Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2016

Administrator Perceptions of the Community College Mission in the State of Mississippi and How it may be Influenced by the Addition of Community College Baccalaureate Programs

Scharvin S. Grizzell

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Administrator perceptions of the community college mission in the state of Mississippi

and how it may be influenced by the addition of community college baccalaureate

programs

By

Scharvin Schweldon Grizzell

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Community College Leadership
in the Department of Educational Leadership

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 2016

Administrator perceptions of the community college mission in the state of Mississippi

and how it may be influenced by the addition of community college baccalaureate

programs

By

Scharvin Schweldon Grizzell

Approved:

_____
Stephanie B. King
(Major Professor)

_____
Arthur D. Stumpf
(Committee Member)

_____
William M. Wiseman
(Committee Member)

_____
James E. Davis
(Committee Member/Graduate Coordinator)

_____
Richard L. Blackbourn
Dean
College of Education

Name: Scharvin Schweldon Grizzell

Date of Degree: May 6, 2016

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Community College Leadership

Major Professor: Dr. Stephanie B. King

Title of Study: Administrator perceptions of the community college mission in the state of Mississippi and how it may be influenced by the addition of community college baccalaureate programs

Pages in Study 89

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

For many years, community colleges that chose to offer community college baccalaureate (CCB) programs were looked upon in a negative light (Rice, 2015). However, as the need for specialized baccalaureates within specific fields and job markets have continued to grow (McKee, 2005), CCB programs are becoming more widely accepted throughout the United States. In spite of this paradigm shift, Mississippi is one of the remaining states that have not embraced the idea of CCB programs, in spite of its statistical deficiency in regards to baccalaureate degree holding citizens (Williams, 2010).

The focus of this study was to explore the perceptions of community college administrators in Mississippi with regards to the influence of CCB programs to the community college mission of institutions in their state. This study indicates that administrators in Mississippi recognize the benefits of offering CCB programs, but do not want CCB programs to take away from the well-established statewide higher education system through mission creep. Many of the strong position statements received overwhelmingly neutral responses. In contrast, Administrators who chose to give their

opinion indicated that they are not familiar with how CCB programs are implemented, and do not believe that Mississippi is ready for CCB programs across the state. However, respondents felt that the community college mission is always evolving, should meet students' needs, and varies from location to location. The findings also show that administrators are favorable to the piloting of CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions, even though they believe the programs will take funding away from current programs and do not want community colleges evolving into 4-year institutions. The study also concludes that there is a significant difference between institution size and survey questions #18 and #20. There is also a significant difference between length of time in the community college sector and survey questions #15, #17, and #18.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife of twenty years, Sharlanda Grizzell, whose love, support, and encouragement has helped me in immeasurable ways. To our children Amanda, Lydia, Chloe, Weldon and Jonathan, who always find ways to show me the importance of love and family; and to my parents Debra Stewart and Charles Grizzell (deceased), who *always* believed in me, and taught me from an early age that I can do anything I set my mind to.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank each and every individual who contributed to the successful completion of my Doctorate degree. To my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Stephanie King, thank you for being there to answer my questions and to give guidance and encouragement in the toughest of times. I thank God for your leadership, knowledge, and readiness to assist. To my committee members, Dr. Arthur Stumpf, Dr. James Davis, and Dr. William Wiseman, thank you for pushing me to be my best and leading by example. To my Christian family and Children of the City Preparatory School staff, thank you for supporting me in your various ways throughout this entire journey. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the Lord above, who has made all things possible and has given me the rigor to endure the obstacles encountered along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the American community college has, at its heart, always been a service driven principle (Levin, 2002). From its inception to its expansion throughout the decades, the American community college has met multifaceted community needs (Seymour, 2013). In Mississippi, the community college mission echoes the sentiments felt by community colleges across the country, a need to be everything to all people who seek their services (Vaughan, 2000). However, with this mandate comes conflict. Where must community colleges draw the line when meeting their community's need expands beyond the borders of their traditional purview?

The changing landscape of the global economy has caused an increased need for more education in the local workforce (Hamilton, 2014). Job positions previously filled by people who have earned associate's degrees now require bachelor's degrees and/or some form of leadership training (Hamilton, 2014). As workforce demands have changed, the need for affordable, accessible bachelor's degrees has arrived at the community college's doorstep (Marcus, 2014). Many programs, such as two-plus-two, have met this need and have been expanded upon throughout the country (Floyd, 2009). However, the gap still remains and a not-so-new alternative has come to the forefront (Walker, 2001). In efforts to fill this void, 22 states have allowed community colleges to confer 4-year degrees, through community college baccalaureate (CCB) programs

1

(Floyd, 2009; Leff, 2015). Despite much resistance, debate, and opposition, CCB programs have been discussed, researched, piloted, and are on track for approval in several more states (Ashford, 2013).

As one of the states poised to benefit the most from such legislation due to its high need for bachelor degree holding residents (Williams, 2010), the Mississippi community college sector has remained publicly silent on the subject. While there has been much speculation surrounding this emerging trend, the recurring theme in most discussions of the topic comes down to how CCB programs have influenced the community college mission (Rice, 2007). A definitive, or rather agreed upon, answer to this question, particularly in Mississippi, would give stakeholders on both sides of the argument solid ground on which to build future policies, strategies, and plans for the state.

Many backers of the practice have cited the community college mission as a valid reason to incorporate CCB programs in order to meet the needs of the community it serves (Floyd, 2009). Inversely, those who oppose the idea have seen the addition of CCB programs as mission creep (Mills, 2012), a negative deviation from the community college's inherent purpose (Rice, 2007). Although both arguments have held some truth, those who have worked closely to the issue, such as the administrators, can truly present a well-rounded look at how CCB programs may influence the mission of Mississippi community colleges.

Statement of the Problem

The problem leading to the need for this study is the perceptions of Mississippi community college administrators regarding the CCB, mission of community colleges,

2

influence of offering CCB programs on that mission, and the extent to which there are differences in perceptions based on institution size and the length of time the administrator has worked in a community college. There is a lack of understanding of how CCB programs will affect the existing framework in the Mississippi community college system. The study presented below addresses how offering CCB programs may influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi. The goal of the study is to understand how Mississippi community college administrators' perceptions of CCB programs influence the mission of the community colleges they serve. Particularly, administrators' views of the current mission practices will be compared to how they perceive the addition of CCB programs will influence the future mission of their respective schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative, correlational study is to explore and understand administrators' perspectives on how CCB programs impact the missions of community colleges in the state of Mississippi. A 2006 report by Peaslee states that due to the open admission policy of community colleges, they have become "of greater importance to economic growth and social stability than any other realm of higher education" (Peaslee, 2014; p. 37). The importance of the 2-year system is further highlighted by the frequent observation that it largely educates social subgroups that are traditionally underserved and deficient in the social and cultural capital that support success (Peaslee, 2014). The significance of the administrators' perspective is that it may provide an understanding of how CCB programs can help ameliorate, or contribute to, ongoing issues in the Mississippi higher education arena.

Research Questions

Four research questions will guide this investigation.

1. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, how does offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

2. How do administrators in Mississippi community colleges define the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

3. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, does offering bachelor's degrees at community college contribute to mission creep or mission evolution?

4. Do administrator perceptions of CCB programs differ based on institution size and/or tenure?

Definition of Key Terms

Accreditation: A concept and process principally concerned with improving educational quality and assuring that institutions meet established standards set by regional accreditation agencies. Accreditation signifies that the institution has a mission appropriate to higher education; has resources, programs, and services sufficient to accomplish that mission; maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers; and indicates whether it is successful in achieving its stated objectives (Commission on Colleges Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 2001). Colleges must be accredited to receive federal funds and ensure course transferability

4

(Young, 2010). Institutions of higher learning participate in accreditation when deciding to offer new degrees at higher levels that previously approved (Davis, 2012).

Applied baccalaureate: The applied baccalaureate degree is a bachelor's degree designed to incorporate applied associate courses and degrees once considered "terminal," or non-baccalaureate level, while providing students with the higher-order thinking skills and advanced technical knowledge and skills desired in today's job market (Townsend, Bragg, & Ruud, 2008). They are sometimes distinguished from traditional baccalaureate degrees in that they incorporate skills requested by employer needs (Painter, 2008).

Associate degree: An associate degree is a type of undergraduate degree requiring a minimum of 60 semester credits or units (the terms credits and units are used interchangeably). The traditional AA (associate of arts) and AS (associate of science) degree programs consist of three parts: general education requirements, major requirements, and electives. Community, junior, or technical colleges award associate degrees upon completing a program of study with a broad base in general education and a concentration in a specific area (Elkins, Braxton, & James, 2000).

Baccalaureate degree: A degree conferred by a college or university to a person who has completed a four or five year program of study or equivalent thereto (Ajzen, 1991).

Community college: Any institution regionally accredited to award the AA or the

    AS as a highest degree (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). An institution that is

    accredited or undergoing accreditation by one of the six regional

    accrediting bodies and primarily offers the associate degree as the highest

    degree. A community college may also be a campus of a regionally-

    accredited, baccalaureate-degree-granting institution that offers the

    associate degree as the highest award (Commission on Colleges Southern

    Association of Colleges and Schools, 2001). A term adopted in the late

    1980s to replace the term junior college (Vaughn, 2006). Community

    college may be used interchangeably with junior college in this research

    paper.

Community college administrator: Defined in this study by the individual

    community/junior college. Administrators were identified in each

    college's online catalog (Hollingsworth, 2010). The majority of the

    administrators included presidents, vice presidents, deans, assistant deans,

    and directors.

Community college baccalaureate: A bachelor's degree program in which the

    students take all courses at a community college and the degree is

    conferred by the community college (Walker, 2005).

Early adopters: People generally in a leadership position, who are young, with

    high social status, financial lucidity, advanced education, socially forward,

    and often opinionated (Rogers, 1995).

6

Early majority: People who generally adopt an innovation after seeing it adopted.

    They are slower in the adoption process, have above average social status,

    and are often in contact with early adopters (Rogers, 1995).

Innovators: People who are risk takers, often young, and are in the highest social

    class. They are characterized by financial lucidity and close contact to

    scientific sources and interaction with other innovators (Rogers, 1995).

Innovation: Something that is defined as an idea, practice, or object that is

    perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption" (Rogers,

    1997).

Laggards: People who show strong aversion to change. They are often older, with

    a focus on traditions. They are of low social status, low financial fluidity,

    and mainly in contact only with family and close friends. They have very

    little to no opinion leadership (Rogers, 1995).

Late majority: People who adopt an innovation after average number of people in

    their society, due to high degree of skepticism of innovation. Often

    characterized by below average social status, little financial lucidity, and

    are in contact with others in late majority and early majority. They have

    very little opinion leadership (Rogers, 1995).

Mission of American community college: To serve as an institution of higher

    education, to be a mirror of society by providing programs that match the

    needs of the local community and provide postsecondary educational

    opportunities through open access and affordable education (Vaughn,

    2000).

Mission creep: Mission creep is a phenomenon where one sector of higher

education takes on a mission of another sector. Mission creep is also

defined as the "expansion of a college's mission, particularly in the

direction of presumed more prestigious activities, resulting in less

attention being paid to the original purposes" (Pluviose, 2008, p. 9).

Mission statement: Supports an institution's philosophical stance and societal

objectives, provides touchstones for the maintenance of institutional

integrity, and for higher education institutions, serves as a guide for

educational planning (Anderson, 2012).

Open-door admissions policy: A community college policy that allows any

student to enroll regardless of academic ability, race, ethnic background,

or socioeconomic status (Vaughan, 2006).

Two-plus-two program: A program designed to assist goal oriented students in

creating a curriculum for their community college tenure (Vaughan,

2009).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is based on Rogers' (1962, 1997)

diffusion of innovation model. Rogers' theory explores how new ideas (innovations) are

communicated, accepted, and implemented through certain channels over time among the

members of a social system (Rogers, 1997). More specifically, the theoretical model

seeks to track and understand the rate at which the innovations are adopted. This

framework is relevant to the study because CCB programs are considered to be

innovations within the community college social system. Understanding administrators'

opinions about how CCBs influence the community college mission may ultimately determine the rate at which they adopt, or reject, the use of such programs in the state of Mississippi.

While there are some who may contend that offering CCB programs is not particularly an innovation, but instead a misguidance or a form of mission creep (Rice, 2007); Rogers' (1962) definition of innovation solves the argument by stating that "an innovation is simply an idea that is perceived as new by the individual" (Rogers, 1997 p. 11). Therefore, by this definition, persons on both sides of the debate can agree that CCB programs are innovations because they are considered "new" to states and community colleges that do not yet offer them.

The practice of offering CCB programs have been implemented since the 1970s (Henderson, 2014); hence, the concept of CCB programs is nearly 50 years old. Yet, the rate of adoption across the entire community college sector has been relatively slow (Henderson, 2014). As of 2015, 22 of the 50 states have community colleges that confer baccalaureate degrees (Koseff, 2015; Marcus, 2014). In addition to addressing the rate of adoption of CCBs through its model, Rogers' theory also provides an avenue to evaluate the social system in which the innovation is presented, as well as, those who choose to reject or adopt the innovation through its four main elements. They are: (1) the innovation, (2) communication channels, (3) time, and (4) social system (Rogers, 1997).

As this study seeks to understand Mississippi's community college administrator perspectives, the fourth element of the framework, which includes identifying members of the social system, will greatly aid in the methods used and interpretation of data. Under the social system element, the diffusion of innovations model has classified the

9

adopters (or members of the social system) into five basic categories. They are organized based on the time frame in which they accept the innovation being presented (Rogers, 1997). The first category consists of innovators, who are the first 2.5% of the social system that embrace the innovation (Hornor, 1998). The second category consists of early adopters, or the next 13.5% of the social system who accept the innovation (Hornor, 1998). The subsequent 34% who join the innovators and early adopters are labeled as the early majority (Hornor, 1998). The fourth group of social members is the late majority, who are the next 34% who accept the new idea (Hornor, 1998). In final succession are the laggards, the last 16% of the social community members who get on board with the innovation (Hornor, 1998). The previous categorization is paramount to this particular study as it allows administrators to be categorized based on their opinions, beliefs, and responses to the availability of CCB adoption in Mississippi.

Under the element of time, Rogers identifies a five-step process, which will reduce the social members' uncertainty about the expected consequences of said innovation (Rogers, 1997). The steps consist of knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation (Rogers, 1962). This portion of the framework will be beneficial by helping to shape and develop survey questions that will indicate and identify the administrators' perceptions of CCBs based on: their knowledge of CCBs, if they have a favorable or unfavorable attitude towards CCBs, how active they are in the furtherance of CCB programs, and what are the perceived results, benefits, and or accomplishments of CCBs by the administrators (Rogers, 1997).

Another key application of the diffusion of innovations theory is that it can also be used as a springboard to help identify gaps in research as it relates to the

10

implementation and spread of CCBs to the remaining 28 states (Davis, 2012; Koseff, 2015; Marcus, 2014). The theory helps to create a viable discussion and provides a model to help further understand why many states, such as Mississippi, have not embraced the idea of CCB programs to the point of making provisions for them. Community college administrators in Mississippi are no doubt the catalysts for change and have the power to be the change agents in the post-secondary social system more than any other members of the group. By understanding their perceptions of CCBs and how they relate to the mission of community colleges across the state, the rate of which CCB programs will be adopted can be better understood.

Overview of Methods

The methods administered in this study are as follows. The survey was delivered via electronic mail and administered online via Kwik Surveys anonymously. This will be done to ensure the administrators would not feel that their true opinions must be altered because their names were attached to them. Secondly, an intimate knowledge of college operations was necessary to respond adequately to the survey. It should also be assumed that the respondents in this study participated in a truthful and thoughtful way (Jones, 2006).

Delimitations of Study

Delimiting factors of this study includes the choice of objectives, the research questions, and theoretical perspectives of Rogers. The research questions were chosen as they tended to seek the underlying reasons behind many questions that can be address to the issue of CCB programs being instituted in Mississippi.

11

The first delimitation was the choice of problem itself. CCB programs are gaining approval momentum by state legislators across the country (Marcus, 2014); however, Mississippi is one of the remaining states that has yet to embrace the practice (Williams, 2010; Nail, 2013). This study only seeks to gain an understanding of how CCB programs influence the mission of Mississippi community colleges from the administrator's perspective. While other studies have explored the views of students (Williams, 2010) and legislators (Jones, 2006), the specific opinion of administrators on mission influence has not yet been studied in academic research.

Tinto's (1993) dimensions of institutional actions and Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model could be applied to this study; however, this study has adopted Rogers (1962) model of dissimilation of innovations as it directly addressed the research questions with CCB programs as the innovation, Mississippi community college administrators as the adopters, and clearly defines which group the adopters would fall into based on their beliefs and views of the innovation. As mentioned above, the population that was chosen for investigation was the community college administrators of Mississippi's 15 community colleges.

The results of this study could be generalizable to administrators who (a) work in the community college sector, (b) in the state of Mississippi and (c) have a considerable knowledge of CCB programs and community college mission statements.

Significance of the Study

This study fills a gap in understanding the perceptions of how CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi whether from the standpoint of mission creep or mission evolution and innovation. To date, studies have highlighted

the need for baccalaureate degrees in Mississippi and how CCB programs could play a significant role (Williams, 2010). Studies have also been conducted on the mission of community colleges in the southern region (Martinez, 2014) as well as the mission of Mississippi community colleges (Jones, 2006). The most recent related study focused on student perceptions of CCB programs (Nail, 2013).

This research will collect the opinions, perspectives, and concerns of community college administrators and present them in a scholarly manner to be used as a catalyst for future research, development, and study. With 42% of the nation's state boards of education approving CCB programs in some capacity, taking a closer look at the influence of these programs could significantly change the scope of higher education in Mississippi for the better (Jones, 2006). Therefore, this study is particularly relevant not only to the administrators, but also to the communities that they serve. The decision to embrace or ignore the possibilities of CBB programs will affect the growth potential of each community in unprecedented ways. Furthermore, this study will inform community college presidents and high-level administrators about their institutions in the larger context of the community college mission in order to analyze, plan, and lead effective strategic decisions for their institution (Martinez, 2014).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The review of the literature will encompass several facets. From a historical view, it will discuss the community college at large, the Mississippi community college system, and the community college baccalaureate. From an evolutionary view, it will explore the mission of the community college and the issues surrounding the acceptance of CCBs. Finally, the chapter will discuss related studies and their impact on the subject. The review of the literature makes the connection between Mississippi community colleges, CCB programs, and administrator perspectives in order to support the purpose of this study. Community colleges hold a unique position across the state in both rural and metropolitan areas. Reviewing the history of Mississippi community colleges gives a greater understanding of the current state of the community college system and perhaps why CCB programs are yet to be implemented.

American Community College History at a Glance

The history of the community college is just as comprehensive as the idea itself, which grew from the high school pedagogy (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Community colleges were developed to foster higher education opportunities to students who might not have the capability to succeed in or have access to courses that were provided in university settings (Hofland, 2011). At the onset of this perspective, a high school in

14

Peoria, Illinois, began offering college-level courses to a few of its students so that the work could be transferred to University of Chicago (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007). Overtime, this notion continued to grow, expand, and take on a life all its own (Hofland, 2011). By 1901, an idea was born in the United States (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). A movement to offer the first two years of college courses in separate schools—"junior" colleges—began (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007 p. 2). This was a huge success. By 1917, junior colleges had been instituted in "Illinois, California, Texas, Iowa, and several other states" (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007, p. 2). Fatheree and Tenhet stated that, "almost all junior colleges were either high schools that offered college courses to qualified students, or small four-year colleges that dropped their third and fourth years of study (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007, p. 3)."

A Brief History of the Mississippi Community College System

Mississippi community colleges have grown in the same way and for the same reasons as community colleges across America (Williams, 2010). As a result of its mission to serve community needs as they exist in current times, the community college mission is required to be flexible (Vaughan, 2006); such is the same with community colleges in Mississippi (Williams, 2010).

Mississippi's 2-year college system began in the 1920s. It was the first community college system established in America (Young & Ewing, 1978). As of 2011, approximately 125,000 students are enrolled in Mississippi's 15 community and junior colleges: Coahoma Community College, Copiah-Lincoln Community College, East Central Community College, East Mississippi Community College, Hinds Community College, Holmes Community College, Itawamba Community College, Jones County

Junior College, Meridian Community College, Mississippi Delta Community College, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Northeast Mississippi Community College, Northwest Community College, Pearl River Community College, and Southwest Community College (Musgrove 2007).

Although the original purpose for Mississippi community colleges was to provide a college education for those students who were financially or geographically unable to attend any of the state's 4-year institutions, their purpose has continually expanded (Young & Ewing, 1978). When the establishment of junior colleges began to take hold in many areas of the United States during the early 1900s, Mississippi was primarily a rural state whose primary resource was agriculture (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007). Segregation was also a part of the daily life during that time (Young & Ewing, 1978).

As detailed by Fatheree (2011, p. 3), "rural schools were usually one-room, wooden frame structures with one teacher, a few books, students of ages from six to sixteen, and an outhouse." In 1908, Mississippi's legislature passed laws that allowed counties to establish agricultural high schools (Young & Ewing, 1978).

By mid the 20th century, "nearly 11 percent of the Mississippi population was educated in some way in the state's public community and junior colleges" (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007, p. 3). Educational activities included university-track academic classes, training in career and technical skills, workforce education directed toward specific jobs, adult basic education, community enrichment courses, and test preparation (Fartherree & Tenhet, 2007).

In 1921, Pearl River Agricultural High School (now Pearl River Community College) was the first high school to offer college courses. The following year the

16

institution now known as Hinds Community College followed suit (Young & Ewing, 1978). By 1930, eleven high schools were offering college courses (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Eventually, the concept of a statewide community college system came to fruition. In 1928, a Senate Bill was passed which stated "all junior colleges seeking to qualify under this act shall be under the control of a state commission, known as the commission of junior colleges" (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 12). Thus, Mississippi's community college system was the first state community college system in the country (The Mississippi Association of Community & Junior Colleges (MACJC), 2007; Monroe, 1972; Musgrove, 2007; Young & Ewing, 1978).

Mississippi's community colleges have evolved through segregation, technological advances, and much more. Understanding the Mississippi community college from a historical perspective allows one to understand the current community college system and how and why it came to fruition (University Press of Mississippi, 2007). History indicates that the evolvement of Mississippi community colleges happened as a result of a direct desire to serve the Mississippi community and its young college-age citizens (Young & Ewing, 1978). Understanding the historical purpose of the Mississippi community college system will aid in understanding if the system has a new responsibility to its community and local citizens in the form of CCB degree programs.

Mission of the Community College: Overview

The historical desire of community colleges to fully and completely serve the needs of the community has presented these institutions with both an array of responsibilities and a highly multifaceted mission (Williams, 2010). As community

college leaders respond to the changing needs of the community, the changing educational needs of their learners, and the changing needs of society, the mission becomes more diverse and less succinct (Vaughn, 2006). According to Wesse (2012), public community colleges are effectively accomplishing the dual mission of offering 2-year degrees and 4-year degrees. This is particularly applicable to community colleges that began to do so in the last 10 years (Wesse, 2012). In spite of this, chief administrators seek to protect the mission of community colleges, which, centers on helping students in a variety of ways with tutorial and remedial programs, smaller class sizes in the freshman and sophomore years than they might have at universities, and a focus on teaching rather than on research and publications (Mills, 2012). According to Vaughn (2006) the uneven and uncertain landscapes bring about a continual quest for meaning and purpose in the organizational life of a community college. Therefore the mission will be ever evolving. Bolman and Deal (2001) characterizes this as "… a contemporary quest for meaning, depth, and faith that transcends boundaries of gender, age, geography, and race … this contemporary search is grounded in the age-old journey of the soul that has been a preoccupation of every human culture since the beginning of time" (p. 4). Vaughn continues to highlight that the mission of the community college is borne out of human's quest for knowledge and the duty to fill this need on every level (Vaughn, 2006). This view of the community college mission is pertinent to this study as it allows for innovations such as CCB programs to be initiated without necessarily taking away from the original mission of community colleges.

History of the Community College Baccalaureate at a Glance

A growing number of community colleges are offering bachelor degrees in addition to maintaining their traditional functions (Hofland, 2011). According to the *Community College Journal*, "the primary motivation for offering community college baccalaureate degrees was to fulfill unmet needs in the local workforce and to expand baccalaureate degree access locally" (Floyd, Delsher, & Catullo, 2007, p. 95). America's community colleges are responsible for the enrollment of almost half of the undergraduates in higher education (Floyd & Walker, 2008, p. 7). As demands for baccalaureate degrees increase, especially in certain high-demand workforce areas, local community colleges are experiencing increased pressures to respond programmatically to meet these needs (Floyd & Walker, 2008).

The models which CCB programs provide are a nontraditional outlet through which unreached citizens can obtain a baccalaureate education through the community college (Floyd, 2005). Before community colleges offered baccalaureate degrees independently, there were three established models for helping community college students obtain a bachelor's degree: the articulation model, the university center model, and the university extension model (Floyd, 2005). These models are seen as the proper and traditional route for community colleges to utilize in order to assist in baccalaureate attainment (Floyd & Walker, 2008). However, these models do not always fill community needs (Floyd, 2005). Although the CCB is the most recent model to provide community college students with access to 4-year degrees, it has garnered increasing momentum and support within the last decade (Wesse, 2012).

19

Contrary to popular belief, the CCB is not a new phenomenon (Floyd, 2006). As early as the 1970s, a small number of 2-year institutions across the country were granted approval to offer 4-year degree programs in specialized areas. During the 1980s, the CCB model was much more common in Canada, with only a handful of U.S. institutions conferring baccalaureate degrees exclusively from the community college (Floyd, 2005). More U.S. 2-year institutions began offering baccalaureate programs in selected fields during the 1990s as a way of providing access to 4-year degrees for place-bound students who would otherwise have been unable to earn their bachelor's degree (Walker, 2005). Economic concerns, changing demographics, and a growth in the number of jobs requiring bachelor's degrees are additional factors that have contributed to the overall increase in CCB programs (Cook, 2000).

In recent years, the CCB model has gained legislative approval in a number of states. Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia have all granted one or more community colleges the authority to offer bachelor's degrees in selected disciplines (Bemmel, Floyd, & Bryan, 2009). As of January 2015, the list has expanded to include 22 states (Koseff, 2015; Marcus, 2014). Although Mississippi has not provided legislative approval for the implementation of such programs, the available literature on the subject in specific regards to Mississippi has continued to increase each year.

The Issues

Even though CCB programs are gaining momentum in state legislature approval across the United States (Marcus, 2014), there are still many issues surrounding its implementation, acceptance, and growth. To understand why CCBs have become a trend

in the community college arena Floyd and Walker (2008) asked the question, "why is baccalaureate attainment an important issue for United States policymakers and citizens?"(p. 7) Research has shown that whether through traditional means or CCB programs, higher education pays for individuals and society (Floyd & Walker, 2008). From the standpoint of increased baccalaureate attainment in each state, proponents of the idea tend to side with Wesse's (2012) belief that "more states need to allow community colleges to offer bachelor's degrees" (p. iii). Many advocates and champions for the cause believe that legislatures who have not yet approved CCB programs for their states have not yet recognized "the reality of the educational and economic development needs of place-bound, non-traditional students who have increased the demand for localized bachelor's degree programs through the implementation of CCBs" (Wesse, 2012, p. iii).

The debate is further continued over the issues of access and availability. In some cases, researchers have found that universities in many areas around the country are unable to meet the demand for teachers were they are needed most (Mills, 2003). Another issue that has continued to strain the relationship between community colleges and universities is the poor transfer policies of some states (Mills, 2003). Furthermore, some universities are reluctant to offer courses at convenient times for students or to offer applied baccalaureate degrees (Floyd, 2005).

Benefits

CCB programs have many benefits that may contribute to its continued growth across the United States. One major benefit is that community colleges are geographically accessible, offer open admissions, and are reasonably affordable

institutions (Floyd & Walker, 2008). Therefore, students are more likely to continue their higher education at a facility that is familiar to them (Henderson, 2014). CCB programs also benefit the community colleges at which they are conferred, as it is reported that schools that offered bachelor's degrees tended to have higher numbers of associate degrees awarded (Wesse, 2012).

Many who support the establishment of CCB programs in their perspective states believe that the programs further the education goals of increasing access to higher education (Mills, 2003). Some university presidents in states who offer CCBs find that they share a common goal with the conferring colleges, which is "to have more people receive bachelor's degrees and become productive citizens" (Mills, 2003, p. 7).

Additionally, the costs of baccalaureate degrees obtained via CCB programs would be significantly lower than traditional means. It was reported by Floyd and Walker (2008) that in every state, the community college student tuition is less than that of state university counterparts. This supports the notion that community colleges are a good value for students (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Additionally, community colleges are a good value for taxpayers as well, since state per-student funding is also lower for community colleges (Floyd & Walker, 2008).

Detriments

As with any novel idea, there will always be negative effects of its heedless implementation. At St. Petersburg College in Florida, it was reported that the faculty faced "identify confusion" ranging from pay issues, to institutional titles, and length of the school year (Mills, 2003).

22

One detriment that is always of concern is cost. According to Floyd and Walker (2008), these fiscally challenging times can be especially difficult for community colleges delivering their own baccalaureate programs, especially if additional funding for the programs does not follow enrollments. When a CCB program can be afforded, other issues abound, such as assimilation of new faculty members, loss of cooperative agreements with other schools (universities), and resource availability (Mills, 2003). Another issue surrounding CCBs is resource availability; while it may be beneficial for a small number of community colleges to offer said degrees, it may be superfluous for all community colleges to try and offer CCB programs (Mills, 2003).

A major detriment to the expansion of CCB programs without a statewide system is the subject of articulation. While many who graduate with associates degrees from community colleges often face articulation issues, when it comes to CCB, graduates transferring to masters programs is even more difficult as it is uncharted territory for administrators and graduates alike (Floyd, Delsher, & Catullo, 2007).

Mission Creep

Community colleges across the United States have continued to grow beyond their 2-year degree missions in order to respond to the workforce demands of their communities (Floyd, Hrabak, & Falconetti, 2008). As a result, the awarding of baccalaureates by U.S. community colleges is prompting these colleges to reexamine their missions as 2- and 4-year degree granting institutions (Floyd, et al., 2008). Proponents of CCBs argue that the basic mission and purposes of community colleges in the country will remain the same; however, the mission will expand to meet the demands of 4-year baccalaureate programming (Floyd, 2006).

23

Critics fear the loss of and a decreased focus on the original open access community college mission (Townsend, 2005). However, Kuttler, president of the college that was previously St. Petersburg Junior College, sees these programs as "a way to open access to four-year degrees and to meet shortages, especially of nurses and teachers" (Mills, 2003, p. 2).

Offering baccalaureates is regarded by many observers as constituting a major departure from the role that community colleges have played over the past several decades, and it represents a major new direction of their focus (Skolnik, 2008). Some community college administrators subscribe to the thought that mission creep really does not figure into their language because the purpose of these institutions and their boards is to serve the community and whatever the community needs (Mills, 2003).

When reviewing the history of higher education, examples of "mission creep" can be found throughout. As small finishing schools evolved to 2-year normal schools, then the normal schools became state teachers colleges, the state teachers colleges became state colleges, and the state colleges became state universities (Mills, 2003). Therefore, should the addition of CCB programs be considered as mission creep or mission innovation?

Mission Innovation

Regional universities and state college missions are evolving, increasing their emphasis on graduate education and research, and consequently increasing undergraduate admissions standards (Floyd & Walker, 2008). Therefore, many place-bound workers aspiring to complete the baccalaureate may lack access to locally provided degrees. This access gap is especially apparent in fields with high employment demand such as allied

health, teaching, technology, and public service (Floyd & Walker, 2008). CCB teachers in Florida believe that "community colleges should be able to show that they have good programs" and that focus should be on having university level courses, but not trying to recreate the university (Mills, 2003, p. 9).

A 2003 survey of community college presidents, commissioned by the Community College Baccalaureate Association, indicates that approximately one-fourth of the respondents received requests from local employers to offer baccalaureate degrees due to unmet needs (Floyd, 2006). Over two-thirds of the respondents indicated that 4-year institutions in their area are not currently meeting the demands for baccalaureate training in certain high-demand career fields (Floyd, 2006). A Community College Baccalaureate Association President Emeritus and former Edison Community College President believes that by offering baccalaureate degrees, community colleges "can address three major issues that face higher education today: demand, access and cost" (Mills, 2003, p.10).

Related Studies

Although a rather emergent trend on the community college radar, only a handful of studies have been made regarding the interest, need, and perception of having CCB programs offered at Mississippi's community colleges. These studies provide valuable insight as to how CCB programs can benefit the state of Mississippi and its 15 community colleges. In 2011, researchers addressed the effects of implementing CCB degrees to combat the rural brain drain that typically plagues rural communities as well as to provide needed education to the place-bound student. According to Walker (1997), community colleges that offer bachelor's degrees in demand by local industries can

25

increase access for students who do not want to leave the area. This would expand one of the main missions of the community college, which is to meet community needs and be aware of economic development opportunities.

Chapter Summary

The review of the literature has provided perspectives from a historical, statistical, and realistic background. While interest has been generated around CCB programs in Mississippi, there is still more to be accomplished. This research aims to advocate for CCB programs in the state by ameliorating a longstanding need in student retention. The studies conducted by Williams (2010) and Nail (2013) shows strong potential and support for the implementation of CCB programs. However, there is still research needed on this topic such as the cost for implementing new programs, teacher and faculty training, access, accreditation, funding, and much more. A major theme that was quietly restated throughout the literature review was related to the community college's mission, which is to meet the needs of the community. The CCB programs can help 2-year institutions in two ways: one, by improving on an existing problem such as retention; two, by helping community colleges stay true to the mission by meeting their community's needs through providing access to baccalaureate degrees.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overall Design

The type of research design for this study is considered to be exploratory and descriptive. This research design is considered to be exploratory because the study seeks to explore the impact of offering CCB programs in Mississippi and how they might influence the current mission. The study is also considered to be descriptive because it seeks to provide a detailed description on aspects of the participants that may help future researchers build upon the current study. The study setting is considered to be non-contrived, as it happened in an environment where day-to-day events naturally occur and not in an enclosed or controlled setting such as a lab. This study is cross-sectional because it occurred at one point in time instead of over a period of time.

Review of Research Questions

The guiding questions of this research study are as follows:

1. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, how does offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

2. How do administrators in Mississippi community colleges define the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

3. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, does offering bachelor's degrees at community college contribute to mission creep or mission evolution?

4. Do administrator perceptions of CCB programs differ based on institution size and/or tenure?

Question one has been chosen as the foundational guide of this study. Community college administrators' perception of CCB programs strongly influences their opinions of how such programs affect the community college mission. The literature and related studies suggest that administrators have a positive perception of CCB programs (Jones, 2006; Nail, 2013; Williams, 2010).

Question two seeks the administrator's perspective on the addition of CCB programs in respect to the mission of their individual community colleges. As each community has different needs, perhaps CCBs may influence a certain community college's mission in a positive way, while it may be detrimental to the mission of another. The interpretation of the mission influences how administrators perceive the effects of CCB programs as well. As highlighted in the literature review, many community college administrators who advocate CCB programs often view the community college's fidelity to community more so than the state systems that serve them (Mills, 2003). The question is addressed to the administrators, as it is their responsibility to see the community college mission fulfilled.

Question three is derived from one of the most notorious arguments against CCB programs, that their addition is simply mission creep, a misguided effort to turn 2-year schools into 4-year schools (Mills, 2003). However, members on both sides of the

argument tend to agree that the mission of the community college has been in constant evolution since its inception. Therefore, this study seeks to find if CCB programs are viewed as either mission evolution (innovation) or mission creep by community college administrators in Mississippi.

Question four is set to further delve into CCB programs' mission influences by evaluating the factors of influence as presented in Rogers' diffusion of innovations model. This question allows for differences (if present) to be identified and analyzed.

Research Site

This study was conducted in 3 of the 15 community colleges in the state of Mississippi. All 15 institutions in the Mississippi community college system were asked to partake in this study. However, only three were willing to participate. The field being researched is community college leadership and administration. According to Vaughan (2006), "the evolving economic and social realities of the 21st Century have also increased the importance of the community college, as government agencies and the private sector have come to depend on the 2-year college system to produce a new vocational workforce" (p. 15). This field is important because community college leadership and administration play a vital role on the local, regional, national, and global scale.

Participants

All administrators from the three participating community colleges in Mississippi were approached to participate in this study. Specifically, community college administrators including presidents, vice presidents, deans, department heads, financial

29

administrators, and enrollment/admissions administrators were asked to participate in the study. The specific area of research focused on administrator opinions of CCB program's influence on the missions of Mississippi community colleges. This research project adds to the field of study by providing valuable insight to the views and opinions of the state's administrators. It also provides a formal documentation of the view of CCBs across the state, which creates a stepping stone in regards to unanswered questions such as whether or not the proposition of CCB programs will be presented to the state legislator and why or why not.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was developed in 2015 by the researcher to assess the need for CCB degrees in the state of Mississippi. A Likert-type scale was used in the questionnaire. Nail's (2013) study measured the perceived need for the CCB in the state of Mississippi among community college students, faculty, and administrators. The format of her study was used as a guide, but survey questions were changed in order to meet the requirements of this study. The specific changes made to the instrument focused on capturing the opinions and perspectives of administrators instead of students. Furthermore, questions were added to address the variables presented in the theoretical framework including length of time the administrator has worked in a community college and size of the institution.

Pilot Study

To establish reliability of the questionnaire a pilot study was carried out. The pilot study was conducted at a community college in Arkansas. The results were evaluated

using Cronbach's Alpha Test. Cronbach's Alpha output: *N=12*, alpha = 0.805. The results indicate a high level of internal consistency for the scale with the specific sample population surveyed in the pilot study.

The survey instrument used in the pilot study included 5 items, which measured participant demographics, such as age range, institution size, and number of years employed at current institution. The survey also included 13 items that measured the administrators' perception of CCB programs, 11 items that measured how community college administrators define the mission of the community colleges, and 10 items which measured participants' opinions of CCB programs' potential influences on the current community college mission. Minimal changes were made to the pilot study survey to reflect that specific population. For example, the state of Mississippi was replaced with the state of Arkansas. After completing the pilot study, survey questions in the demographic section were amended by removing specific institution names and focusing only on institution size.

In order to establish the validity of the pilot test questions, an expert review panel was solicited to review the survey items and make recommendations and give approval prior to conducting the pilot study. The expert panel consisted of three well-known professionals in the community college sector with a significant knowledge of CCB programs and varying opinions. The expert review panel was comprised of Dr. Collin Ruud of the University of Illinois, Dr. Michael Skolnik of the University of Toronto, and Dr. Deborah Floyd of Florida Atlantic University, the panel chairperson. Each of the panel members thoroughly reviewed and scrutinized the proposal of this study as well as the developed pilot test questions and offered their recommendations in writing and

31

through telephone conference. The researcher made several significant changes to the survey instrument based on the recommendations of the expert review panel. The IRB of Mississippi State University approved the pilot study as well as the subsequent research.

Data Collection Procedures

The primary means of data collection was via surveys. The surveys were presented to community college administrators at 3 of the 15 community colleges in Mississippi; the method of dispersion was online via Kwik Surveys. The primary contact at each institution was presented with the survey and instructed to e-mail the link to all administrators along with the letter of consent. Administrators chose to participate in this study of their own will as an anonymous respondent.

Data Analysis Procedures

For the purposes of this study, respondents were categorized based on the major characteristics that are consistent with the diffusion of innovation theory including length of time the administrator has worked in a community college and institution size. This study examined the similarities and differences between the responses at each institution. Frequency and percentage data were determined as part of data analysis for all research questions. Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance tests were used to determine if there were differences in administrator perceptions based on their demographic characteristics.

Chapter Summary

Chapter three presented a discussion of the survey research design used in this study, and the participants of the study were identified. The questionnaire administered

was defined along with the components of the instrument. The chapter concluded with

specifics on the study's data collection and analysis procedures.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to determine the perceptions of community college
administrators regarding the influence of CCB programs on the mission of community
colleges in the state of Mississippi. The study served to increase knowledge of
administrator perceptions of CCBs in Mississippi. This was a quantitative research study.
Data analyses to address the research questions include descriptive statistics to address
research questions 1-3 and inferential statistics to address research question 4.
Descriptive statistics to address research questions include frequencies and percentages.
Inferential statistics to address research question 4 include the Kruskal Wallis analysis of
variance. This chapter presents a description of the results.

Four research questions guided this investigation.

1. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, how does
    offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in
    Mississippi?

2. How do administrators in Mississippi community colleges define the
    mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

3. According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, does
    offering bachelor's degrees at community college contribute to mission
    creep or mission evolution?

4.   Do administrator perceptions of CCB programs differ based on institution

size and/or tenure?

All 15 community colleges were invited to participate in the study; however, only

three accepted and distributed the survey to their administrators via email. From the three

schools, a total of 27 administrators completed the actual survey. The survey was

organized into four parts. Part A of the survey consisted of administrator's demographic

characteristics; Part B consisted of the perception of CCB programs; Part C consisted of

questions about community college mission; and Part D consisted of questions about

CCB programs' potential influence on current community college missions.

First, demographic data reflecting the respondents is presented. Then, each of the

survey questions is presented with a summary of the responses along with some specific

examples of responses. After the overall responses are presented, data are used to answer

the research questions, question by question. All questions are presented to get a full

picture of data and to identify the overall data trends. This chapter presents the results of

the survey along with the results of analyses that compare the perceptions among groups

based on demographic characteristics in relation to Rogers' (1962) model. Chapter 4

concludes with a summary of the findings.

Demographics

Part A included 5 questions pertaining to the administrator's demographic

characteristics: age range, employment length at current institution, institution size,

length of time in community college sector, and gender. Each demographic question has

a direct relationship to the characteristics of adopters laid out in Rogers (1995) diffusion

of innovation model.

For the purpose of this study, the demographics identify the innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards through age, institution size, length of time at institution, and length of time in the community college sector. Gender is used for general demographics only.

All information in regards to demographic data is displayed in Table 1. The majority of the respondents were primarily between the ages of 46-55 ($n=11$). Of the respondents, the next largest age range was 56 or older ($n=8$), followed by the 36-45 ($n=4$) range, then the 18-24 ($n=2$) range and the 25-35 ($n=2$) range.

The next demographic question addressed employment at current institution. Two groups represent the majority of the respondents with equal percentages. The groups were in the 5-9 year range ($n=8$) and the more than 20-year range ($n=8$). The next largest group of administrators said that they have been employed at their current institution for 10-15 years ($n=6$). The second smallest group was administrators in the less than 5-year range ($n=3$), followed by administrators who have been employed for 16-20 years ($n=2$), which make up the smallest group.

Demographic question three asked the participating administrators to indicate the size of their current institution at full time enrollment. The majority of the respondents indicated that their institution size was to 5,000-9,999 ($n=10$) students. The second largest institution size selected was 2,000-4,999 ($n=6$) students, followed by institutions with less than 500 students ($n=4$). Nearly 10% of the participants did not wish to answer this question ($n=2$). The smallest amount of administrators stated that their institution served more than 10,000 students at full time enrollment ($n=1$).

In addition to time employed at current institution, respondents were asked to indicate how long they have been working in the community college sector at large. One third of the respondents ($n=9$) indicated that they have been in the community college sector for more than 20 years; they also represent the largest group. Two groups represent the second largest population percentage. This is the 10-15 year group ($n=6$), and the 5-9 year group ($n=6$). The third largest group of administrators indicated that they have been employed in the community college sector for 16-20 years ($n=4$), and the smallest group represented was those who had been working in the community college sector for less than 5 years ($n=2$).

The final question in the demographic portion of the survey addressed gender. Of the respondents, nearly 10% indicated that they did not wish to reveal their gender ($n=2$). More than 50% of the participating administrators were female ($n=13$), and less than 30% were male ($n=8$).

Table 1

PART A: Participant Demographics

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Age Range		
18-24	2	7.4%
25-35	2	7.4%
36-45	4	14.8%
46-55	11	40.7%
56 or older	8	29.6%
No answer	0	0%
Employment at Current Institution		
Less than 5 years	3	11.1%
5 – 9 years	8	29.6%
10 – 15 years	6	22.2%
16 – 20 years	2	7.4%
More than 20 years	8	29.6%
No answer	0	0%
Size of Institution (FTE)		
Less than 500 students	4	14.8%
500 – 1999 students	0	0%
2000 – 4999 students	6	22.2%
5000 – 9999 students	10	37%
More than 10,000 students	1	3.7%
Do not wish to answer	2	7.4%
No answer	4	14.8%
Employment in Community College Sector		
Less than 5 years	2	7.4%
5 – 9 years	6	22.2%
10 – 15 years	6	22.2%
16 – 20 years	4	14.8%
More than 20 years	9	33.3%
No answer	0	0%
Gender		
Male	8	29.6%
Female	13	48.1%
Do not wish to answer	2	7.4%
No answer	4	14.8%

Demographics Data Summary

The demographic information collected provided helpful information regarding

survey respondents. Administrators were asked to respond to five demographic questions

which provided data relating to age, length of employment at current institution,

institution size, length of employment in the community college sector, and gender. The

38

frequency and percentages of data collected on each demographic question are summarized in Table 1. In relation to Rogers (1995) model, the majority of the respondents (*n=19*) would fall under the late adopters and laggards category based on age (46 years old to 56 and older). Nearly 15% (*n=4*) are innovators or early adopters (18 to 35 years old), and nearly 15% (*n=4*) are considered to part of the early majority (36 to 45 years old). According to the tenure statistics, 37% (*n=10*) of the responding administrators would fall into the laggard and/or late adopters category (46 years old to 56 years and older). The demographic analyses indicate that respondents are less likely to be favorable towards the adoption of an innovation.

Research Question 1: According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, how does offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

Part B asked 11 questions regarding the administrator's perceptions of the CCB. Research Question 1 was designed to gage the perceptions of community college administrators in regards to CCB programs. The eleven survey questions in this section were developed to indicate if administrators have favorable or unfavorable perceptions of CCB programs. When administrators agreed or strongly agreed with any statement in this section, their perceptions of CCB programs are favorable. When administrators disagreed or strongly disagreed with any statement, their perceptions of CCB programs are unfavorable. Neutral answers allowed administrators to avoid taking a strong position in regards to CCBs. Responses are shown in Table 2.

In this section, administrators were first asked if they had a significant knowledge of CCB programs. The majority of respondents selected the neutral option (*n=9*). No administrators strongly disagreed, but the second largest response selected was

"disagree" (*n=7*). Less than a quarter of the respondents agreed with the statement (*n=6*), and the smallest percentage of the group strongly agreed that they have significant knowledge of CCB programs (*n=2*).

Next, participants were asked if they had a significant knowledge of CCB implementation. Following the response pattern of the previous question, the most frequently selected response was neutral (*n=11*), followed by disagree (*n=8*). Less than 15% of the respondents agreed with this statement (*n=4*), and less than 4% strongly agreed (*n=1*). However, none of the administrators strongly disagreed with the statement (*n=0*).

The participating administrators were also asked if they support CCB programs being offered at community colleges across the nation. Nearly half of the respondents agreed with this statement (*n=13*), but, more than a quarter of the respondents selected the neutral option (*n=6*). The third largest group strongly agreed with this statement (*n=3*) and the smallest group disagreed (*n=1*). No respondents strongly disagreed (*n=0*).

The next question pertaining to perceptions of CCB programs asked if the respondents personally knew an administrator with CCB programs at their institution. The majority of the respondents (*n=13*) disagreed with this statement, while less than 4% (*n=1*) strongly disagreed; meaning that they do not personally know an administrator with CCB programs at their institution. The second largest group, slightly less than 20% (*n=5*), stated that the agreed with the statement. Less than 10% of the administrators (*n=2*) strongly agreed with the statement. More than a tenth of the administrators selected the neutral option (*n=3*).

In response to the next question, which asked if administrators believed that CCB programs would increase baccalaureate degree access/attainment in Mississippi, no respondents disagreed (*n=0*) or strongly disagreed (*n=0*) with this statement. Nearly one quarter of the respondents selected the neutral option (*n=6*), while almost half agreed with the statement (*n=13*). Approximately 20% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement (*n=5*).

Respondents were then asked if they believed that CCB programs in Mississippi would be the only realistic option for a significant number of students to obtain baccalaureate degrees. None disagreed (*n=0*) or strongly disagreed (*n=0*). The majority of the respondents either agreed (*n=14*) or strongly agreed (*n=4*) with this statement, and nearly one quarter selected neutral (*n=6*) as their best choice.

The next question in section B surveyed participants in regards to if it is the community college's responsibility to offer CCB degrees if students express a need. The majority of respondents were neutral (*n=11*) to the statement. Nearly 30% of the respondents agreed (*n=7*) with this statement, while less than 5% strongly agreed (*n=1*). More than one fifth of the respondents disagreed (*n=5*) with the statement, but none strongly disagreed (*n=0*).

Table 2 also presents data collected in regards to the feasibility of Mississippi legislation approving statewide CCB programs by the 2016/2017 school year. The majority of the respondents equally strongly disagreed (*n=7*), disagreed (*n=7*) or remained neutral (*n=7*). Less than 10% of the administrators agreed (*n=2*) with the statement. No respondents strongly agreed (*n=0*) with the statement.

41

Next, administrators were presented with the statement "there is strong support for CCB programs across the state of Mississippi." The majority of the respondents chose to remain neutral ($n=12$), while one third of the respondents disagreed ($n=9$). The remaining respondents strongly disagreed ($n=3$).

Respondents were then asked if they believed that Mississippi should pilot CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions. None of the respondents strongly disagreed ($n=0$), but more than twenty percent strongly agreed ($n=6$) with the statement. Approximately eleven percent of the participants disagreed ($n=3$) with the pilot test statement, and an equal amount selected "neutral" ($n=7$) or "agree" ($n=7$) as a survey response.

The last question in section B asked if respondents believed that there were too many undetermined factors related to CCB programs at this time. Nearly 30% of the respondents gave a neutral ($n=8$) response. Respondents equally chose to agree ($n=7$) and disagree ($n=7$) with this statement. The strongly disagree ($n=1$) option and the strongly agree ($n=1$) option also received an equal number of responses.

Table 2

PART B: Perceptions of CCB Programs

Factors	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
I Have A Significant Knowledge Of CCB Programs						
Percent	7.4%	22.2%	33.3%	25.9%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	2	6	9	7	0	3
I Have A Significant Knowledge Of CCB Implementation.						
Percent	3.7%	14.8%	40.7%	29.6%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	1	4	11	8	0	3
I Support CCB Programs Being Offered At Community Colleges Across The Nation.						
Percent	11.1%	48.1%	22.2%	3.7%	0%	14.8%
Frequency	3	13	6	1	0	4
I Personally Know (A) Community College Administrator(s) With CCB Programs At Their Institution.						
Percent	7.4%	18.5%	11.1%	48.1%	3.7%	11.1%
Frequency	2	5	3	13	1	3
I Believe That CCB Programs Would Increase Baccalaureate Degree Access/Attainment In Mississippi.						
Percent	18.5%	48.1%	22.2%	0%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	5	13	6	0	0	3
CCB Programs In Mississippi Would Be The Only Realistic Option For A Significant Number Of Students To Obtain Baccalaureate Degrees.						
Percent	14.8%	51.9%	22.2%	0%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	4	14	6	0	0	3
It Is The Community College's Responsibility To Offer Baccalaureate Degrees If Students Express That There Is A Need.						
Percent	3.7%	25.9%	40.7%	18.5%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	1	7	11	5	0	3
It Is Feasible For Mississippi Legislation To Approve CCB Programs In The State By The 2016/2017 School Year.						
Percent	0%	7.4%	25.9%	25.9%	25.9%	14.8%
Frequency	0	2	7	7	7	4
There Is Strong Support For CCB Programs Across The State Of Mississippi.						
Percent	0%	0%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%
Frequency	0	0	12	9	3	3
Mississippi Should Pilot CCB Programs At A Few (1-2) Institutions.						
Percent	22.2%	25.9%	25.9%	11.1%	0%	14.8%
Frequency	6	7	7	3	0	4
There Are Too Many Undetermined Factors Related To CCB Programs At This Time.						
Percent	3.7%	25.9%	29.6%	25.9%	3.7%	11.1%
Frequency	1	7	8	7	1	3

Question 1 Data Summary

Research Question 1 was designed to gage the perceptions of community college

administrators in regards to CCB programs. The 11 survey questions in this section were

developed to highlight if administrators have favorable or unfavorable perceptions of

43

CCB programs. With the exception of the last question, when administrators agreed or strongly agreed with any statement in this section, their perceptions of CCB programs are favorable. When administrators disagreed or strongly disagreed with any statement in this section, their perceptions of CCB programs are unfavorable. A neutral answer allowed administrators to avoid taking a strong position in regards to CCBs.

Research Question 2: How do administrators in Mississippi community colleges define the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

Part C included 10 questions regarding the community college mission. These questions were designed to detect if administrators' opinions of the community college mission were favorable to the adaptation of CCB programs. Responses are shown in Table 3.

The first question in Part C asked if the mission of the American community college is always evolving. Nearly 41% of the respondents strongly agreed (*n=11*) with the statement, and approximately 30% selected the "agree" (*n=8*) option. The "neutral" choice (*n=2*) and the "disagree" choice (*n=2*) received the same percentage of administrator choices; both were less than 10%. The least selected survey choice was the "strongly disagree" (*n=1*) option, being chosen by less than 5% of the respondents.

The next question in the section asked administrator opinions in regards to the mission statement of a community college. Results are displayed in Table 3. Approximately 45% of the respondents strongly agreed (*n=12*) with this statement, and nearly 40% agreed (*n=11*). Only less than 5% of the respondents selected the neutral option (*n=1*). No respondents disagreed (*n=0*) or strongly disagreed (*n=0*).

44

The next survey question asked if community colleges have fidelity to their students' need above all else. In response, approximately 45% of the respondents agreed (*n=12*). None strongly disagreed (*n=0*). The response least selected was the "strongly agree" option (*n=2*). The remaining respondents equally disagreed (*n=5*) or remained neutral (*n=5*).

Next, respondents were asked if they believed that the mission statement of their institution was up to date. No respondents strongly disagreed (*n=0*) with this statement, but nearly 20% said that they disagreed (*n=5*). Less than 5% submitted a neutral response (*n=1*), while the majority agreed (*n=10*) with the statement, and almost 30% of the respondents strongly agreed (*n=8*).

The next statement asked the respondents if they believed that the mission of their institution meets the many needs of the people that it serves. In response, the majority agreed (*n=13*) with the statement. Approximately 30% of the respondents strongly agreed (*n=8*), and the smallest amount of respondents remained neutral (*n=3*). No respondents disagreed (*n=0*) or strongly disagreed (*n=0*).

Respondents were then asked if they agreed that the mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed by the community. None of the respondents strongly agreed (*n=0*) with this statement, but more than 20% agreed (*n=6*). The largest response to this statement was neutral (*n=14*) with more than 50% of administrators selection this option. The "disagree" (*n=3*) or "strongly disagree" (*n=1*) options were the least selected in response to this survey question.

When asked if they agreed that the history of community colleges is favorable to offering CCB programs, respondents gave varied answers. No administrator strongly

45

disagreed (*n=0*) with this statement, but nearly one tenth of the respondents said they disagreed (*n=2*). The majority of the respondents remained neutral (*n=11*) and the "agree" (*n=10*) or "strongly agree" (*n=1*) response makes up the next largest response choices by administrators.

The next survey question asked if administrators agreed that the community college mission of remediation is greater than the mission of continued education (specifically baccalaureate attainment). The majority gave a neutral (*n=9*) response to this question. The least chosen response was "strongly disagree" (*n=1*), while respondents equally selected the "disagree" (*n=6*) and "agree" (*n=6*) answer choice to this statement. The remaining respondents strongly agreed (*n=2*) with the statement.

The next survey statement was "the mission of the community colleges varies from location to location. Therefore, CCB programs may be good for some institutions, but not for others." Results show that almost half of the respondents agreed (*n=13*) with the statement, and one fourth strongly agreed (*n=6*). The neutral option received the least amount of selections (*n=2*), and less than 15% of the respondents disagreed (*n=3*) with the statement. No respondents selected the "strongly disagree" option *(n=0)*.

At the end of this section, respondents were asked if they agreed with the statement that the mission of the community college is limited to 2-year degrees, technical degrees, and certificates only. The majority of the respondents disagreed (*n=8*) or strongly disagreed (*n=4*) with this statement. More than one quarter of the respondents opted for the neutral (*n=7*) selection, while the minority agreed (*n=4*) or strongly agreed (*n=1*) with the statement.

46

Table 3

PART C: Perceptions of the Community College Mission

Factors	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
The Mission Of The American Community College Is Always Evolving.						
Percent	40.7%	29.6%	7.4%	7.4%	3.7%	11.1%
Frequency	11	8	2	2	1	3
The Mission Statement Of A Community College Should Guide And Influence The Culture Of The Institution On A Daily Basis.						
Percent	44.4%	40.7%	4.7%	0%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	12	11	1	0	0	3
Because Of Their Mission, Community Colleges Have A Fidelity To Their Students' Need Above All Else.						
Percent	7.4%	44.4%	18.5%	18.5%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	2	12	5	5	0	3
The Mission Statement Of My Institution Is Up To Date.						
Percent	29.6%	37%	3.7%	18.5%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	8	10	1	5	0	3
The Mission Of My Institution Meets Many Needs Of The People That It Serves.						
Percent	29.6%	48.1%	11.1%	0%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	8	13	3	0	0	3
The mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed by the community.						
Percent	0%	22.2%	51.9%	11.1%	3.7%	11.1%
Frequency	0	6	14	3	1	3
The History Of Community Colleges Is Favorable To Offering CCB Programs.						
Percent	3.7%	37%	40.7%	7.4%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	1	10	11	2	0	3
The Community College Mission Of Remediation Is Greater Than The Mission Of Continued Education (Specifically Baccalaureate Attainment).						
Percent	7.4%	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%	7.4%	11.1%
Frequency	2	6	9	6	1	3
The Mission Of The Community Colleges Varies From Location To Location. Therefore, CCB Programs May Be Good For Some Institutions, But Not For Others.						
Percent	22.2%	48.1%	7.4%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	6	13	2	3	0	3
The Mission Of The Community College Is Limited To Two-Year Degrees, Technical Degrees, And Certificates Only.						
Percent	3.7%	14.8%	25.9%	29.6%	14.8%	11.1%
Frequency	1	4	7	8	4	3

Question 2 Data Summary

Research Question 2 was designed to gage the administrators' definition of the

community college mission. Survey questions 17, 19, 22, and 23 were used to indicate

which administrators would likely be favorable of CCB programs based on a selection of

agree or strongly agree. However, questions 18, 20, 21 and 25 can be interpreted in

47

different ways. Questions 24 and 26 were designed to indicate which administrators would likely have an unfavorable opinion of CCB programs when they agree or strongly agree with these statements.

Research Question 3: According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, might offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi?

The ten survey statements presented in Part D sought to gauge the administrator opinions of how CCB programs could potentially influence the current missions of Mississippi community colleges. Results are shown in Table 4. The first question in Part D asked if offering CCB programs will positively influence the mission(s) of community colleges in Mississippi. In response, the majority of the respondents remained neutral (*n=11*). When combining the "agree" (*n=9)* and "strongly agree" (*n=1*) options, they make up the second largest opinion sector. Less than 12% selected the disagree option (*n=3*). No respondents chose to strongly disagree (*n=0*).

Next, respondents were asked if they believed that CCB programs are an important part of community college growth in Mississippi. Table 4 shows that the neutral (*n=9*) response is the most frequent answer, followed by agree (*n=7*), and disagree (*n=6*). No respondents strongly disagreed (*n=0*), and less than 10% strongly agreed (*n=2*) with this statement.

The third question in Part D asked respondents to agree with the statement that CCB programs will help Mississippi community colleges reach their goals more effectively. The majority remained neutral (*n=12*). Nearly 20% (*n=5*) of the respondents agreed with the statement and disagreed (*n=5*). The least selected responses were "strongly agree" (*n=1*) and "strongly disagree" (*n=1*).

Next, respondents were asked if they agreed with the statement that CCB programs would positively affect their institution and/or community it serves. The majority of the respondents selected the neutral option (*n=9*). The same amount of respondents chose to equally agree (*n=6*) and strongly agree (*n=6*). However, the smallest selected response was disagree (*n=3*). No respondents strongly disagreed (*n=0*).

Next, survey respondents were asked if they believed that offering CCB programs would expand the mission of their institution in a positive way. The most frequent response was agree (*n=10*), followed by neutral (*n=8*). Strongly agree (*n=3*) and disagree (*n=3*) received the same amount of responses. However, no respondents selected the strongly disagree option (*n=0*).

When respondents were asked if they believed that offering CCB programs would require a significant change in their institution's mission statement, the majority of respondents selected the neutral option (*n=8*), and approximately 26% chose to agree (*n=7*) with the statement. No respondents strongly disagreed (*n=0*). Nearly 15% of the responses went to the strongly agree option (*n=4*); the disagree selection (*n=5*) received approximately 20%of the responses. No respondents selected the strongly disagree option (*n=0*).

Participants were next asked if they felt that providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges in Mississippi might compromise the community college's core values. None of the administrators strongly disagreed (*n=0*) with the statement. However, the majority disagreed (*n=10*) with the statement. In contrast, more than one fourth of the respondents agreed (*n=7*) with the statement. The neutral option (*n=6*) was selected by

49

more than 20% of the respondents. The least selected option was "strongly agree" ($n=1$), with less than 5% of the respondents selecting this choice.

In response to the survey statement that CCB programs will take funding away from current programs. The majority of the group opted to remain neutral ($n=9$). Nearly twenty percent of the responses went to the disagree option ($n=5$) as well as the agree option ($n=5$). Less than one fifth of the respondents strongly agreed ($n=4$) with the statement; however, none strongly disagreed ($n=0$).

Next, administrators were asked if they believed CCB programs would have a negative effect on the open admissions policy of Mississippi community colleges. The majority of respondents disagreed ($n=10$) with this statement, while nearly thirty percent selected the neutral option ($n=8$). The minority agreed ($n=4$) or strongly agreed ($n=1$) that CCB programs will have a negative influence. No respondents strongly disagreed with this statement ($n=0$).

In the final question of Part D, respondents were asked if most community colleges that offer CCB programs want to become 4-year institutions. Once again, the majority of the respondents selected the neutral choice ($n=10$) as their response. However, the second largest response comes from the disagree option ($n=8$). The percentage of respondents who chose to strongly agree ($n=1$) or agree ($n=2$) was low.

Table 4

PART D: Perceptions of the Influence of CCB programs on the Community College Mission

Factors	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
Offering CCB Programs Will Positively Influence The Mission(s) Of Community Colleges In Mississippi.						
Percent	3.7%	33.3%	40.7%	11.1%	0%	11/1%
Frequency	1	9	11	3	0	3
CCB Programs Are An Important Part Of Community College Growth In Mississippi.						
Percent	7.4%	25.9%	33.3%	22.2%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	2	7	9	6	0	3
CCB Programs Will Help Mississippi Community Colleges Reach Their Goals More Effectively.						
Percent	3.7%	18.5%	44.4%	18.5%	3.7%	11.1%
Frequency	1	5	12	5	1	3
CCB Programs Will Positively Affect My Institution And/Or The Community It Serves.						
Percent	22.2%	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	6	6	9	3	0	3
Offering CCB Programs Will Expand The Mission Of My Institution In A Positive Way.						
Percent	11.1%	37%	29.6%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	3	10	8	3	0	3
Offering CCB Programs Will Require A Significant Change In My Institution's Mission Statement.						
Percent	14.8%	25.9%	29.6%	18.5%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	4	7	8	5	0	3
I Feel That Providing Baccalaureate Degrees At Community Colleges In Mississippi May Compromise The Community College's Core Values (E.G., Open-Door Access, Learner-Centeredness, Affordability, Convenience, And/Or Responsiveness).						
Percent	3.7%	25.9%	22.2%	37%	0%	11.1%
Frequency	1	7	6	10	0	3
Offering CCB Programs Will Take Funding Away From Current Programs.						
Percent	14.8%	18.5%	33.3%	18.5%	0%	14.8%
Frequency	4	5	9	5	0	4
CCB Programs Will Have A Negative Effect On The Open Admissions Policy Of Mississippi Community Colleges.						
Percent	3.7%	14.8%	29.6%	37%	0%	14.8%
Frequency	1	4	8	10	0	4
Most Community Colleges That Offer CCB Programs Want To Become 4-Year Institutions						
Percent	3.7%	7.4%	37%	29.6%	7.4%	14.8%
Frequency	1	2	10	8	2	4

Question 3 Data Summary

Data collected in Part D displays that administrators have varied responses in regards to CCB programs leading to mission creep or evolution. This section also has a high percentage of neutral answers, with the lowest neutral response being 22.2% (*n=6*); this means that all answers had at least six respondents who selected the neutral option.

51

Data also indicate that administrators only strongly disagree with 2 of the 10 questions in Part D.

Research Question 4: Do administrator perceptions of CCB programs differ based on institution size and/or the length of time the administrator has worked in a community college?

The data in Tables 5 – 10 present the results of the Kruskal Wallis analysis of variance that was computed using the SPSS statistical program to examine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the administrators based on the size of their institutions or their length of time worked in the community college sector. The subsequent tables also present the mean ranks and the results of the Kruskal Wallis statistical test.

Size of Institution

Table 5 compares institution size on the influence of administrator perceptions of CCB programs (survey questions from Part B). Data indicated which administrators had significant knowledge of CCB program. Administrators from schools with less than 500 students had the highest mean rank score, followed by administrators from schools with 5,000-9,999, then administrators from schools with more than 10,000, and finally, administrators from schools with 2,000-4,999 students.

The next survey question was in regards to significant knowledge of CCB implementation. The institution size with the highest mean rank was more than 10,000 students ($r=11.5$). The lowest ranking institution size was less than 500 students ($r=7.75$). When institution size was considered regarding support of CCB programs

52

being offered at community colleges across the nation the highest-ranking institution size was less than 500 students (*r=13.5*).

Administrators at institutions with less than 500 students (*r=14.25*) had the highest in regards to the community college's responsibility to offer baccalaureate degrees if students express that there is a need. The institution size with the lowest rank (*r=8.39*) were those who had 5,000 – 9,000 students. The value for this statistic was calculated as *p < .317.*

When institution size was compared to the survey question stating that Mississippi should pilot test CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions, the rankings were as follows: administrators at institutions with 2000-4999 students (*r=10.8*), followed by administrators at institutions with less than 500 students (*r=10.75*), next came administrators at institutions with 5,000-9,999 students (*r=8.63*), and the lowest rank was given to administrators at institutions with more than 10,000 students (*r=5.00*). The value calculated for this statistic is p < .659. When asked if there are too many undetermined factors related to CCB programs at this time, administrators at institutions with 5,000 - 9,000 students had the highest rank. The values calculated for this statistic is p < .316.

Table 5

Size of Institution Ranks on Perception of CCB Programs

Factors	Less than 500	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000+	Total	*p value*
I have significant knowledge of CCB programs						
Mean Rank	12.13	8.20	10.11	9.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.756
I have significant knowledge of CCB implementation						
Mean Rank	7.75	9.60	11.06	11.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.752
I support CCB programs being offered at community colleges across the nation.						
Mean Rank	13.50	10.50	8.78	4.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.328
I personally know a community college administrator with CCB programs…						
Mean Rank	10.75	9.10	9.94	12.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.946
I believe that CCB programs would increase baccalaureate degree access/attainment in …						
Mean Rank	12.38	8.90	10.39	2.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.296
CCB programs in Mississippi would be the only realistic option for a …						
Mean Rank	12.25	10.40	9.56	3.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.434
It is the community college's responsibility to offer baccalaureate degrees if students…						
Mean Rank	14.25	9,70	8.39	9.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.317
It is feasible for Mississippi legislation to approve CCB programs in the state by the …						
Mean Rank	6.00	10.90	10.72	15.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.338
There is strong support for CCB programs across the state of Mississippi						
Mean Rank	4.88	12.80	10.22	14.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.091
Mississippi should pilot CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions.						
Mean Rank	10.75	10.80	8.63	5.00		
Frequency	4	5	8	1	18	.659
p value						
There are too many undetermined factors related to CCB programs at this time.						
Mean Rank	6.00	9.70	12.00	9.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.316

Table 6 compares institution size with administrator opinions of community college missions (survey questions from PART C). Ranks of institution size on administrator opinions in regards to the mission of the American community college is always evolving is as follows: Administrators at institutions with less than 500 hundred students received the highest rank ($r=13.75$), followed by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,000 students ($r=9.50$), the third highest rank was received by administrators with 2,000 – 4,999 students ($r=9.00$), and the lowest rank was received by administrators at institutions with more than 10,000 students ($r=4.50$).

The mean ranks of institution size in regards to whether the mission statement of the community college should guide and influence the culture of the institution on a daily basis are as follows: Administrators at institutions with less than 500 students received the highest rank ($r=15.00$), the next highest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 2,000 – 4,999 students ($r=11.40$), the third largest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,999 students ($r=8.00$), and the lowest rank was received by administrators at institutions with more than 10,000 students ($r=1.00$). The value calculated for this statistic is $p < .028$, which indicated a significant difference between institution sizes and administrator opinions.

Ranks established in regards to the mission statement of current institutions being up to date are as follows: Administrators at institutions with 2,000 – 4,999 students receive the highest rank ($r=14.20$), the second highest rank is given to administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,000 students ($r=10.72$), the third highest rank was received by administrators at institutions with more than 10,000 students ($r=5.00$), and the lowest rank was received by administrators at institutions with less than 500 students ($r=4.38$).

55

The statistic calculated was p < .031. This indicated that there is a significant difference between institution size and administrators opinion of their accuracy of their institution's mission statement.

In regards to administrators opinions of the mission of their institution meeting the needs of the people it servers ranks by institution size are as follows: Administrators at institutions with 2,000 – 4,999 student received the highest rank (*r=12.10*), followed by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,999 students (*r=10.83*), the third largest rank was received by administrators at with less than 500 students (*r=6.38*), and the lowest rank was received by administrators with more than 10,000 students (r=*1.50*). The value calculated for this statistic is p < .063.

Data collected in regards to the survey statement "the mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed the community" are as follows: Administrators at institutions with less than 500 students received the highest rank (*r=11.00*), the second highest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 2,000-4,999 students (*r=10.10*), the third largest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,999 students (*r=9.67*), the lowest rank was received by administrators with more than 10,000 students (*r=8.50*). The value calculated for this statistic is p < .964.

56

Table 6

Size of Intuition Ranks On Administrator Opinions on Community College Missions

Factors	Less than 500	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	More than 10,000	Total	*p value*
The mission of the American community college is always evolving.						
Mean Rank	13.75	9.00	9.50	4.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.346
The mission statement of the community college should guide and influence the …						
Mean Rank	15.00	11.40	8.00	1.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.028
Because of their mission, community colleges have a fidelity to their students' …						
Mean Rank	5.75	12.40	11.00	6.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.207
The mission statement of my institution is up to date						
Mean Rank	4.38	14.20	10.72	5.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.031
The mission of my institution meets many needs of the people that it serves						
Mean Rank	6.38	12.10	10.83	1.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.063
The mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed …						
Mean Rank	11.00	10.10	9.67	8.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.964
The history of community colleges is favorable to offering CCB programs						
Mean Rank	11.75	6.80	11.28	7.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.346
The community college mission of remediation is greater than the mission of …						
Mean Rank	11.00	7.40	11.11	9.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.614
The mission of the community colleges varies from location to location.						
Mean Rank	14.00	6.80	10.61	4.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.134
The mission of the community college is limited to two year degrees, technical …						
Mean Rank	8.13	13.30	8.72	12.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.386

57

Table 7 compares institution size with CCB programs potential influence on current missions (survey questions from Part D). In regards to the survey statement "Offering CCB programs will positively influence the mission of the community colleges in Mississippi" the institution size value was p < .502. Rankings for this question are as follows: Administrators at small institutions (less than 500 students) received the highest rank (*r=12.00*), followed by administrators at institutions serving 2,000-4,999 students (*r=11.80*), administrators at instructions with 5,000-9,000 students were next (*r=8.44*), and last were administrators at institutions with 10,000 or more students (*r=7.00*).

In regards to if CCB programs are an important part of community college growth in Mississippi mean ranks are as follows: Administrators at institutions with 2,000 – 4,999 students received the highest rank (*r=13.20*), followed by administrators at institutions with less than 500 students (*r=9.25*), the third largest rank was received by administrators with more than 10,000 students (*r=9.00*), and the lowest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,000 students (*r=8.67*). The value for this statistic was p < .472.

The rankings in regards to if offering CCB programs will take funding away from current programs are as follows: Administrators at institutions with less than 500 students received the highest rank (r=13.00), followed by administrators at institutions with 5,000 – 9,999 students (r=10.83), the third highest rank was received by administrators at institutions with more than 10,000 students, and the lowest rank was received by administrators at institutions with 2,000 – 4,999 students (*r=5.20*).

58

Table 7

Size of Institution Ranks on CCB Programs Potential Influence on Current Missions

Factors	Less than 500	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	More than 10,000	Total	*p value*
Offering CCB programs will positively influence the mission(s) of community colleges…						
Mean Rank	12.00	11.80	8.44	7.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.502
CCB programs are an important part of community college growth in Mississippi.						
Mean Rank	9.25	13.20	8.67	9.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.472
CCB programs will help Mississippi community colleges reach their goals more …						
Mean Rank	9.63	14.00	8.00	9.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.251
CCB programs will positively effect my institution and/or the community it serves.						
Mean Rank	7.63	13.50	9.39	7.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.353
Offering CCB programs will expand the mission of institution in a positive way.						
Mean Rank	9.90	9.90	11.44	7.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.148
I feel that providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges in Mississippi…						
Mean Rank	10.88	7.30	11.17	9.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.606
Offering CCB programs will take funding away from current programs.						
Mean Rank	13.00	5.20	10.83	8.50		
Frequency	3	5	9	1	19	
p value						.137
CCB programs will have a negative effect on the open admissions policy of …						
Mean Rank	6.83	9.60	10.11	11.50		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.764
Most community colleges that offer CCB programs want to become 4-year …						
Mean Rank	9.67	6.10	10.94	13.00		
Frequency	4	5	9	1	19	
p value						.302

Length of Tenure

      Table 8 compares length of time in community college sector with administrator perceptions of CCB programs (survey questions from Part B). When the Kruskal Wallis test was rendered to establish if there were any relationships between tenure and the survey statement "CCB programs in Mississippi would be the only realistic option for a significant number of students to obtain baccalaureate degrees" the results are as follows: administrators who worked the least amount of time in the community college sector (less than 5 years) received the highest rank *(r=22.50)*. The next highest rank was received by administrators in the 5-9 year range (*r=13.50*); followed by the 10-15 year range (*r=11.67*). The fourth lowest rank was received by administrators in the more than 20 year group (*r=10.50*), and the lowest rank was received by administrators in the 16-20 year range. The value rendered for this survey statement was *p > .165*.

      Mean ranks in regards to whether Mississippi should pilot CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions are as follows: Administrators at institutions less than 5 years received the highest rank (r=20.50), the second highest rank was received by administrators with 10-15 years of experience (r=16.17), the third highest rank was received by administrators with 16-20 years experience (r=14.00), the fourth highest rank was received by administrators with 5-9 years experience, and the lowest rank was received by administrators with 20+ years of experience. The value calculated for this statistic is p < .021, indicating that there is a significant difference in administrator perceptions per length of time in the community college sector.

Table 8

Length of Time in Community College Sector Ranks on Perception of CCB programs

Factors	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	10-15 years	16-20 years	20+ years	Total	*p value*
CCB programs in Mississippi would be the only realistic option for a significant number…							
Mean Rank	22.50	13.50	11.67	10.17	10.50		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.165
It is the community college's responsibility to offer baccalaureate degrees if students…							
Mean Rank	20.00	12.67	11.33	14.00	10.57		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.474
It is feasible for Mississippi legislation to approve CCB programs in the state by the …							
Mean Rank	7.50	11.00	9.60	14.83	14.64		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.475
There is strong support for CCB programs across the state of Mississippi…							
Mean Rank	5.00	12.25	11.50	15.00	14.64		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.388
Mississippi should pilot CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions.							
Mean Rank	20.50	11.00	16.17	14.00	6.29		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.021
There are too many undetermined factors related to CCB programs at this time.							
Mean Rank	6.75	10.00	11.25	12.50	17.36		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.193

Table 9 compares length of time in the community college sector with administrator opinions of the community college mission (survey questions in Part C). In regards to whether the mission of the American community college is always evolving the mean ranks are as follows: Administrators with less than 5-9 years receive the highest rank (*r=17.42*), the second highest rank was received by administrators with 16-20 years experience (*r=15.83*), the third highest rank was received by administrators with less than

61

5 years experience ($r=14.25$), the fourth highest rank was received by administrators with 10-15 years experience ($r=12.83$), and the lowest rank was received by administrators with 20+ years of experience ($r=6.07$). The value calculated for this statistic is p < .027, which indicateds a significant difference.

A significant difference was also indicated in regards to the mission statement guiding and influencing the culture of the institution on a daily basis. The value for this statistic is p < .045. Mean ranks are as follows: Administrators with 5-9 years experience received the highest rank ($r=18.50$), the second highest rank was received by administrators with 10-15 ($r=12.75$) years experience and administrators with less than 5 years experience ($r=12.75$), the third highest rank was received by administrators with 16-20 years experience ($r=10.83$), and the lowest rank was received by administrators with 20+ years of experience ($r=7.79$).

Table 9

Length of Time in Community College Sector Ranks on Community College Mission

Factors	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	10-15 years	16-20 years	20+ years	Total	*p value*
The mission of the American community college is always evolving							
Mean Rank	14.25	17.42	12.83	15.83	6.07		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.027
The mission statement of a community college should guide and influence the culture…							
Mean Rank	12.75	18.50	12.75	10.83	7.79		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.045
Because of their mission, community colleges have a fidelity to their students' need…							
Mean Rank	9.75	10.00	14.00	16.50	12.43		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.616
The mission statement of my institution is up to date.							
Mean Rank	7.25	14.50	11.75	8.67	14.57		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.471
The mission of my institution meets many needs of the people that it serves.							
Mean Rank	6.00	15.25	10.42	13.50	13.36		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.395
The mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed by the …							
Mean Rank	16.50	10.08	10.33	18.17	12.86		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.298
The history of community colleges is favorable to offering CCB programs.							
Mean Rank	18.50	14.17	12.17	11.50	10.07		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.523
The community college mission of remediation is greater than the mission of continued…							
Mean Rank	12.00	12.67	12.67	12.00	12.57		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							1.000
The mission of the community college varies from location to location. Therefore, CCB …							
Mean Rank	16.75	15.17	11.83	15.17	8.43		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.257
The mission of the community college is limited to two-year degrees, technical degrees …							
Mean Rank	2.50	10.25	14.50	11.00	16.21		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.104

63

Table 10 displays data related to Administrators length of time in the community college sector and how it may influence their opinions of CCB programs influence on Current Missions (survey questions in Part D). In regards to CCB programs taking funding away from current programs, the ranks are as follows: Administrators with 20+ of years experience received the highest rank ($r=12.64$), the second highest rank was received by administrators with 5-9 years of experience ($r=12.33$), the third highest rank was received by administrators with 10-15 years of experience ($r=11.80$), the fourth highest rank was received by administrator with 16-20 years of experience ($r=11.50$), the lowest rank was received by administrators with less than 5 years of experience ($r=10.00$). The value calculated for this statistic is $p < .990$.

Data related to the survey statement "CCB programs will positively affect my institution and/or the community serves" received the following ranks. Administrators with less than 5 years of experience received the highest rank ($r=15.50$), the second highest rank was received by administrators with 5-9 years of experience ($r=13.75$), the third highest rank was received by administrators with 10-15 years of experience ($r=12.75$), the fourth highest rank was received by administrators with 20+ years of experience ($r=11.21$). and the lowest rank was received by administrators with 16 -20 years of experience ($r=10.50$). The value calculated for this statistic is $p < .891$.

Table 10

Length of Time in Community College Sector Ranks on CCB Potential Influence on

Current Missions

Factors	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	10-15 years	16-20 years	20+ years	Total	*p value*
Offering CCB programs will positively influence the mission(s) of community colleges in …							
Mean Rank	19.00	12.33	13.67	10.00	10.86		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.546
CCB programs are an important part of community college growth in Mississippi.							
Mean Rank	19.00	13.92	11.17	11.17	11.14		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.598
CCB programs will positively affect my institution and/or the community it serves.							
Mean Rank	15.50	13.75	12.75	10.50	11.21		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.891
CCB programs will help Mississippi community colleges reach their goals more …							
Mean Rank	21.00	11.08	12.50	12.50	11.29		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.421
Offering CCB programs will expand the mission of my institution in a positive way.							
Mean Rank	16.50	15.67	12.17	13.50	8.50		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.322
Offering CCB programs will require a significant change in my institution's mission …							
Mean Rank	10.00	9.67	16.17	18.83	9.79		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.149
I feel that providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges in Mississippi may …							
Mean Rank	12.75	10.58	11.67	15.17	13.64		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.865
Offering CCB programs will take funding away from current programs.							
Mean Rank	10.00	12.33	11.80	11.50	12.64		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.990
CCB programs will have a negative effect on the open admissions policy of Mississippi…							
Mean Rank	5.50	10.00	15.10	13.50	12.71		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.385
Most community colleges that offer CCB programs want to become 4-year institutions							
Mean Rank	14.75	7.83	13.10	17.50	11.64		
Frequency	2	6	6	3	7	24	
p value							.250

65

Research Question 4 Data Summary

A review of each *p* value displayed on Tables 5 – 10 show there was a significant difference found between institution size and questions related administrator perceptions of CCB programs. A significant difference was also found between length of time in the community college sector and questions related to administrator perceptions of CCB programs and administrator perceptions of CCB programs potential influence on the community college mission.

Chapter Summary

Chapter four presented the results of the statistical analysis along with a discussion of data. The research questions were examined according to the statistical data taken from the online survey.

Research Question 1: According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, how does offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi? Data collected in regards to research question one show that administrators are overwhelmingly neutral in regards to this aspect, however, descriptive statistics show that administrators believe that CCB programs will have an influence on the mission Mississippi community colleges although they do not clearly indicate through which mechanisms.

Research Question 2: How do administrators in Mississippi community colleges define the mission of community colleges in Mississippi? Data collected in regards to research question two indicate that administrators surveyed define the mission as evolving and student centered, however, they do not believe that mission should focus on student need only while ignore other significant factors.

66

Research Question 3: According to administrators in Mississippi community colleges, might offering CCB programs influence the mission of community colleges in Mississippi? Data collected and interpreted through descriptive statistics in regards to research question three indicate that administrators surveyed believe that offering CCB programs will influence the mission; however respondents had a neutral response on whether the influence would cause mission creep or evolution.

Research Question 4: Do administrator perceptions of CCB programs differ based on institution size and/or the length of time the administrator has worked in a community college? Data collected in regards to research question four show that there is a potential relationship between administrator perceptions of CCB programs based on institution size as well as the length of time the administrator has worked in a community college.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, conclusions are drawn in order to answer the proposed research

questions laid out in the beginning of this study. The findings from this study are

discussed for each research question along with comparisons from the findings of

previous research and then conclusions are made.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study present perspectives of the 27 administrators from the

three colleges in Mississippi who chose to participate in the study regarding CCB

programs, the mission of community colleges, and the influence of CCB programs on

community college missions. Participants ranged from 18 years of age to 56 years and

older; the median age range was from 46-55 years old. Women composed the majority of

the participants at 44%; men made up 36% of the participants, and 20% of the

participants chose not to disclose their gender. The average respondent had been

employed at their institution between 12-16 years. The most common institution size was

5,000-9,999 students.

The purpose of the study was to examine administrator perceptions of CCB

programs, how they relate to the community college mission in the state of Mississippi,

and if CCB programs would induce mission creep if introduced to community colleges

throughout the state. Furthermore, the study set out to establish if there was a significant

68

connection between institution size, length of time employed in the community college sector, and perceptions of CCB programs.

The findings of this study indicate that the majority of administrators (66.7%) do not firmly believe they have significant knowledge of CCB programs, but more than half of the respondents (56.2%) were favorable to CCB programs being offered across the nation. Interestingly enough, 75% of the respondents believed that CCB programs would increase baccalaureate attainment in the state of Mississippi. The findings also show that the respondents were reluctant to take a strong position on whether or not community colleges that offer CCB programs wish to eventually become 4-year institutions, with 43.5% selecting neutral as their choice.

This study also indicates that administrators in Mississippi recognize the benefits of offering CCB programs, but do not want CCB programs to take away from the well-established statewide higher education system through mission creep. The findings also show that administrators who have spent more than 20 years in the community college sector are more likely to believe that remediation is a greater community college mission than offering baccalaureate degrees. The need for remediation is recognized by all levels of employment tenure but is more prominent in the 20+ years demographic.

The findings of this study show that 70% of respondents believe that the missions of community colleges are always evolving. This statistics show that the majority of administrators expect for a community college to change or alter its mission during the life of the institution. At 81.5%, administrators also overwhelmingly believe that the community college mission should guide and influence the culture of the institution on a daily basis. It is evident that administrators believe that a community college mission

69

should not only be evolving, but at the same it should continue to lead and influence the direction the institution must take.

Comparison to Previous Findings

In Davis' (2012) study of administrator perceptions of CCB program, she found that approximately 97% of the administrators had heard of CCB programs, but more than half had no involvement with those types of programs. Her research is echoed in the findings of this study; many administrators are aware of CCB programs, but do not have any involvement or concrete knowledge of how such programs or implemented. As a result, this can lead to opposition of said programs as described in Rogers' (1962) diffusion of innovations theory.

A previous study (Martinez, 2014) shows that when the administrators believe that CCB programs are in line with their community college's mission, they are more receptive of their implications and implementations. The results of data presented in relation to Research Question 2 support the findings of Martinez (2014).

For many years, community colleges that chose to offer CCB programs were looked upon in a negative light (Rice, 2015). However, as the need for specialized baccalaureates within specific fields and job markets have continued to grow (McKee, 2005), CCB programs are becoming more widely accepted throughout the United States. In spite of this paradigm shift, Mississippi is one of the remaining states that have not embraced the idea of CCB programs, in spite of its statistical deficiency in regards to baccalaureate degree holding citizens (Williams, 2010).

70

Limitations

The findings of this research lack external validity. Because so few administrators were studied, the results cannot be generalized to the population. However, given that distinct types of administrators were identified, it is likely that the information collected will be informative and useful to community college decision makers.

One might question the fact that the numbers and types of participants surveyed at each institution were not consistent. The researcher was not able to select respondents due to the anonymity of the survey. Therefore, the types of administrators available limited the responses during the weeks of fall mid-terms when the survey was available. Because there is no significant difference between institution size and administrators opinions as well as length of time as a community college administrator and opinions towards CCB programs, future researchers can further this study by focusing in on the individual survey questions and seeking to understand why administrators made their selections.

The institution size could be misrepresented because it was not clearly defined. Many of the community colleges in Mississippi have satellite campuses that vary in size. Therefore, administrators could have chosen a smaller number of students per institution size based on the location they were administering versus the size of the school with all satellite campuses combined.

Recommendations For Future Research

It is recommended for future research that a wide scale status of Mississippi community college administrators be studied in order to ascertain the true perception of CCB programs across the state of Mississippi. In addition, it is recommended that this

71

study be replicated with more than one researcher and at least 300 administrators from a minimum of 8 community colleges throughout the state. It would be ideal for all 15 community colleges to participate in this study in order to attain generalized conclusions from collected data. It is also recommended that future researchers repeat this study and test for relationships between all five demographic values instead of only two as carried out in this current research. The addition of administrator interviews would provide a deeper understanding of opinions in regards to CCB programs, and is recommended for future research.

Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

It is recommended that practitioners and policymakers strongly consider the benefits of CCB programs. The results of this research show that administrators from the sample population have a positive perception of CCB programs and believe that they would be a beneficial addition to the Mississippi 2-year college system. However, practitioners and policymakers should be cautious about how regulations for CCB programs are implemented. As suggested in the survey, a pilot program should be introduced at one or two of Mississippi's more flexible community colleges.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50,* 179-211.

Ashford, E. (2013). More community colleges confer bachelor's degrees, *The Community College Daily.* Retrieved from http://www.ccdaily.com/Pages/Campus-Issues/More-community-colleges-conferring-bachelor%E2%80%99s-degrees.aspx

Bemmel, E. P., Floyd, D. L., & Bryan, V. C. (2009). Perceptions and Reflections of Administrators: Community Colleges Transitioning to Baccalaureate Colleges. *Community College Journal Of Research & Practice*, *33*(2), 151-176.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

College Week, 13 (18), 4 – 5 .

Commission on Colleges Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2001). *Principles of accreditation.* Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org /pdf/PrinciplesOfAccreditation.PDF

73

Commission on the Future of Higher Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Cook, A. (2000). *Community college baccalaureate degrees: A delivery model for the Future?* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED439765).

Davis, K. A. (2012). *Faculty perceptions of educational innovation as it pertains to the community college baccalaureate degree* (Order No. 3499679). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (945732963).

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Easton, D. (1965). *A framework for political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Eaton, J. S. (2005). Why community colleges shouldn't offer baccalaureates. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *52* (10), B25.

Elkins, S. A., Braxton, J. M., & James, G. W. (2000). Tinto's Separation Stage and Its Influence on First-Semester College Student Persistence. *Research In Higher Education, 41*(2), 251.

Falconettie, A. M. (2009). The perceived effects of state governance decentralization on baccalaureate articulation. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(2), 177-194.

Fartherree, B., & Tenhet, N. (2007). Hinds community college. In Mississippi
    Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Ed.), *The Mississippi public
    community and junior college story: 1972-2002* (pp. 69-83). Jackson, MS:
    University Press of Mississippi.

Floyd, D. L, & Arnauld, C. (2007). An exploratory study of community college
    baccalaureate teacher education programs. *Community College Review, 33*(1), 66-
    84.

Floyd, D. L, Hrabak, M., & Falconetti, A. M. (2008). Introduction to the special issue on
    the community college baccalaureate. *Community College Journal of Research
    and Practice, 33*(2), 85-89.

Floyd, D. L. (2005). The Community College Baccalaureate in the U.S.: Models,
    Programs, and Issues. In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The
    Community College Baccalaureate: Emerging Trends & Policy Issues* (pp. 25 –
    47). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Floyd, D. L. (2006). Achieving the baccalaureate through the community college. *New
    Directions for Community Colleges, 135*, 59 – 72.

Floyd, D. L., Felsher, R. A., & Catullo, L. (2007). Graduate Education Issues and
    Challenges: Community College Applied and Workforce Baccalaureates. New
    Directions For Community Colleges, 2007 (158), 95-101.

Floyd, D. L., & Skolnik, M. L. (2005). Perspectives on the community college
    baccalaureate. In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik, & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The
    community college baccalaureate: Emerging trends and policy issues* (pp. 1-7).
    Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Floyd, D. L., & Walker, D. A. (2008). Community college teacher education: A typology, challenging issues, and state views. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27*, 643-663.

Floyd, D. L., & Walker, D. A. (2009). The community college baccalaureate: putting the pieces together. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(2), 90.

Floyd, D. L., Hrabak, M., & Falconetti, A. M. (2009a). Introduction to the special issue on the community college baccalaureate. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(2), 195-202.

Floyd, D. L., Skolnik, M. L., & Walker, K. P. (2005). *The community college baccalaureate: Emerging trends & policy issues*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Henderson, C. E. (2014). *The community college baccalaureate degree in the united states: An event history analysis* (Order No. 3638004). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (1615365950)

Hofland, B. S. (2011). *A case study of the community college baccalaureate: What happened in ten years?*(Order No. 3466789). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (885430207)

Hollingsworth, S. S. (2010). *The accreditation process in mississippi from the perspective of community college administrators* (Order No. 3398525

Hornor, M. (1998). *Diffusion of innovation theory.* Retrieved from http://www.disciplewalk.com/files/Marianne_S_Hornor.p df

Jones, S. L. (2006). *A study of the perceptions of Mississippi legislators regarding the mission and goals of Mississippi community and junior colleges*. Mississippi State: Mississippi State University, 2006.

Koseff, A. (2015). California community colleges board approves 15 pilot bachelor's degrees *Sacbee.* Retrieved from http://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article7780146.html

Leff, L. (2015). California community colleges to offer bachelor's degrees. *The Washington Times (online)*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jan/20/california-to-select-4-year-community-colleges/

Levin, J. S. (2002). *Institutional identity: The community college as a baccalaureate degree granting institution*. Sacramento, CA: Association for the Study of Higher Education. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED474578)

Levin, S. L. (1998). *Organizational change in the community college: A ripple or a sea change?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lorenzo, A. L. (2005). The university center: A collaborative approach to baccalaureate degrees. In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik, & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The community college baccalaureate: Emerging trends & policy issues* (pp. 73–93.) Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Marcus, J. (2014). Community Colleges Increasingly Adding Bachelor's Degrees. *Community College Week*, *26*(21), 7.

Martinez, M. C. (2014, August). Meeting the challenges of population growth and the future demand for postsecondary education: Considerations for state higher education policy. *Education Commission of the States,* 2-11.

Mills, K. (Winter 2003). Community college baccalaureates: Some critics decry the trend as "mission creep". *National CrossTalk*. Retrieved from http://www.highereducation.org/crosstalk/ct0103/news0103-community.shtml

Musgrove, R. (2007). Foreword. In Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Ed.), *The Mississippi public community and junior college story: 1972-2002*. (pp. ix). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi

Nail, E. L. (2013). *The community college baccalaureate: Assessing student perceptions at one rural mississippi community college* (Order No. 3603467). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (1469609589).

Painter, N. I. (2008). High School and Community College Historians and the OAH.. (cover story). *OAH Newsletter*,*36*(1), 1-6.

Peaslee, J. (2014). Creating and Sustaining an Appreciative Culture in a Community College from 2006 to 2014.*AI Practitioner*, *16*(2), 78-84.

Pluvoise, D. (2008). *Community college no longer? Harper college's effort to gain baccalaureate-granting status has sparked a debate in Illinois over the mission of two-year colleges*. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0WMX/is_4_25/ai_n25339056/

Rice, J. P. (2007). *Mission metamorphosis: How community college bachelor degree programs influence the traditional community college mission* (Order No. 3274575). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (304720698).

Rogers, E. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Rogers, E. (1997). *A history of communication study: A biographical approach.* New York: Free Press.

Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.

Russell, A. Update on the community college baccalaureate degree: Evolving trends and issues. *American Association of State Colleges and Schools.* Retrieved from http://congressweb.com/aascu/docfiles/AASCU_Update_Community_College_Baccalaureate.pdf

Skolnik, M. L. (2008): Theorizing about the emergence of the community college baccalaureate. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(2), 125-150.

Skolnik, M. L., & Floyd, D. L. (2005). The community college baccalaureate: Toward an agenda for policy and research. In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The community college baccalaureate: Emerging trends and policy issues* (pp. 191-198). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Townsend, B. K., Bragg, D. D., & Ruud, C. M. (2008). *The adult learner and the applied baccalaureate: National and state-by-state inventory*. Retrieved from http://education.missouri.edu/orgs/cccr/projects.php

Townsend, B. K. (2005). *A cautionary view.* In D. L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik, & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *Community college baccalaureate: Emerging trends and policy issues* (pp. 179 – 190). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

79

Vaughn, G. B. (2000). *The community college story.* Washington, DC: American

    Association of Community Colleges.

Vaughn, G. B. (2006). *The community college story* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American

    Association of Community Colleges.

Walker, K. P. (1997). Should community colleges offer bachelor's degrees? *Community*

    College Times, 9(21), 13-18.

Walker, K. P. (1999). Workforce bachelor's degree. *Presidency, 2*(3), 27-30.

Walker, K. P. (2000a). The community college baccalaureate degree. *Trustee Quarterly,*

    13-16.

Walker, K. P. (2000b). Reinventing the community college. *On The Horizon, 8*(4), 10-11.

Walker, K. P. (2001). An open door to the bachelor's degree. *Leadership Abstracts, 4*(2),

    1-4.

Walker, K. P. (2002). Open access to the bachelor's degree: A new paradigm community

    college. *Update*, *13*(2), 1-4.

Walker, K. P. (2005). History, rationale, and the community college baccalaureate

    association. In D.L. Floyd, M. L. Skolnik, & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The community*

    college baccalaureate: Emerging trends and policy issues (pp. 1-7). Sterling, VA:

    Stylus.

Walker, K. P., & Floyd, D. L. (2005). Applied and workforce baccalaureates. In D. L.

    Floyd, M. L. Skolnik & K. P. Walker (Eds.), *The community college*

    baccalaureate: Emerging trends and policy issues (pp. 95-102). Sterling, VA:

    Stylus Publishing.

Wattenbarger , J. (2000). Colleges should stick to what they do best. *Community College Week, 13*(18), 4-5.

Wesse, D. J. (2012). *The Influence of the Introduction of Baccalaureate Degree Programs on the Awarding of Associate Degrees at Public Community Colleges.*

Williams, J. B. (2010). Assessing the need for community college baccalaureate degree programs in mississippi (Order No. 3424893). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (757364269).

Young, A. L. (2010). *The Regional Accreditation Process At Community Colleges: A Case Study Of Effectiveness.*

Young, J. B., & Ewing, J. M. (1978). *The Mississippi public junior college story: The first fifty years, 1922-1972.* Jackson, MS: The University Press of Mississippi

APPENDIX A

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PART A
Participant Demographics

Instructions: Please select the appropriate box for each of the following items	
#1 Which of the following describes your age range? o 18-24 o 25-35 o 36-45 o 46-55 o 56 or older	#2 How long have you been employed at your current institution? o Less than 5 years o 5-9 years o 10-15 years o 16-20 years o More than 20 years
#3 What is the approximate size of your institution (FTE)? o Less than 500 students o 500-1999 students o 2000-4999 students o 5000-9999 students o More than 10,000 students o Do not wish to answer	#4 How long have you worked in the community college sector? o Less than 5 years o 5-9 years o 10-15 years o 16-20 years o More than 20 years #5 What is your gender? o Male o Female o Do not wish to answer

PART B
Perception of Community College Baccalaureate Programs

Item Number	**Instructions:** Please choose the number that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please answer every question. There is no right or wrong answer.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
#6	I have a significant knowledge of CCB programs.	O	O	O	O	O
#7	I have a significant knowledge of CCB implementation.	O	O	O	O	O
#8	I support CCB programs being offered at community colleges across the nation.	O	O	O	O	O
#9	I personally know (a) community college administrator(s) with CCB programs at their institution.	O	O	O	O	O
#10	I believe that CCB programs would increase baccalaureate degree access/attainment in Mississippi.	O	O	O	O	O
#11	CCB programs in Mississippi would be the only realistic option for a significant number of students to obtain baccalaureate degrees.	O	O	O	O	O
#12	It is the community college's responsibility to offer baccalaureate degrees if students express that there is a need.	O	O	O	O	O
#13	It is feasible for Mississippi legislation to approve CCB programs in the state by the 2016/2017 school year.	O	O	O	O	O
#14	There is strong support for CCB programs across the state of Mississippi.	O	O	O	O	O
#15	Mississippi should pilot CCB programs at a few (1-2) institutions.	O	O	O	O	O
#16	There are too many undetermined factors related to CCB programs at this time.	O	O	O	O	O

84

PART C
Community College Mission

Item Number	**Instructions:** Please choose the number that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please answer every question. There is no right or wrong answer.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
#17	The mission of the American community college is always evolving.	O	O	O	O	O
#18	The mission statement of a community college should guide and influence the culture of the institution on a daily basis.	O	O	O	O	O
#19	Because of their mission, community colleges have a fidelity to their students' need above all else.	O	O	O	O	O
#20	The mission statement of my institution is up to date.	O	O	O	O	O
#21	The mission of my institution meets many needs of the people that it serves.	O	O	O	O	O
#22	The mission of the community college is to meet any and all needs expressed by the community.	O	O	O	O	O
#23	The history of community colleges is favorable to offering CCB programs.	O	O	O	O	O
#24	The community college mission of remediation is greater than the mission of continued education (specifically baccalaureate attainment).	O	O	O	O	O
#25	The mission of the community colleges varies from location to location. Therefore, CCB programs may be good for some institutions, but not for others.	O	O	O	O	O
#26	The mission of the community college is limited to two-year degrees, technical degrees, and certificates only.	O	O	O	O	O

PART D
Community College Baccalaureate Potential Influence on Current Missions

Item Number	**Instructions:** Please choose the number that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please answer every question. There is no right or wrong answer.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
#27	Offering CCB programs will positively influence the mission(s) of community colleges in Mississippi.	O	O	O	O	O
#28	CCB programs are an important part of community college growth in Mississippi.	O	O	O	O	O
#29	CCB programs will help Mississippi community colleges reach their goals more effectively.	O	O	O	O	O
#30	CCB programs will positively affect my institution and/or the community it serves.	O	O	O	O	O
#31	Offering CCB programs will expand the mission of my institution in a positive way.	O	O	O	O	O
#32	Offering CCB programs will require a significant change in my institution's mission statement.	O	O	O	O	O
#33	I feel that providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges in Mississippi may compromise the community college's core values (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and/or responsiveness).	O	O	O	O	O
#34	Offering CCB programs will take funding away from current programs.	O	O	O	O	O
#35	CCB programs will have a negative effect on the open admissions policy of Mississippi community colleges.	O	O	O	O	O
#36	Most community colleges that offer CCB programs want to become 4-year institutions.	O	O	O	O	O

APPENDIX B

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Protocol Title: Administrator perceptions of the community college mission in the state of Mississippi and how it may be influenced by the addition of community college baccalaureate programs

Protocol Number: 15-239

Principal Investigator: Mr. Scharvin Grizzell

Date of Determination: 7/22/2015

Qualifying Exempt Category: 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2)

Attachments: Stamped informed consent in separate email

Dear Mr. Grizzell:

The Human Research Protection Program has determined the above referenced project exempt from IRB review.

Please note the following:

Retain a copy of this correspondence for your records.

An approval stamp is required on all informed consents. You must use the stamped consent form for obtaining consent from participants.

Only the MSU staff and students named on the application are approved as MSU investigators and/or key personnel for this study! .

The approved study will expire on 5/31/2016, which was the completion date indicated on your application. If additional time is needed, submit a continuation request. (SOP 01-07 Continuing Review of Approved Applications)

Any modifications to the project must be reviewed and approved by the HRPP prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project.

Per university requirement, all research-related records (e.g. application materials, letters of support, signed consent forms, etc.) must be retained and available for audit for a period of at least 3 years after the research has ended.

It is the responsibility of the investigator to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This determination is issued under the Mississippi State University's OHRP Federal! wide Assurance #FWA00000203. All forms and procedures can be found on the HRPP website: www.orc.msstate.edu.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at nmorse@orc.msstate.edu or call 662-325-5220.

Finally, we would greatly appreciate your feedback on the HRPP approval process. Please take a few minutes to complete our survey at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PPM2FBP.