result, the ability to provide consistency amongst LLPs can be challenging for LLP administrators to accomplish. According to participants, facilitation of collaboration needs to be fluid and able to change depending on the priorities of their partners.

Summary

In summary, through the data LLPs are collaboratively led by student affairs units and academic affairs through co-curricular programming and other LLP related tasks. However, there is a clear divide in responsibilities when addressing the curricular and
judicial engagement of LLP students. According to the data, classroom content and responsibilities for LLPs are mainly coordinated by academic affairs and the judicial aspects of an LLP are specifically coordinated by student affairs units. In addition, LLP administrators actively facilitate collaboration between both units using four emergent factors; a) a mutually-supportive relationships between the institution and Living Learning Programs, (b) collaborative networks, (c) the LLP coordinator position, and (d) mechanisms used for collaboration. Coincidently, all findings from the study have connections to previous literature on student affairs and academic affairs collaboration, as well as LLPs. In chapter 5, the researcher will draw connections between the findings of the study and past and current literature.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study was to explore how administrators facilitate collaboration between academic affairs and students affairs units in the context of LLPs. The research questions used to guide this inquiry were as follows: (1) Are LLPs which are co-supported by academic affairs and student affairs units collaboratively led by those units? (2) How do administrators of collaboratively-led LLPs facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs? (3) Moreover, how do LLP administrators perceive the impact of the institutional environment on their ability to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs?

Due to the study’s intent to explore the facilitation of collaborative efforts between both units, it was essential to operationalize the collaboratively-led construct discussed throughout this study. For the purpose of this research, collaboratively-led was operationalized in three domains: how often LLP administrators from differing units (a) jointly share LLP work-related responsibilities, (b) jointly discuss LLP-related tasks, and (c) jointly participate in a shared decision-making process. All three domains are terms that readily identify with the shared governance and collaborative leadership theoretical frameworks, which are both theories both used to analyze the data in this study.

The methodological approach used throughout this research was a mixed-method analysis designed to solicit quantitative data in support of identifying whether or not LLPs are collaboratively led by both units. The quantitative data was later integrated with qualitative analysis designed to generate emerging themes for how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between both units. The survey used in the first phase of the study
was available for participants from June 27, 2017, to July 31, 2017. Results from the quantitative data analysis provided a full dataset of 45 LLP coordinators who were also representative of 45 institutions. Data from the survey was analyzed via standard statistical measures (descriptive statistics), and the data revealed that the answer to whether LLPs are collaboratively led by student affairs units and academic affairs is both yes and no.

According to the data, student affairs and academic affairs LLP administrators demonstrated a willingness to jointly share responsibilities and jointly discuss all elements of the LLP except for when the items were related to curricular or judicial aspects of the program. Instead, what was visible in the data was a transparent distribution of efforts between LLP administrators’ related judicial and curricular items. For example, 8.9% of LLP coordinators reported that LLP Administrators from both units share responsibilities to teach the LLP connected course, 20% review LLP student conduct issues together and academically and socially advise LLP students, and 15.6% jointly share responsibility in applying disciplinary sanctions to LLP students when needed. Regarding items listed in the jointly shared decision-making domain, 10.3% of LLP administrators shared decision making for LLP academic student sanctions and for LLP student judicial sanctions, and another 26.3% shared that they participate in a joint decision-making process for LLP connected course content.

Further investigation of the data revealed that academic LLP Administrators were 100% responsible for curricular aspects of the program and student affairs administrators were 100% responsible for the judicial tasks related to the LLP. The only item that appeared to receive high collaborative scores in all three collaboratively-led domains was LLP co-curricular programming. According to the data, 69.8% of LLP administrators
shared the responsibility of coordinating/facilitating co-curriculum programming, 100% jointly discussed LLP co-curricular programming, and 82.5% shared decision-making responsibilities for LLP co-curricular programs.

Ultimately, the quantitative data analysis for this study led the researcher to a four-year public institution with high collaboratively-led scores in all three domains. The selected institution for the second phase of the study is home to more than 36 academic and thematic undergraduate LLPs and has an estimated enrollment of 3,500 undergraduate students in the LLPs. The selected institution was unique in that a bifurcated LLP reporting system was present at the university. At J&E University, 17 of the 36 LLPs primarily report to an academic affairs unit, and the other 19 Living Learning Programs report to a unit within student affairs. A theme analysis of group interviews collected during a site visit in September 2017 designated four emerging themes used by administrators to facilitate collaboration between both units. The emergent factors for how administrators at J&E University facilitate collaboration between both units were as follows: (a) learning outcomes and institutional support, (b) an LLP coordinator, (c) collaborative networks, and (d) mechanisms for collaboration used by the LLP coordinator.

**Contribution to the Literature**

Based on literature (Astin and Astin, 2000; Kezar, 2005; Schoem, 2004), results from this study further confirm a salient connection between LLP assessment efforts and the institution's strategic plan. As described in the data analysis, LLP assessment efforts at J&E University demonstrated a connection to the advancement of educational priorities found in the strategic plan of the university. In return, both LLP reporting structures
received institutional support from high-level administrators in the form of financial investments or supporting policies and procedures. This finding materialized into a mutually supportive relationship between LLPs and the institution. According to the data, a mutually supportive relationship between the institution and LLPs helps cultivate a perception amongst LLP administrators that the collaborative efforts between both units are valuable to the institution and the students enrolled in the program.

Consequently, the ideology of a mutually supportive relationship contributing to the facilitation of a collaborative effort between student affairs units and academic affairs is a concept that can easily connect with various tenants found in the collaborative leadership and shared governance framework. According to Astin and Astin (2000), institutional support for a collaborative initiative between student affairs units and academic affairs engenders a belief that the end goal or shared purpose is meaningful or valuable work for the institution. This belief then has the potential to become a cultural foundation for developing a shared purpose and collaborative vision between student affairs units and academic affairs (Astin and Astin, 2000). Principles found within the shared governance theoretical framework espouse that an essential factor in ensuring efficiency and effectiveness of collaborative efforts is the endorsement of high-level administrators. Scott and Caress (2005) state the importance of a collaborative initiative being both “practitioner owned and institutionally supported” (pg.4) Both qualities ensure a necessary change in climate and culture.
Additionally, scholarly literature (Kezar, 2005; Schoem, 2004; Whitt et al., 2008) recommends that collaborative student success initiatives should always attempt to link assessment efforts to the strategic plan and mission of the institution. According to Schoem (2004) and Kezar (2008), connecting assessment efforts to the strategic plan of the institution would assist collaborative initiatives in receiving support from high-level administrators, all ideas that emerged through the findings of this study.

**Collaborative Networks**

Results from this study also substantiate the assumption that LLPs require a significant investment of time, support, resources, and monetary contributions from multiple units on campus (Astin and Astin, 2000; Schoem, 2004). As demonstrated in the qualitative analysis, the LLP student experience for each LLP reporting structure was highly dependent on the ongoing relationships between the LLP coordinator on campus partners throughout the academic year. For the student affairs-operated LLPs, an elaborate three-part collaborative networking model was implemented to engage varying levels of LLP administrators and bring academic support services into the residence hall. On the other hand, the academic affairs-operated LLPs were used as a recruitment and retention initiative designed to increase the academic profile of incoming students. As a result, the collaborative networks for the academic affairs-operated LLPs were on-campus partners, whom they believed would elevate the curricular and co-curricular components of the LLP student experience.
Furthermore, the collaborative networks variable unveiled in the results of this study validates previous literature on the use of “networks” in postsecondary student success initiatives. Kezar (2005) describes “networks” in higher education as a set of ongoing relationships used to achieve a particular goal. A potential benefit of effective “networks” is a reduction in the potentially negative impact of hierarchical structures and power differentials on collaboration. Ironically, challenges consistently mentioned by LLP administrators in the qualitative phase of the study are inconsistencies, and conflicting priorities of the partnering units found within the collaborative networks. According to participants, LLP administrators are often influenced by a shift in priorities for their employing unit. Unfortunately, the result of shifting priorities is an inability to provide a quality and consistent educational experience for students enrolled in the LLP.

Coincidently, this serves as a prime example of how the application of the shared governance theory can be helpful, professional development for practitioners asked to facilitate collaboration between different units. According to shared governance, enthusiast conflict is inevitable, and administrators should be prepared to deal with the conflict between units resulting from scarce resources, cultural shifts, and hierarchal differences (Magolda, 2007; Tineray, 2004). More specifically, Scott and Caress (2005) state that “Shared governance is an ongoing and fluid process, requiring continual assessment and re-evaluation to be flexible and responsive to an ever-changing environment” (pg. 4).

In response to dealing with conflict in collaboration, Magolda (2005) encourages administrators to seek and implement strategies that aid practitioners in engaging stakeholders through discussions that negotiate meaningful experiences, acknowledge
cultural differences, and deal with discomfort and conflict. Fortuitously, the data analysis for this research study may have stumbled on mechanisms for collaboration that practitioners can use to aid in addressing potential setbacks and frustration in collaborative partnerships.

**LLP coordinators**

An assumption discovered through the literature review for Living Learning Programs is the idea that cross-collaboration between LLP administrators in student affairs units and academic affairs can organically cultivate with like-minded individuals or groups who strive to achieve the same goal (Magolda, 2005). Although a “shared purpose” is identified in the literature as a necessity for successful collaborations, results from this study suggest that an LLP coordinator, whose primary job responsibilities include establishing partnerships and facilitating collaborative efforts between both units, is helpful when attempting to facilitate collaboration between both units.

After further investigation, two types of LLP coordinators emerged from the data analysis: the associate director and an assistant director. Results disclosed that 93% of LLP coordinators in the dataset create and sustain interdepartmental partnerships between student affairs and academic LLP administrators, and 88% of LLP coordinators facilitate LLP partner meetings. The questionnaire administered in the first phase of the study did not provide an option to identify types of LLP coordinators; instead, this identification was a pleasant discovery and contribution to the literature. In addition, there is limited representation of an LLP coordinator position in the literature review for LLPs.
An example of the closest representation found in the literature on LLP coordinators is seen in Schoem (2004). According to Schoem (2004), running a living learning program is equivalent to running a small college. As a result, the facilitation of a living-learning program needs a primary director. Characteristics of a director as described by Schoem (2004) require someone who can “gain the confidence of academic or student affairs administrators and are less likely to become frustrated by challenges of boundary crossing and budgetary instability and thus are better able to sustain and lead their programs” (pg. 149).

Coincidently, results from this study identified a few specific job responsibilities and characteristics of an LLP coordinator, that institutions might want to consider when developing administrative support roles for their LLPs. For instance, 88.9% of LLP coordinators within this study reported that marketing for LLPs and facilitating LLP partner meetings was one of their primary job responsibilities. In addition, 84.4% train resident directors and hall directors, 80% evaluate the LLP administrator partnership, and 93% create and sustain LLP administrator partnerships.

Furthermore, the study uncovered potential prerequisites in the professional background and educational philosophy for prospective candidates hired to fill an LLP coordinator position. For example, the associate director for the student affairs-operated LLPs and the associate director for the academic affairs-operated LLPs both mentioned prior work-related experience in the unit with which they are currently expected to partner. Based on participant responses, previous professional experience in the differing unit was an insightful experience that presently aids both coordinators’ understanding of the
nuances of the units they intend to partner with as well their obtaining a true sense of appreciation for the contribution made by partners from differing units.

Overall, the discovery of the LLP coordinator position confirms that the contemporary organizational structure of living learning programs still meets some of the foundational tenets described in the shared governance theoretical framework. The creation of the LLP coordinator position assists in maximizing significant involvement from stakeholders by building trust between both units, protecting divergent views, and identifying shared goals, all factors that uniquely align with tenets found in Veneable and Gardner’s (1988) model of shared governance. According to Veneable and Gardner (1988), the higher the perceptions of trust and protection of views between both units, the higher the levels of collaboration and the more successful the pursuit of common goals and accomplishments between groups (Gardiner, 2006; Gardiner, 2009).

Mechanisms used by LLP coordinators.

Another finding that can be considered a major contribution to the research and literature on LLPs is the identification of mechanisms used by LLP coordinators to facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. Currently, there is little to no literature that outlines specific strategies for LLP coordinators that can aid in facilitating collaborative efforts between two or more units in the context of LLPs. Although the list of mechanisms provided in this study is not exhaustive, the limited mechanisms provided are potentially beneficial in assisting practitioners in moving beyond theory and into practice.
The five key collaborative mechanisms that emerged as potential best practices for LLP coordinators are memorandums of understanding, role clarity documents, vision planning meetings, shared facility space, partial meal plans, and LLP partner meetings. Each mechanism can play a significant role in preparing for and responding to shifting priorities, conflict, and facilitation of collaborative efforts, through principles found in collaborative leadership and/or shared governance frameworks.

For instance, memorandums of understanding, role clarity documents, and vision planning meetings are all mechanisms that, if facilitated correctly, can foster a climate of trust, develop a communicative plan of information sharing, and outline and prepare for meaningful participation as well as engender collective decision-making between LLP administrators from both units. Coincidently, four of the six distinct characteristics used to describe the potential outcomes of these strategies perfectly align with the principles found in Gardiner’s (2006) model of shared governance. Shared facility space and partial meal plans are also collaborative mechanisms that perfectly align with Astin and Astin’s (2000), discussion of collaborative leadership. According to Astin and Astin (2000), cultivating a successful collaborative relationship must take place in an environment and/or space conducive to collaboration. Both the mechanisms of shared facility space and partial meal plans remove the unwelcoming stigma and territorialism by inviting partners into a space that they typically would not occupy.

Overall, the existing literature on LLPs provides a robust account of the LLP student experience and the benefits of student participation and learning. However, this study permitted an investigation of student affairs units and academic affairs collaborations within the context of LLPs. With the assistance of concepts found
throughout the shared governance theoretical framework and the collaborative leadership theory, this study helps to fill in the gaps found within the literature and provides insightful reflection on how collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs is facilitated in Living Learning Program environments.

**Limitations of the study**

It is important to acknowledge the potential limitations of the study that have influential implications on the collection, outcomes, and generalizability of the study’s results. For instance, only members listed in the ACUHO-I membership directory were asked to participate in the research study. As such, the sample for both the quantative and qualitative phases of the study is too small to permit generalizations to the larger discussion of student affairs units and academic affair collaborations in the context of LLPs. In addition, participant selection introduced the potential for self-selection bias as a possible limitation of the present study.

Furthermore, this study was operationalized through a constructivist approach to knowledge. This approach means the researcher believes that the findings of this study are co-constructed through the experience, thoughts, and perceptions of the participants and the researcher. As a result, the findings of the study are limited to the ideas and experiences of a small group and are not reflective of additional experiences of participants who were unable to contribute to the survey or the second phase of this research.

Lastly, the terminology used throughout the study was a disadvantage in the potential generalizability of the study results. Living Learning Programs is an umbrella
terminology that covers a significant variation of residential education programs (Laufgraben & Shapiro, 2004). Inkelas et al. (2008) identified 17 different variations of LLPs in their typology study. Due to multiple variations in LLP program names, structures, and terminology used to describe affiliated administrators and LLP related tasks, inconsistent labeling can confuse survey participants and the researcher during efforts to respond, collect, and report recognizable data.

**Opportunities for further research**

There are several promising themes that emerge from this study as opportunities for future research on the collaborative efforts of student affairs units and academic affairs in LLPs. In addition, utilizing shared governance and the collaborative leadership as a theoretical framework for future research may lead to more fruitful discussions as demonstrated in this research study. Tierney (2004) also discussed the idea of facilitating research that investigates the relational aspects or communication efforts of shared governance versus the structural elements of shared governance. Commonly seen throughout the shared governance literature are studies that highlight the organizational structure and topics used to facilitate shared governance between multiple groups.

One potential consideration for future research would be to investigate the involvement of academic advisors in the role of an LLP academic partner for living learning programs. According to the results of this study, nearly 80% of the LLP academic partners for the student affairs-operated LLPs were academic advisors. Tierney (2004) discussed the growing population of academic non tenured track positions in higher education and the need to represent the voices of academic staff throughout the literature. Future research exploring the facilitation of shared governance between
academic staff or advisors and student affairs units within the context of LLPs may prove to be a beneficial contribution to the literature as the number of academic advisors and/or non tenured academic staff who work with Living Learning Programs potentially increases.

Another potential research study is the exploration of LLP coordinators, more specifically the associate directors of a Living learning program. Due to the critical role that this position holds in facilitating collaboration between both units, research exploring the organizational location of the position, the characteristics and credentials necessary for a successful collaborative leader, and the career trajectory for collaborative leaders would be insightful for administrators who choose to pursue career paths that focus on collaborative partnerships in postsecondary environments and LLPs.

**Implications for Practice and Conclusion**

Inkelas (2008) suggests that most practitioners at postsecondary institutions struggle with selecting a structure for LLPs on their campus that supports the needs of their students and advances the mission of the institution. Perhaps the lack of confidence identified by Inkelas (2008) can be explained with what Jackson and Ebbers (1999) identified as a lack of training. According to Jackson and Ebbers (1999), the divide between student affairs units and academic affairs exists for several reasons: "(a) very little training in academic and student affairs collaboration is offered in graduate or postgraduate work, (b) very little substantive literature is available, and (c) it is unclear how to achieve this goal of collaboration. In many cases, the available personnel and resources on campus are not sufficient to deal with this situation" (Jackson & Ebbers, 1999, p. 380).
As a result, the ideas presented in this research study should not be seen as a solution, but rather as an extension to previous and current conversations in higher education on the need for cross-collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs on student success initiatives and specifically within the context of LLPs. According to the literature review and the results of this study that is definitely still work that needs to be done. Furthermore, the ideas shared throughout this study may aid practitioners in acquiring an understanding of the nuances found in facilitating collaboratively-led LLPs, shorten the gap between the theoretical values of cross-collaboration versus implementation, and overall aid LLP administrators in facilitating collaborative efforts between both units. As such, the application of collaborative leadership and the shared governance theoretical framework may lead to greater gains in maximizing outcomes of student learning in collaboratively-led LLPs.

**Collaborative Networks: Who are we missing?**

With further exploration of the results for this study, findings reveal implications for how LLP administrators should facilitate collaboration between both units moving forward. For instance, a practitioner may review the data analysis of this study and wonder who is not represented throughout the data and the reasons for that absence. The data analysis of this study depicts academic advisors as one of the primary academic partners for most LLPs. However, consistently mentioned in the literature, LLPs are designed to create a seamless integration of a curricular and co-curricular environment through experiences with students and faculty both in and out of classroom.

Although results from this study highlight the benefits of having academic advisors as an LLP academic partner, literature highlights the benefits of faculty as primary LLP
academic partners. Based on the results of this study, it appears that the evolution of Living Learning Programs over time is inclusive of a culture shift in which the LLP academic partner may no longer be faculty but instead academic advisors or staff. Schoem (2004) states that a major challenge for LLPs is recruiting tenured faculty to work with LLPs, a challenge that is often a consequence of institutions disincentivizing work outside of the classroom and rewarding faculty for research, teaching, and publishing. Regardless of evidence outlining the difficulties in attracting tenured faculty to engage in LLPs, there is documentation on the benefits of faculty involvement in LLPs.

If administrators intend to engage students in a robust and holistic learning environment, collaborative leadership practitioners must be prepared to have a conversation on how to engage faculty in LLPs once again. Masterson (2008) shares that student affairs professionals tend to think of themselves as a reinforcement for faculty and are unfortunately not accustomed to working with faculty members. On the other hand, Magolda (2005) discusses faculty apprehensions to working with student affairs administrators due to a lack of faculty knowledge on the exact role and benefit of a student affairs unit in higher education. As a result, this finding can impede the ability to create a vibrant LLP student experience if administrators lack the skill set needed to engage all stakeholders for an effective and interactive LLP student experience.

**Defining Collaboration**

It may come as no surprise that both the quantitative data and the qualitative analysis for this study revealed that the majority of facilitated collaborative efforts between LLP administrators was categorized as the creation and execution of co-curricular programming. According to the data, LLP coordinators found in the dataset shared that
LLP administrators from both units are 100% responsible for jointly discussing LLP co-curricular programming. 69.8% shared the responsibility of coordinating/facilitating co-curriculum programming, and 82.5% shared decision-making responsibilities for LLP co-curricular programs. The qualitative data supported the statistical analysis found in the first phase of the study as well. For example, participant ten stated, “We collaborate to plan programs and the partners help with speakers and any additional resources.” In addition, a detailed examination of the collaboratively-led domain data exposed a clear delineation of responsibilities by LLP administrators. Three institutions that scored relatively high in collaborative efforts between LLP administrators revealed that student affairs LLP administrators were 100% responsible for reviewing LLP student conduct issues and applying disciplinary sanctions when needed. On the other hand, academic LLP administrators were reported as being 100% responsible for teaching the LLP connected course. When Participant Eight was asked about their partnership, their, “My role for the LLP is conduct, because I do the conduct for the building and I meet with the RA’s on the floor.”

Moving forward, the implications of these findings have valuable insight on how administrators define and facilitate collaboration between both units on LLPS. Despite efforts of encouragement from scholarly literature (Astin, 2000; Blimling, 2001; Kezar, 2005; Tinto, 2009), postsecondary institutions in this century have yet to achieve collaborative efforts beyond co-curricular programming. Imagine if the collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs for LLPS extended beyond co-curricular programming. The desire to move beyond co-curricular programming was uniquely expressed by two of the LLP administrators at J&E University. Participant Eight shared,
“The hall directors receive a list of students with a 2.5 and below and they are asked to meet with those students. It would be helpful if the academic LLP partner could help facilitate those meetings.” Participant Nine said, “There is a monthly newsletter that the hall director sends to all students in the facility. I would love to write a piece in their every month related to academic.”

According to Blimling (2001), administrators must consider relinquishing territorial attributes to achieve true collaboration and achieve gains in student success. In the 1920s, philosophers such as Alexander Meiklejohn and John Dewey discussed the idea of developing holistic undergraduate educational experiences, a concept that in 2018 has not fully actualized in LLPs according to the results of this study (Gabelnick et al., 1990; Smith et al., 2004).

**General implications**

This research may potentially have implications for other collaborative initiatives between student affairs and academic affairs in postsecondary environments. For decades, potential solutions to improving the collaborative relationship between student affairs units and academic affairs have been a topic of conversation for postsecondary institutions. Conversations about using and improving the student affairs and academic affairs collaborative relationship for student learning dates as far back as the 1900s. This research validates previous literature and continues to encourage post-secondary institutions in enhancing the student learning experience through fostering collegial environments.
Based on the results of this large-scale study, initiatives that require cross-collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs may find more success and sustainment in collaboration if they begin by soliciting and obtaining institutional support from a high-level administrator. According to findings from this study, the steps to receive institutional support should start with assessment efforts that strategically connect and advance the mission and strategic plan of the institution. Furthermore, results from this study also highlight that collaborative efforts between student affairs units and academic affairs should not be expected to take place organically. Positioning an administrator or center to act as a liaison between both units would help keep both units focused on achieving the shared goal of the initiative. Finally, administrators must be prepared to deal with conflict and engage with administrators on hierarchal and power levels. Through the use of specific mechanisms, postsecondary administrators can engage staff and faculty in a meaningful experience that is also supportive of student learning.

Conclusion

The current study begins with an exploration of how LLP administrators facilitate collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs. Exploring the way in which collaboration is facilitated between both units aids administrators in understanding the nuances of facilitating collaborative efforts in LLP environments. According to the results, administrators sometimes mistakenly assume that a collaborative relationship between both units will be cultivated organically if both groups consist of like-minded individuals with a shared goal. As a consequence of these assumptions, collaborative efforts between both units can become more susceptible to failure and potentially translate into uninspiring learning environments for LLP students.
Moving Forward, LLP administrators must be flexible in adapting to the needs of both units as they prepare to deal with an inevitable difference in culture, shifting priorities and discomfort, or conflict when facilitating collaboration amongst LLP administrators. Considering the current study, institutional support, LLP coordinators, collaborative networks, and mechanisms for collaboration are all potential ingredients to a successful recipe for facilitating collaboration between both units. Furthermore, a welcome addition to the discussion of facilitating collaboration between LLP administrators in both units and LLPs is the use of shared governance and collaborative leadership frameworks when exploring the continual need to improve the collegial environment amongst administrators.

Moreover, if facilitated correctly, both students and involved faculty and staff stand to obtain significant gains in improving academic and social learning environments. To that end, despite the rhetoric mentioned in dialogue about higher education reform, further work remains in identifying mechanisms for collaboration between student affairs units and academic affairs as well as moving practitioners beyond collaborating on co-curricular programming.
Appendix A: Institution Descriptive Statistics

Table # 4
*Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 5
*Basic Classification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities – R1, R2, &amp; R3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1:Master's Colleges and Universities - Larger programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 6
*Size and Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Year, primarily or highly residential</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Year primarily nonresidential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 7
*Undergraduate Enrollment Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four year, medium full time, inclusive or selective, higher transfer-in</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year, full time, selective, lower or higher transfer-in</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year, full time, more selective, lower transfer-in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table #8
*Total Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 -20,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 – 40,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 -50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 – 60,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table #9
*Total LLPs Offered*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table #10
*Total number of students Enrolled in the LLP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-2000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-6000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001-7000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Jointly Discuss Collaboratively –led domain survey questions 9

**Academic Partner & Student Affairs LLP administrators jointly discuss**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLP Assessment efforts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Learning Objectives</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for the LLP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Mission</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Concerns</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP student behavioral observations in the residence halls</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Connected course information</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Programs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Budget</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Shared Decision Making Collaboratively –led domain survey question 18

**Academic Partner & Student Affairs LLP administrators jointly share decision making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLP Assessment Efforts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Learning Objectives and Outcomes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Strategic Plan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Mission</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Concerns of LLP students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Academic student sanctions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Student judicial sanctions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Programs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Connected Course content</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Budget and Purchasing needs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Shared responsibilities collaboratively-led domain (Survey question #24)

**Academic Partner & Student Affairs LLP administrators jointly share responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>LLP Academic Partner</th>
<th>LLP Student Affairs Professional</th>
<th>Both LLP Partner and student Affairs professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating \ facilitating co-curricular programming</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Peer Mentors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of LLP Peer Mentors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of LLP RA's</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of LLP Students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting LLP students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support of the community</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching LLP Connected Course</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training LLP peer mentors and/ or RA's</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academically and/or socially advising LLP students</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating curricular tasks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing LLP student Conduct issues</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying disciplinary sanctions to the LLP students when needed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Assessment and program evaluation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Survey cover letter and consent form

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this research study. As noted in the cover letter, this questionnaire is designed to assist in identifying institutions with LLPs that are collaboratively led by faculty and/or academic staff, and student affairs professionals. The desired participant to complete this survey is an LLP administrator, whose primary job responsibilities is to assist in the coordination of all or some LLPs efforts at their institution (i.e. Director of First Year Experiences, Associate Director of Residential Education, Assistant Director of Academic Initiatives; Director, Assistant or Associate Director of Living Learning Programs).

If you are not the primary LLP coordinator for your institution, but know who is please forward this survey to them or provide the principal investigator, Trisha Clement-Montgomery, of this research study with the LLP coordinator professional email address at tclem2@uky.edu. If you are the primary LLP coordinator for your institution and wish to continue this survey, please take a few minutes of your time to review the below instructions.

The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete and there are no known risks to participation in this survey. Your response to the survey is confidential and will only be used by the researcher for data analysis. Confidentiality for this study means no names will appear or be used on research documents, in presentations and/or publications.

**Before beginning the survey please familiarize yourself with the following key terms:**

Living Learning Program (LLP): residential on-campus programs designed to intentionally blend curricular and co-curricular learning for undergraduate students. In addition, to helping students make connections between their formal classroom and out-of-class experiences. Examples of an LLP are Residential Colleges, themed housing or Living Learning communities.

LLP Partner: LLP administrators from an academic college and is a faculty of staff member who primary or part-time job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs.

LLP coordinator: A Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrator or faculty whose primary responsibilities include the coordinated efforts of all or some LLPs at their institution.

LLP Student Affairs Professionals: an administrator or staff member employed by a campus department i.e office of student involvement, recreation office, Office of Residence Life etc... the students affairs professional’s job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs.

LLP Type: LLP type refers to the interest or focused discipline of the Living Learning Program. For instance is the LLP type aimed to help students draw connections between an academic major
or thematic interest. Example of an LLP type may be Engineering (academic discipline) or Community service (thematic).

Thank you for your time and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Trisha Clement-Montgomery
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate
University of Kentucky College of Education
tclem2@uky.edu
859-257-6611

Please click NEXT below to continue.
Appendix C: Survey Instrument

Which best describes your professional role at the University/College?

LLP Partner or Academic LLP Partner (Academic faculty/ staff: an administrator, staff member or faculty member employed by a college and responsible.)

LLP Student Affairs Professional an administrator or staff member employed by a campus department i.e office of student involvement, recreation office, Office of Residence Life etc... the students affairs professionals job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs.

LLP coordinator A Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrator whose primary responsibilities include the coordinated efforts of all or some LLPs at their institution.

Name of Higher Education institution

How many Living Learning Programs (LLPs) does your institution offer undergraduate students?

(Please note: Examples of Living Learning Programs are inclusive of Residential Colleges, themed housing or Living Learning communities.

______ LLPs

What types of LLPs are offered at your institution?

(Please note: LLP type refers to the interest or focused discipline of the residential program. For instance an LLP type may be Engineering or Business (academic discipline) or Community service/First Generation (thematic).

Academic Discipline communities
Thematic communities
Both academic discipline and thematic communities

How many students are enrolled in an LLP at your institution?

Please note: This can be an estimate if you do not know the exact total number.

How long have you been in your role as an LLP coordinator?

LLP coordinator definition: A Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrator whose primary responsibilities include the coordinated efforts of all or some LLPs at their institution.

What are your responsibilities for the LLP? Please click on all that apply.

- coordinate / facilitate co-curricular programming
- Supervise Peer Mentors
- Selection of LLP Peer Mentors
- Selection of LLP RA's
- Selection of LLP students
☐ Recruitment of LLP students
☐ Financial resource for community
☐ teach LLP connected course
☐ train LLP peer mentors and/or RA’s
☐ academically and/or socially advise LLP students
☐ coordinate curricular tasks
☐ Review LLP student conduct issues
☐ apply disciplinary sanctions to LLP students when needed
☐ LLP assessment or Program evaluation
☐ Other ____________________

How many LLP Partners or LLP Student Affairs Professionals do you work with to facilitate the everyday operations of an LLP?

LLP Partner: LLP administrators from an academic college and is a faculty of staff member who primary or part-time job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs. LLP Student Affairs Professionals: an administrator or staff member employed by a campus department i.e office of student involvement, recreation office, Office of Residence Life etc... the students affairs professionals job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs.

______ LLP Partners or Student Affairs Professionals

Which best describes the professional role at the University/ College of your LLP Partner(s) ? Please click all that apply.

(LLP Partner definition: faculty, academic staff or departmental staff from either an academic college, on campus departmental unit or resident director that collaboratively assist you in the facilitation of a residential on campus learning experience / program.

☐ Academic Faculty or Staff Member (Academic faculty/ staff: an administrator, staff member or faculty member employed by a college and responsible.)
☐ Resident Director / Housing Staff Member  Resident Director: Residence Life staff member responsible for the day to day management the residential facility.
☐ Departmental staff  Departmental staff: an administrator or staff member employed by department i.e office of student involvement, recreation office etc...
What are the responsibilities of the LLP Partner(s) and LLP students Affairs professionals that you work with on an LLP?

Please click on all that apply. LLP Partner: LLP administrators from an academic college and is a faculty of staff member who primary or part-time job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs. LLP Student Affairs Professionals: an administrator or staff member employed by a campus department i.e office of student involvement, recreation office, Office of Residence Life etc... the students affairs professionals job responsibilities include the facilitation of one or more LLPs.

- coordinate / facilitate co-curricular programming
- Supervise Peer Mentors
- Selection of LLP Peer Mentors
- Selection of LLP RA’s
- Selection of LLP students
- Recruitment of LLP students
- Financial resource for community
- teach LLP connected course
- train LLP peer mentors and/or RA’s
- academically and/or socially advise LLP students
- coordinate curricular tasks
- Review LLP student conduct issues
- apply disciplinary sanctions to LLP students when needed
- LLP assessment and program evaluation
- Other ______________________

How often do think LLP partner(s) and LLP student affairs professionals at your institution communicate (via phone, email or in person) in a given month?

- Once a month
- twice a month
- More than three times a month
- Other (please describe) ______________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do LLP Partners and LLP student Affairs Professionals at your institution jointly discuss any of the following items throughout the academic year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLP students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Assessment efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic concerns for LLP students i.e. performance in the classroom socially and academically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP connected course information i.e.; syllabus, course assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral observations of LLP students in the residence hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for the LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do LLP Partners and LLP student Affairs Professionals at your institution jointly share decision making of LLPs on any the following areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Assessment efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP Learning objectives &amp; outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic concerns for LLP students i.e. performance in the classroom socially and academically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP connected course content i.e.; syllabus, course assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP budget &amp; purchasing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for the LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP academic student sanctions, i.e assignment grading, assignment extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLP student judicial sanctions, i.e imposed student sanctions for violation of student code or LLP student requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement using the scale provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that LLPs can enhance the undergraduate student learning experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe LLPs require the support of many campus partners to be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe LLPs should include curricular and co-curricular programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mission of my LLP is aligned with my personal philosophy on education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you give your permission to be contacted in the future by Trisha Clement-Montgomery regarding your willingness to participate in the second phase of the study about the collaborative relationship/leadership of LLP administrators, should your institution be selected for the second phase of the study?

Yes
No

Please provide your name and email address for future contact

Thank you so much for completing the survey. Your insight and feedback is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at any time. Trisha Clement-Montgomery
Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidates University of Kentucky College of Education  tclem2@uky.edu 859-257-6611

Click NEXT below to submit your responses.
Appendix D: Collaboratively-led domain and collaboration composite score survey items

Survey Question # 9
Do LLP Partners and LLP student Affairs Professionals at your institution jointly discuss any of the following items throughout the academic year?

LLP Coordinators were given 11 items (items listed below), in which they could select yes or no. If the respondent selected the response “yes”, the response was given 1 point toward the collaboratively led domain score and collaboration composite score.

1. LLP students
2. LLP Assessment efforts
3. LLP Learning objectives
4. LLP learning outcomes
5. Academic concerns for LLP students i.e. performance in the classroom socially and academically.
6. LLP connected course information i.e.; syllabus, course assignments
7. Co-Curricular programs
8. Behavioral observations of LLP students in the residence hall
9. LLP Budget
10. Mission of LLP
11. Strategic Planning for the LLP

Survey Question # 18
Do LLP Partners and LLP student Affairs Professionals at your institution jointly share decision making responsibilities for any of the following items throughout the academic year?

LLP Coordinators were given 10 items (items listed below), in which they could select yes or no. If the respondent selected the response “yes”, the response was given 1 point toward the collaboratively led domain score and collaboration composite score.

1. LLP Assessment efforts
2. LLP Learning objectives & outcomes
3. Academic concerns for LLP students i.e. performance in the classroom socially and academically.
4. LLP connected course content i.e.; syllabus, course assignments
5. Co-Curricular programs
6. LLP budget & purchasing needs
7. Mission of LLP
8. Strategic Planning for the LLP
9. LLP academic student sanctions, i.e assignment grading, assignment extensions
10. LLP student judicial sanctions, i.e imposed student sanctions for violation of student code or LLP student requirements
**Survey Question # 24**

What are the day to day responsibilities of the LLP Partner(s) and LLP students Affairs professionals that you work with on an LLP? Please click on the appropriate staff member for the associated responsibility.

LLP Coordinators were given 15 items (items listed below), in which they could select one of the following three options; (a) LLP academic partner, (b) LLP student affairs professional and (c) both LLP academic partner and LLP student affairs professional.

If the respondent selected the “both LLP academic partner and LLP student affairs professional response, the response was given 1 point toward the collaboratively led domain score and collaboration composite score

1. coordinate / facilitate co-curricular programming
2. Supervise Peer Mentors
3. Selection of LLP Peer Mentors
4. Selection of LLP RA’s
5. Selection of LLP students
6. Recruitment of LLP students
7. Financial resource for community
8. Teach LLP connected course
9. Train LLP peer mentors and/or RA’s
10. Academically and/or socially advise LLP students
11. Coordinate curricular tasks
12. Review LLP student conduct issues
13. Apply disciplinary sanctions to LLP students when needed
14. LLP assessment or Program evaluation
15. Other ____________________
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Appendix E: Informed Consent for participation in second phase

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for considering to participate in the LLP Administrators case study. As noted in the informed letter there are no known risks to participation in this study. Your participation will be kept confidential and only used by the researcher for data analysis. Confidentiality for this study means no names or identifiable characteristics of the participant or the institution in which they are employed will appear or be used on research documents, in presentations and/or publications. However, identifiable information will be shared with IRB administrators to ensure that the study was completed correctly.

Would you like to participate in the LLP Administrators case study?

yes
No

Please provide your name and preferred method of contact i.e. email address or phone number below.

Thank you so much for your time. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at any of the methods found below. Trisha Clement-Montgomery Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate University of Kentucky College of Education tclem2@uky.edu 859-257-6611
Appendix F: semi-structured Interview Questions

**LLP Administrator Questions:**

1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
2. Did you participate in an LLP as an undergraduate student?
   a. If so tell me about your experience as a student in the LLP?
   b. If not have you had any previous experience with LLPs?
3. What is your current position?
   a. Tell me about your responsibilities in this position.
4. How long have you been employed in your current position?
5. Tell me about any previous higher education experience you may have?
6. How many students are enrolled in your LLP?
7. Tell me about your LLP’s academic or thematic focus.
8. Tell me about your LLP’s learning objectives or goals.
9. How were those objectives/goals developed?
   a. Who was involved in the process of creating the learning outcomes and goals?
10. Tell me about the structural layout of the residence hall that your LLPs currently resides in? (is it possible to get a tour)

**LLP Administrator Collaboration Questions:**

11. Tell me about your role with LLPs at the institution?
12. Who do you work with collaborate with in regards to LLPs?
13. Tell me about the role your LLP partners play in Living Learning Programs?
14. How do you facilitate collaboration between the LLP’s co-sponsoring units? I
15. Talk to me about the collaborative relationship between you and your LLP Partner?
16. How would you describe the relationship between you and your LLP Partner?
17. Would you say that you and your LLP Partner have successfully maintained a collaborative relationship?
18. What would you say are the positive aspects of your collaborative relationship with your partner?
19. Tell me about any challenges?
20. Tell me about how you and the co-sponsor communicate.
   a. How often do you communicate?
21. Are there any challenges to facilitating collaboration between the sponsoring units?
   a. If so, tell me about those challenges.
22. Tell me about a successful collaborative experience between the units that you may have been apart of? What made the experience a successful one?
23. How are curricular and co-curricular experiences for the enrolled students developed? Who develops those experiences?
   a. Who makes decisions about those experiences?
24. Do you feel supported by your department/unit to collaborate with the co-sponsoring unit?
   a. Tell me how/why?
25. Do you feel like your collaboration is supported by the institution? Tell me how/why?
26. Are curricular events provided for students in your LLP?
27. Are co-curricular events provided for the students in your LLP?
28. Tell me about the curricular and/or curricular events that are provided for the students in your LLP?
29. Who is responsible for coordinating and facilitating the events for your LLP?
30. Do you and your LLP Partner work on together on planning events?
   a. If so tell me in your words how you and your LLP Partner plan events together?
31. Do you and your LLP Partner facilitate events for your LLP?
   a. If so tell me in your own words how you and your LLP Partner facilitate events together?
32. How long have you and your LLP Partner worked together on this LLP?
Appendix G: Cognitive Interview Questions

Please complete the survey and reflect on the following questions in effort to encourage constructive criticism on the layout of the survey, language, and question construction, as well as, the functionality of the survey.

1. How long did it take to complete the survey?

2. Did you find the terms identified at the beginning of the survey familiar and applicable to your position, as well as the LLP structure at your institution?

3. Are there any questions that you found confusing or difficult to respond to?

4. The survey is designed to identify institutions who have a perceived collaborative relationship between student affairs and academic units on facilitating an LLP. Do you think the questions on the survey successfully attempt to collect the information intended to receive?

5. In your professional opinion when would be the best time of year for other professionals in your position at different institutions to complete the survey and participate in the case study?

6. Do you have any recommendations or suggestions on questions that you think should be revised, added or removed from the survey?
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