# Iowa State University Digital Repository

2007

# An assessment of leadership development programs for employees in Iowa's community colleges

Karen J. Vickers
*Iowa State University*

## Recommended Citation

www.manaraa.com

**An assessment of leadership development programs for employees
in Iowa's community colleges**

by

Karen J. Vickers

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major:  Education (Higher Education)

Program of Study Committee:
Larry H. Ebbers, Major Professor
Robert J. Barak
Sharon K. Drake
Daniel C. Robinson
Mack C. Shelley II

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2007

UMI Number: 3274902

UMI

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

## ABSTRACT

The development of potential leaders for the community college system is critical for their continued success.  Research has indicated that many community college administrative staff are preparing for their retirements.  As current leaders take their leave, it is essential to ensure there are qualified persons stepping forward to continue leading the colleges. Leadership development programs must be in place to assure there are trained leaders to continue the tradition of the community colleges.

The purpose of this study was to describe the impact of two existing leadership development programs on the community college system and its employees in Iowa.  The Leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) and the Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC) have been in place to provide leadership development opportunities to employees with a goal of expanding the base of leaders within the community colleges.  Information was gathered from several sources and a survey was completed to gain initial information from those participating in the two programs.  Focus groups were conducted on three community college campuses, and community college leaders and staff from the two leadership programs were interviewed.  These sources provided a picture of the impact the programs are having on community colleges.

Findings revealed that the participants from the programs are earning promotions, the programs are serving as retention tools for the colleges, participants are continuing their education, the credit earned in the programs is important to the participants, and participants are satisfied with the program topics.

The LINC and CLIC programs are providing opportunities for community college employees to learn about the colleges and leadership needed in the colleges. The programs are preparing the next generation of leaders for the colleges and the continuation of the programs is critical.  This study should be replicated on a regular basis to continue to record the impact the LINC and CLIC programs are having on community college employees.

## CHAPTER 1.  INTRODUCTION

Community colleges were established as American institutions that placed higher education in communities across the United States.  The colleges have built their foundation on training skilled workers for the workforce and providing educational opportunities for their area residents.  The 1947 Truman Commission report published by the President's Commission on Higher Education outlined the need for a network of public community colleges that would provide educational offerings for diverse groups, provide a place for communities to meet, and charge little to no tuition.  This report made "community college" a common term and, soon, previously existing junior colleges were including the term community in their name.

The concept of community colleges became a national network of colleges during the 1960s, with all colleges sharing a common mission of access, comprehensive programming, a community-based philosophy, a commitment to teaching, learning, and lifelong learning (AACC Website, 2007).  There has been incredible growth and success during the first 100 years of the community colleges. Community colleges have become a "primary provider of higher education in the United States.  The 1,100 community colleges in the country enroll 13.5 million students each year with over 800,000 students earning certificates or degrees" (Burnham, 2002. p. 16).

The colleges have worked to provide current training, have expanded their network and have grown in enrollment.  Community colleges serve their communities through making higher education available to all who come to the colleges, the development of training programs for a myriad of occupations and by providing a variety of services to their

communities (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2001). All community colleges strive to be responsive to the needs of their communities and work to meet the demands of the local workforce. In doing so, the community colleges provide a wide array of services for people of all ages and cultures. People can enroll in specialized programs to prepare for the workforce or upgrade current skills. Students can begin work on a bachelor's degree. Students are able to enroll in classes to improve basic skills or classes for personal interest. The colleges also provide a place for nonreaders to learn to read and for speakers of other languages to learn English. Today, community colleges enroll half of the nation's undergraduates, with many more enrolling in noncredit programs. At least one hundred million people have attended community colleges since their establishment in 1901 (AACC Website, 2007). According to Boggs (2003), community colleges have earned the reputation of meeting local needs through their flexibility and emphasis on creativity. While community colleges are relatively young, they have developed into leaders in education as well as leaders in the communities they serve.

Community colleges hold an important position in today's society. Rouche, Baker, and Rose (1989) posited:

> Community colleges are vital to the future of this nation. It will be the community college that will keep America working. It will be the community college that will be able to transfer the technology, developed in partnership between the American corporation and the American university, into operational reality. The diversity of needs of individual communities throughout America is constantly being identified and uniquely addressed by their community colleges. We suggest that the totality of this effort nationwide has established the community college as an essential institution, vital to the health and well-being of this country. (p. 5)

Kemppainen (1999) stated:

> Community colleges in the United States have evolved into one of the most important segments of higher education in the nation. They will continue to grow at an ever-increasing rate as our diverse, multicultural population explores, opportunities to further education and training to meet the growing demands of the workplace. (p. 5)

Kemppainen also reminded readers that the community colleges are often referred to as the "people's colleges" (p. 5).

## A Call for New Leaders

As community colleges celebrated their 100-year anniversary in 2001, a change in leadership appeared to be imminent. Attention turned to the next generation of leaders who would serve as the new leaders in the community college system. Instead of finding a group of eager, up-and-coming leaders, a critical shortage seemed to be present. In a report by Weisman and Vaughan (2002) published by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), it was noted that the average age of sitting presidents at that time was 56.5 years, slightly older than when first reported in 1996. The 2006 Community College President: Career and Lifestyle Survey (2006) reported the average age of sitting presidents was 58 years. Only 10% of current community college presidents are 50 years of age or younger (ACE, 2007). Several reports have disclosed that nearly 45% of the current community college presidents planned to retire by the year 2007 (AACC Website; Anderson, 1997; Barwick, 2002; Boggs, 2003; Campbell & Kacluk, 2002; Evelyn, 2001; Kelly, 2002; Shults, 2001; Wright, 1997).

A closer look at the current leadership has revealed that approximately 80% of those individuals plan to retire by 2010 (Barwick, 2002; Kelly, 2002). Predictions were shared

that, within the next 10 years, community colleges would be replacing 800 of the 1,150 sitting presidents (AACC, 2007). Reports have disclosed that retirements were impacting community colleges at all levels. Community colleges are not only preparing to lose their CEOs but they are also finding that other administrative and faculty leaders are also planning for their retirements (AACC, 2007). Current presidents are reporting that up to 38% of their chief administrators are planning to retire by 2012 (Evelyn, 2001; McClenney, 2001; Shek, 2001). Additionally, faculty are retiring in record numbers. The AACC brought together leaders from community colleges to discuss the pending retirements in the system and to identify the skills needed to successfully lead the colleges. The results of the Leading Forward Summit (2004) revealed that, in addition to the vacancies at the presidential level, there will be 1,800 upper-level administrative positions as well as 30,000 faculty positions that will need to be replaced in the next few years. A more recent study published in 2005 suggested that the number of retirements may have been under-reported and the vacancies will be more that previously believed (O'Banion, 2007). Regardless of the number, the predictions are startling. The challenge to find well-trained leaders will be great.

McClenney (2001) remarked, "...the current leaders of America's community colleges are pondering a daunting task – how to develop and prepare substantial numbers of future leaders who will possess the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics to succeed in a future fraught with both enormous opportunity and unprecedented complexity" (p. 25). She continued: "Clearly, the impending leadership shortage is not limited to the community college presidency alone. The leadership 'pipeline' is also an issue, as the faculty leaders and senior administrators who have contributed so much to building community college programs and traditions have begun to take their leave" (p. 25).

Just as community colleges throughout the nation are anticipating changes in leadership, the state of Iowa is experiencing the impact of retirements in the state's 15 community colleges. Leadership among the colleges has seen great change within the last few years. Community college employees are aging. The Condition of Iowa Community Colleges for 2006, issued by the State Department of Education in 2007, reported that of all community college employees, 22.95% are 55 years of age or older, with an additional 41.61% between the ages of 41 and 55 (p. 45). A study of the workforce needs of the colleges (Ebbers, Wild, & Friedel, 2003) revealed that 38% of Iowa community college administrators will retire by 2010. This represents 58% of those in the positions of president, vice president, provost, or executive deans, and 42% of the directors, coordinators, and managers (Ebbers et al.).

While numerous retirements will impact the community college system, nationwide fewer students have been enrolling in graduate programs to prepare for community college administration. The number of degrees conferred in community college administration declined by 78% between 1983 and 1997 (AACC website, 2004, 2007; Kelly, 2002; Leading Forward website, 2007; Patton, 2004; Shults, 2001; Watts & Hammons, 2002). For many sitting presidents, their path to their position has been by way of graduate school (Kelly, 2002; Kubala & Bailey, 2001; Vaughan, 2001). However, attention to the need for leaders may be making a difference. Dembicki (2006) reported an increase of 35% in the number of Masters degrees and a 31% increase in the number of Doctoral degrees awarded in Higher Education Administration and Community College Leadership programs between 2002 and 2004. Even with these gains, there may be concern regarding the number and quality of potential leaders who have gained the skills and experience needed to lead the colleges.

While some have reported the number of retirements to be a crisis, Barwick (2002) proposed the crisis is not in the number of retirements, but in the diminishing number of potential leaders waiting to fill the positions vacated.  Shults (2001) noted:

> With the retirement of these leaders, inestimable experience and history, as well as an intimate understanding of the community college mission, values, and culture, will disappear, leaving an enormous gap in the collective memory and the leadership of community colleges. (p. 2)

Watts and Hammons (2002) added:

> Community colleges certainly need strong leadership to maintain their overall effectiveness and to maintain their competitive position with four-year institutions in seeking state funding. (p. 60)

> …community colleges have become a vital link between education and the nation's economy.  The next generation of leaders must have the knowledge and skills to maintain that position of prominence. (p. 61)

It is clear that there must be an emphasis on the training of new potential leaders at all levels of the community college (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Amey, VanDerLinden, & Brown, 2002; Barwick, 2002; Carter, Terwilliger, Alfred, Hartleb, & Simone, 2002; Ebbers et al., 2003; Oglesby & Windham, 1996; Shults, 2001).  Retirements will impact not only vacant positions, but also the entire leadership pipeline for community colleges (McClenney, 2001; Shults, 2001).

**Challenge for Leadership**

As community colleges look to the future, questions remain as to the status of its leadership.  Many believe that the next potential generation of leadership is already employed in the community college system and several of those are contemplating their own retirements (Ebbers et al., 2003; McClenney, 2001; McFarland & Ebbers, 1992; Shek, 2001).  If this is the case, from where will the next generation of leaders come?  How will those

individuals be prepared for their new roles?  Are there qualified candidates to fill the

expected vacancies?  What must community colleges do to assure there are skilled leaders for

their future?

Wright (1997) noted that hiring the next generation of leaders will be the most

important task for community colleges today.  It is believed that 90% of the next generation

of community college leaders will come from current midlevel community college staff (ISU

website, 2007).  A look at current community college presidents reveals that 90% came from

within the community college system, while 33% were internal candidates for their positions

(Vaughan, 1998; 2004).  These figures demonstrate how important it is for colleges to begin

looking internally to tap potential leadership.  Successful colleges will be the ones who

identify potential leaders at all levels and provide leadership opportunities for those

individuals (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002).  To ensure new leaders will be in place, it will

be important to provide well-designed training opportunities to reach potential leaders who

are currently in the community college system (Roe & Baker, 1989; Roueche et el., 1989).

The American Association of Community Colleges (2001) revealed that successful colleges

will work to grow their own leadership for all administrative positions. Doing so could

expand the base of potential leaders.

Ebbers, Wild, and Friedel (2003) stressed the importance of providing opportunities

to current community college employees:

> ...Current administrators should be vigilant about identifying and supporting
> faculty who may have a strong acumen for leadership.  Special attention needs
> to be given to identifying persons of color and women who have identified
> leadership attributes.  New models of leadership which allow institutions to
> maintain these heretofore nimble natures must be encouraged to breed within
> a new set of leaders the enthusiasm and desire that was so vital to the creation
> of the community college movement. (p. 236)

While the pending retirements and changes in community college leadership bring challenges, there will also be many opportunities. Boggs (2003) reported that one challenge will be to work to maintain the core mission and values of the community colleges and to create new ways to prepare future leaders to be successful in the current environment. He remarked that the coming changes offer opportunities to bring new leaders to the community colleges who offer new energy, ideas, and perspectives. However, there must also be many opportunities to instill the community college values in new leaders and expand the number of potential leaders within the system.

As the colleges begin to identify new leaders, there is great opportunity to bring greater diversity to the leadership (Campbell & Kacluk, 2002). The number of presidents representing minority groups has increased slowly. In 1998, 12.3% of the sitting presidents represented minority groups (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2001; Kelly, 2002; McClenney, 2001). During the three years between 1995 and 1998, 34.5% of the presidents hired were women while 15.7% hired were from minority groups (McClenney, 2001). The 2007 American College President publication reported that 28.8% of presidencies at community colleges are held by women while minorities comprise only 13.9% of the presidencies. Curtis (2002) revealed that 39% of the second-in-command at community colleges in the country, the most common position held before serving as president, is held by women. These figures offer great potential to expand the diversity of leadership in the country's community colleges.

However and whomever they choose, colleges have great opportunities to identify their new leaders. When looking at the upcoming retirements, Shults (2001) noted, "These retirements will create leadership opportunities for a new generation, but they will also create a leadership gap. To address the gap effectively, community colleges must identify new

leaders and give them the opportunity to acquire and practice the skills they will need to lead colleges in the 21st century" (p. 3). It will be critical to develop new leaders throughout the colleges who understand and embrace the mission and core values of community colleges (Lorenzo, 1998). Watts and Hammons (2002) posited that community colleges must look to strong leaders to continue the effectiveness of the colleges and to maintain the work and reputation of their colleges. If leadership makes a difference to the success of the college, then the preparation of the next generation of leaders is indeed important (Ebbers & McFarlin, 1998).

> Ebbers et al. (2003) noted:
>
> Preparation of leaders for all phases of community college functions will be critical to the continual success of community colleges in the state of Iowa. These individuals will need a rich and varied combination of work experience and educational credentials to provide the leadership needed. They also will need to be aware of local, regional, and national issues in the field of education. (p. 232)

Leadership today is challenging and complicated. Today, leaders have very different roles and responsibilities than earlier leaders (Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002). Community colleges will face a variety of challenges that will call for strong leadership. The environment is changing quickly and the challenges vary from year to year, which makes preparing for leadership difficult and ever-changing (Evans, 1998). The colleges will need strong, well-trained leaders to address the challenges before them.

The key for many colleges will be to ensure there are well-trained potential leaders ready to lead their colleges. The challenges for many colleges will be how best to structure the training, offer the opportunity to potential leaders, and know which process is most effective.

**Leadership development programs**

Few formal training programs existed for leaders during the first 15-20 years of the community colleges. Many of the leaders came to the community colleges from secondary school systems (Burnham, 2002). In 1959, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation established a community college leadership program at 10 major universities to prepare leaders for the community college system (McClenney, 2001). The Junior/Community College Leadership Fellows Program identified the unique skills needed to successfully lead a community college (Burnham, 2002). The program stressed the skills needed to represent instructional issues as well as operational management and prepared many of the early leaders who provided leadership during the early years of the community college movement. McClenney (2001) stated that the program "...produced a generation of leaders who have built community colleges into a major force in American society" (p. 26). When the fellows program came to a close in 1974, 485 fellows had been trained for community college leadership (Burnham, 2002).

Current literature has revealed that graduate programs, in-house programs, and certificate programs are the three primary ways to prepare future leaders (Manzo, 2003; Shults, 2001; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Additionally, programs have been developed by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) to assist in the development of future leaders. A project funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation has led to additional attention to leadership development programs. The project, Leading Forward, has outlined recommendations to help enhance leadership development in community colleges. With a focus on new leaders, the project is offering insight regarding ways colleges can cultivate new leadership and provide the needed skill sets for future leaders.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to review two existing leadership programs established and offered through Iowa State University (ISU).  The Leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) was developed in 1989 with the goal to "grow leaders" and expand the diversity of leadership for the community college system in Iowa. Developed through a partnership with ISU, the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees (IACCT) and the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents (IACCP), the program strives to develop women and people of color for leadership positions in the community college system.  The stated goal of the program is to "provide participants with academic and internship opportunities designed to encourage the advancement of women and people of color into administrative leadership roles within the Iowa community college system" (Ebbers, Coyan, & Kelly, 1992, p. 9; Ebbers, Gallisath, Rockel, & Coyan, 2000, p. 326; ISU Website, 2007).

The LINC program is designed to encourage personal exploration and the development of a network of others working in the community college system.  The objectives of the program include gaining a better understanding of the state and local governance and funding systems, exploring the role of the president and their responsibility to internal and external constituencies, to better understand the intended role of community colleges, and to improve management and communication skills (ISU Web site, 2007).

The program brings participants together for one and one-half days each month during the academic year.  Most participants are employees of Iowa community colleges, and participants represent a variety of positions within the colleges, including upper-level administrative positions, mid-level positions, entry-level positions, and non-administrative

positions. Graduate credit can be awarded for the experience in the program. Since the beginning of the program, 275 participants from all 15 Iowa community colleges have taken part in the LINC program (ISU Website, 2007). Recently, participants from other colleges in the Midwest as well as staff from the Iowa Department of Education have been included in the program.

Program participants are introduced to state and national leaders, and are able to explore the current topics and challenges important to community colleges. Leadership models are studied and participants are encouraged to evaluate their own leadership styles. (Ebbers et al., 1992, 2000). While participating in LINC, participants observe meetings of the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents as well as the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees to learn more about how these two groups work to provide leadership in the state. Additionally, participants study the characteristics and behaviors of leaders as well as the roles, traits, behaviors, and responsibilities of leaders. Participants explore organizational structure, culture, rules, and regulations and learn from current leaders what they believe leads to their success. They also study the concept of leadership, roles of leaders, and the characteristics of exemplary leaders. Furthermore, participants have the opportunity to listen to a variety of leaders and observe the different styles of leadership. Networking and the opportunity to establish a support group adds to the participants' learning experience. Participants spend time assessing their strengths and are provided the opportunity to set career and personal goals, create new resumes, and learn about successful interview techniques. Increased self-worth and self confidence, as well as an insight to their own career goals, have been reported as outcomes for those participating in the program (Ebbers et al., 1992, 2000).

As the LINC program has emerged, men have been included in the program. The program has developed into an "entry-level" program with a primary focus on the Iowa community college system. The program has become one that strives to build skills for those interested in leadership positions (Ebbers personal interview, 11/1/06).

The second program offered through ISU is the Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC). While the LINC program provided opportunities for women and people of color, a void for training opportunities remained for men. The program was developed in 1995 as a response to the desire and need for leadership development opportunities for men. As this program has developed, women have been included in the program. The CLIC program provides upper-level and mid-management administrators with staff development opportunities to assist in developing and improving the skills they need to lead a college. The Iowa State University Website (2007) states that the program is

> ...designed to encourage growth and further development of administrative skills in current and future college Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs. Emphasis is placed on the latest advancements in areas of management and supervision, current issues in the community college system, and networking opportunities to enhance communications between educational institutions.

As with LINC, participants can register to earn graduate credit for the program through ISU. The program meets five to six times throughout the academic year on one of the 15 community college campuses in the state. Participants are nominated by their president and the presidents provide guidance to the programming of CLIC. Participants in the CLIC program tend to be fairly new to the community college system as follow-up data on the program has revealed that most have been in the system for less than five years.

Through the spring of 2005, 190 people had participated in the program. (Ebbers personal interview, 11/1/06).

Both programs provide opportunities to learn about the community college system in Iowa. Ebbers (2006) noted that participants may participate in CLIC after completing LINC. Both programs are presently providing leaders for the community college system in Iowa. The 2007 Directory of Iowa Community Colleges listed 110 LINC and/or CLIC graduates as holding positions of leadership within the colleges. Two program graduates currently serve as Chief Executive Officers of their colleges.

## Significance of the Study

As community colleges face the impending challenges of replacing leaders in their system, it is critical to have leadership development programs in place that will prepare new leaders. This study provided feedback on two existing programs and assessed the impact the programs have had on community college staff. Feedback from participants is used to ascertain the impact the programs have had on the participants to help in evaluating the effectiveness of the program and to assist in the future development of program topics.

While the LINC and CLIC programs are in place, there is a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs and study the impact the programs have had on participants and the community college system in Iowa. Two studies have been completed with LINC to provide an evaluation of the program, the first in 1992 by Viana Kelly and the second in 1995 by Glenda Gallisath. The current study updated the satisfaction of the participants as well as ascertained needed skills for the development of new leaders. This was accomplished through updating the original satisfaction and perception survey designed by Kelly for the

evaluation of the LINC program.  The survey was sent to all participants who had completed LINC and whose locations were known to gather their perceptions of the program and the impact the program has had on their career.

A formal evaluation has not been completed for the CLIC program.  The survey was sent to all participants in the program whose locations were known.  As with the LINC program, participants were asked about their satisfaction with the program and the impact on their career.

To complement the surveys, focus groups were held on three community college campuses that have had participants in both programs.  Three community college leaders were interviewed to learn about their perception of the impact the program has had on the community colleges in Iowa as well as recommendations for improvement.  Program staff who had assisted in the direction of the program sessions and worked directly with the participants were also interviewed to learn of their views of the program and changes they have seen in the leadership in Iowa community colleges.  The goal of the interviews was to gather more in-depth information on the impact of the leadership programs.

The overall goal of the project was to gather insights as to how the skill level of the participants has been enhanced and determine how the LINC and CLIC programs are preparing participants for new leadership roles.  The study also determined the impact of the programs on the participants and the advancements of those who have participated.  Last, the study assisted in determining what skills need to be included in future training programs for potential leaders to be successful.  The survey, interviews, and focus groups provided current data on the impact the LINC and CLIC programs have had on community colleges and their staff.  These results should offer program staff information that can be used in modifying the

program to better meet the needs of participants in the future as well as information to share with stakeholders of the two programs.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were developed for this study. The questions focus on the perceptions and experiences of those participating in the LINC and CLIC programs as well as stakeholders of the two programs.

1. What has been the impact of the LINC and CLIC programs on the participants' careers?

2. Did involvement in the program(s) impact degree attainment by the participants?

3. Did involvement in the program result in improvement of leadership skills?

4. Do the topics covered in the programs meet the needs to develop new leaders for the community college system in Iowa?

## Data Collection

Data for this study were gathered from several data sources. The Satisfaction and Perception Survey (SPS) was sent to those former LINC and CLIC participants whose addresses were known. The surveys provided in-depth information about the experiences of those individuals. Once the surveys were completed, interviews were conducted with three community college leaders who have supported the programs and have recommended staff for program participation. Three staff members of the LINC and CLIC programs were interviewed to gain their perspectives of the programs and observed impact on individuals and the community college system in Iowa. Last, three focus groups were conducted on

three community college campuses to gather additional information from former participants of the two programs.

## Assumptions

It was anticipated that the data presented will be helpful in the planning of future programs to meet the needs of community college staff. It was also assumed that the information presented will be of value to community college presidents as they determine the need to continue supporting leadership opportunities for community college employees. It was also assumed that the feedback provided through the surveys and information gathered through focus groups and interviews was honest and thoughtful.

## Limitations

There were a number of limitations to this study:

1. The LINC program was implemented 18 years ago, and the CLIC program was first offered 12 years ago. Both programs have evolved as issues and the community college environment have changed. Not all participants have experienced the same content and program format. This may impact their view of the programs.

2. As with all programs, the experiences in these programs may vary from participant to participant depending on the level of involvement and participation.

3. Participants have experienced different opportunities and experiences since completing the programs. It may be difficult to separate the impact of the programs from work experience and other leadership opportunities that may have occurred since program participation.

4. Since the inception of the LINC program, there has been a large turnover of community college presidents in Iowa. Currently, only one president was serving in his current role when the LINC program began. There may be a varying degree of familiarity or background information for all presidents to provide valuable information.

5. The study looked only at the perceptions of community college leaders and participants to learn about the impact of the program. This study focused on the ways LINC and CLIC have influenced the participants and their leadership development. It is reasonable to assume time, opportunities and individual goals impact advancement in position.

6. Addresses were not known for all participants who had completed the programs. While an attempt was made to find as many as possible, there were some missing addresses.

7. Since those in the programs for the 2005-2006 academic year had not completed the programs when the survey was administered, they were not included in the program numbers and results.

8. The study relied on voluntary participation from those who were contacted.

9. All responses to the survey and interview were based on self-reporting of former participants and program staff.

10. The surveys and interviews provided a point-in-time assessment of the participants.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms were defined for use in this study:

*Community College*:  An educational institution that is regionally accredited and offers a

curriculum that meets the need of the community.  Offerings may include college parallel

courses, programs that lead to employment, and courses intended for upgrading or retraining

employment skills.  The colleges share goals of access, service, open admission, and low

tuition.

*Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium [CLIC]:*  Program developed as a

response for leadership development opportunities for men. The program was developed by

Iowa State University, the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees, and the Iowa

Association of Community College Presidents.

*Community College President:*  Chief Executive Officer of the college.

*Employment Levels:*  For the purpose of the survey, those participating in both LINC and

CLIC were grouped into three employment categories:

>    Level One:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean,
>    Executive Director, Associate Deans, Assistant Dean.

>    Level Two:  Director, Associate Director, assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor,
>    Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar,
>    Assistant Registrar, Controller.

>    Level Three:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior
>    Advisor, Advisor, Officer Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.

>    Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions

*Iowa Association of Community College Presidents [IACCP]:*  This group consists of the

Chief Executive Officers at each of the fifteen community colleges in Iowa.

*Iowa Association of Community College Trustees [IACCT]:*  Community College Trustees

are a locally elected body that provides policy guidance to the colleges.  IACCT represents

the trustees from all fifteen community colleges and the mission of the group is to provide leadership and advocacy for the community college system in Iowa.

*Focus Group:* Group interview used to learn how a group of people who represent a target population reacts to certain discussion topics (Krathwohl, 1998).

*Iowa Community Colleges:* A system of 15 colleges in the state of Iowa. All colleges maintain locally elected Boards while following state operating guidelines.

*Leadership:* The ability to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute to an organization.

*Leadership Development:* A process in which there is an investment in people within an organization to assist in developing skills.

*Leadership Institute for a New Century [LINC]:* A program intended to provide leadership development opportunities for women and people of color. The program was developed by Iowa State University, the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees, and the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents.

*LINC/CLIC Staff:* Staff who plan and facilitate the leadership programs.

*Leadership Level:* Participants grouped into employment categories based on the definitions of the Iowa Department of Education.

*Leadership Skills:* The ability to motivate a group of people to work toward a common goal.

*Satisfaction and Perception Survey [SPS]:* Originally developed by Vianna Kelly in 1992, and then modified by Glenda Gallisath in 1992. The survey was used in the current study to gather the perceptions of the LINC and CLIC participants.

**Organization of the Study**

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 presents the introduction to the study. The review of the current literature on leadership, leadership development, and topics for leadership development programs is outlined in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 explains the research methods including the population studied, the survey instrument, and interview questions. Chapter 4 provides the research findings including the survey results and the summary from semi-structured interviews and focus groups. A discussion of the findings and recommendations for application as well as recommendations for future studies is presented in Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Introduction

It is clear that an expected shortfall of potential community college leaders is a concern within the colleges today. As community colleges work to ensure there are potential leaders in place, it is critical that opportunities are available to assist these individuals in gaining the necessary skills to be successful. This chapter presents a review of the current literature on community college leadership, the skill requirements for new leaders, and the desired topics for training programs.

### History of Community College Leadership

Much is expected of persons in leadership positions. Rouche, Baker, and Rose (1989) described leadership as the "ability to influence, shape, and embed values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors consistent with increased staff and faculty commitment to the unique mission of the community college" (p. 18). Wharton (1997) noted that leadership is "the ability to develop in people a willing, enduring, and dedicated commitment to the achievement of organizational goals" (p. 17). Such statements reveal that leaders make a difference in an organization. It is the leaders who establish the effectiveness of the organization and define the culture of the institution (Rouche et al., 1989). In writing about community college leaders, Neck and Manz (1998) described leadership as a "process of influence." Romero (2004) noted the complexity of community college leadership: "Leadership in the community college is not limited to any particular role or function. These institutions need leaders who share common goals and strategies at every level of the organization" (p. 34). Such statements help to emphasize the impact leaders have on an organization.

Community colleges are fortunate to have had strong leaders.  The success and reputation of community colleges today are due largely to the people who developed the colleges and provided the early leadership to create the mission committed to service and access.  Gonzales-Sullivan (2001) described three generations of leaders who have impacted the community college movement.  The first generation of leaders developed the community colleges and established the unique mission of the colleges (Gonzales-Sullivan).  These leaders are referred to as the "builders and shapers" and the "founding fathers" of the colleges (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004; Oglesby & Windham, 1996).  They developed the colleges and established the core values and mission of the colleges which remain intact today. Roueche et al. (1989) described these founding leaders as "great pioneers" who established the practices that served as the foundation for today's community colleges.  These individuals had a vision of what the colleges could accomplish and the skills needed to carry out that vision.  These leaders were "individuals with a vision that matched the horizon of the time" (Roueche et al., p. 40).

The generation of leaders that followed (i.e., the second generation) provided leadership during a time of growth in student enrollment and strong financial support.  Often referred to as "good managers", they were influenced by the first generation of leaders and worked to maintain the values established by the earlier leaders while developing their colleges (Roueche et al., 1989).  It has been the first two generations of leaders who have set the standards that remain today at most community colleges (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004).

The first two generations of community college leaders had entrepreneurial spirits that led to the establishment, development, and growth of the community colleges.  The leaders looked very much alike.  They tended to be white men who had earned their

doctorates (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004). Many operated in the traditional hieratical leadership style which they learned from the university model (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004; Myran, Myran, & Galant, 2004). By the early 1990s, many of these leaders had retired (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004).

It is the third generation of leaders who are currently serving the community colleges. These leaders have worked in an environment that has been very different from their predecessors. Public mistrust, declining resources, increasing accountability, growth and reliance on technology, and increasing numbers of under-represented and under-prepared students are just a few of the challenges this group of leaders has addressed (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004). This generation of leaders has worked to develop partnerships to address the challenging financial times (Gonzales-Sullivan), and has actively worked with workforce development through the expansion of training programs (Campbell & Levertz, 1997). These leaders have continued to make access to education a primary goal for the colleges. However, it is this generation of leaders who is now preparing for retirement. Like those before them, they will leave their legacies for future generations of leaders to follow.

This third generation of leaders looks and works very differently from the first two generations. Many tend to work in a more collaborative environment and have developed strong teams within their colleges (Goff, 2002). Leadership has moved to more of a principle-centered leadership style (Myran et al., 2004). A greater diversity is found in the current leadership with the number of women hired since 1986 doubling, and the number of minorities also increasing significantly (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004). While there had been growth in the number of presidents who are minorities, from less than 10% to 20% in 2004,

that number has once again dipped and is now at 13.8% (American Council on Education, 2007; Dembicki, 2006).

As the current leaders prepare for their retirements, there is concern and question as to the origin of the next generation of leaders. With the number of retirements increasing in all positions in the community college, there is some doubt whether there will be trained, well-qualified candidates for leadership positions. Colleges must be prepared to work to identify and develop new leaders at all levels to ensure there will not be a void in leadership within their administration (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Barwick, 2002; Carter et al, 2002; Ebbers et al., 2003; Oglesby & Windham, 1996; Shults, 2001).

The history of community college leadership has revealed there have been potential leaders within the system who have been ready and willing to step forward to assume new leadership roles. The traditional path for potential leaders has long been the route through the academic ranks (Vaughan, 2004). The 2007 American College President publication reported that 43% of sitting presidents have begun their careers in academic affairs. The report indicated that, of the current presidents, 36.8% held the position of chief academic officer or provost previous to their presidency. Expected retirements at the upper administrative level in addition to those at the president's level bring concern that the pipeline that served the community colleges well in the past may be sparse regarding future needs. These pending retirements will challenge the community college system to find new leadership to direct and lead the colleges in its next century.

**Leadership**

Burnham (2002) noted:

Two year college leaders have been a unique and discreet body of educational practitioners—possessing, evolving, developing, and demonstrating distinguishable skill sets. Although these are leadership traits found in community college leaders that are common to all leadership roles, both within and outside of education, it is evident that because of the special nature of those two-year institutions and their responsibilities, there are leadership elements distinct and singular that must be nurtured in order to successfully fulfill the mission of a community college. (p. 16)

The challenges facing community colleges will require new leaders to have a greater diversity of skills and attributes to lead the colleges into the future (*Community College Times*, 2005; Kelly, 2002). Roueche et al. (1989) called for the need for transformational leadership to continue the work of community colleges. They stated, "The ability of the community college CEO to influence the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of others by working with and through them in order to accomplish the college's mission and purpose" (p. 11). Fullins-Calkins and Milling (2005) posited that leaders must continually examine the role and style of their leadership if the colleges are to meet the many challenges before them.

New leadership will impact the future of community colleges (Goff, 2002). Roueche et al. (1989) agreed noting that "The challenges confronting American society, now more than ever, must be met by exceptional leaders who can deal with change and revitalize the institutions in America" (p. 5). The writers (1989) continued by stating, "We believe what is needed to enhance the quality and clarity of the community college mission is excellent leadership; that is, colleges need leaders who can perceive and integrate the global picture of community needs with existing institutional resources and future potential" (p. 10). While it will be important to instill the skills needed to be successful, leaders must also maintain a

passion for the role of the colleges and their mission and values of access, equity and quality (McClenney, 2001).

As leadership positions at all levels in the community college become vacant, it will be important to understand the skills needed to fill the roles successfully. Colleges must work to develop leaders and provide leadership development opportunities at all levels. While there has been much focus on the skills and traits needed for presidents, the identified traits have significant applicability to other major leadership roles in the colleges. Mid-level managers must be offered training so they can be prepared to be the next generation of college leaders (Filan, 2002). Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) reported that internal promotions are the most frequent way of hiring new administrators. With this in mind, it becomes critical to address the leadership development of employees at all levels. Filan (2002) noted:

> It is important that we look at succession planning not as a replacement issue, but as a strategic responsibility to be shared among the organization's stakeholders. The leaders of the future must be a tireless, innovative, observant, risk-taking, and an ever-hopeful builder and enabler of management and leadership teams within the college. (p. 6)

Hockaday and Puyear (2000) stressed that, while leaders do not fit one mold, there are agreed upon characteristics that can be observed in effective leaders. They stated, "...leadership is simply holding the goals of the institution in one hand and the people of the institution in the other and somehow bringing these two together in a common good" (para. 2).

**Challenges facing today's leaders**

Community colleges will face many challenges in the future and leaders must be prepared to address this myriad of new challenges successfully. Wharton (1997) remarked that the "long-term ability to respond well to challenges and to create the future they desire depends directly on the quality of leadership within community colleges" (para. 2). Leadership in community colleges today is more difficult than in the past, and will require skilled leaders with a wider range of skills and innovative approaches (CCLDI, 2001; Evans, 2001; Kellogg Foundation, 2001; Kelly, 2002; Romero, 2004). The ability to lead people will be important as leaders will spend more time sharing authority, coaching, and working in teams to resolve conflicts (Campbell & Kacluk, 2002; Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Gibson-Benninger, Ratcliff, & Rhoads, 1996; Goff, 2002; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Hernandez, 2000; Kellogg Foundation, 2001; Lorenzo, 1998). Thus, leaders must be prepared to learn on a continual basis in their roles (Goff, 2002; Lorenzo & De Marte, 2002). The expectations of the next generation of community college leaders will be more complex, and more demanding and successful leaders will be required to possess a much more diverse set of skills and personal attributes than ever before (Goff, 2002; Kelly, 2002; Pierce & Pedersen, 1997).

Leaders are often asked to assume a variety of tasks by many different constituencies. Evans (2001) described the need for new ways of doing business to meet the needs of a changing world. Hockaday and Puyear (2000) posited that community college leaders will face issues that are different and more complicated than in the past, and these issues may cause leaders to carry out their roles in a different manner than before. To be successful in an environment that changes quickly will require keen skills. Successful leaders will need to

be inclusive in their decision making and establish a participatory leadership style for their

work in and outside their colleges (Romero, 2004).  Villadsen (2002) noted:

> The traits our "new creature" must include both old and new- the collective
> wisdom and crucial values of open access, low cost education, and multiple
> approaches to teaching and learning must combine with the strengths of new,
> potential leaders in cultural competition, technological sophistication, and
> research based decision making. (p. 38)

In the future, challenges for community college leaders will be presented in many

venues.  Leaders must be seen as academic leaders while addressing new ways of

accomplishing the mission of the colleges (Kemppainen, 1999).  Colleges will be faced with

many issues, including increased demand for greater accountability to the public and funding

sources (Anderson, 1999, Boggs, 2003; Goff, 2002, Roe & Baker, 1989, Wharton, 1997), a

shift from teaching to learning, an emphasis on learning outcomes, and the expectation that

services and programs will be available quickly and at all times (Anderson, 1997; Boggs,

2003; Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004; Roe & Baker, 1989; Wharton, 1997).  Leaders will be

challenged to work with declining financial resources at the very time when employers are

requesting more advanced skills, and there is a need to replace aging faculty, address

changing workplace needs, and establish truly collaborative relationships with other

institutions as well as face greater and changing expectations by constituents (Anderson,

1997; Boggs, 2003; Goff, 2002; Gonzales-Sullivan. 2004; Oglesby & Windham, 1996;

Rouche et al., 1989; Travis & Travis, 1999).  Limited budgets will lead to the need for tuition

and fee increases, increased use of adjunct faculty, increased community involvement, and

shifts in the traditional academic schedule (Anderson, 1997; Boggs, 2003; Rouche, 1996).

Competition will come from many directions with the growth of distance learning and more

private sector educational offerings (Boggs, 2003; Goff, 2002; Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004;

Hockaday & Puyear, 2000). The need to establish new sources of funding will create additional challenges for all new leaders (Anderson, 1997; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Roe & Baker, 1989).

More extensive services will be required as colleges matriculate students who are not as prepared as in the past and present a variety of challenges (Anderson, 1997; Boggs, 2003; Goff, 2002). Changing demographics, the shift to embracing outcomes and assessment, technological developments which will require additional financial support as well as staff development, and the continued explosion of new information to be processed will become critical issues for all community college leaders (Anderson, 1997; Goff 2002; Wharton, 1997). Additionally, the current landscape of increasing regulations will lead to new business practices and colleges will need to work to maintain the trust and support of their stakeholders. Leaders will need to work with state policy, external standards and mandates (Gonzales-Sullivan, 2004; Oglesby & Windham, 1996). Oglesby and Windham (1996) predicted that, with stable enrollments, tighter budgets, a greater emphasis on accountability, and the continual changing of expectations, there will be little emphasis on the building of new campuses. Tomorrow's leaders must be more entrepreneurial (Kelly, 2002; Shults, 2001), more adaptive (Garavalia & Miller, 1996), more inclusive (Brown et al, 2002; Gibson-Benninger et al., 1996; Kezar, 1998), and possess a greater willingness to share authority (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Lorenzo, 1998; McClenney, 2001). Because of the demands for the colleges and the expectations placed on them to increase services and programs, colleges may experience what Hockaday and Puyear (2000) called a mission-boundaries blurring. Thus, future leaders will need to be very flexible and skilled as they lead the community colleges (Wharton, 1997).

Barwick (2002) noted:

> …the role of the CEO is changing even at the most fundamental level: the community college mission.  Early presidents had to sell the idea of the open door, that post secondary education should be available to every adult.  Now CEOs have to demonstrate that it is quality education and that students are learning.  In addition, new CEOs might be called upon to reinterpret the mission, either as a consequence of shrinking resources or changing societal needs. (p. 9)

Wolf and Carroll (2002) agreed that, with time, the role of leadership in community colleges has changed.  Leadership today is shared, and, more staff have roles in providing leadership for the college (Gibson-Benninger et al., 1996; Goff, 2002; Hines, 1992; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002; McClenney, 2001).  This sharing of leadership requires a different set of skills for all involved.  Lorenzo and DeMarte (2002) described the greatest change in the role of leadership over the past century as one that leads to a greater focus on developing people, and implementing and directing organizational change while spending less time and effort on managing the completion of tasks.  Thus, leaders must put people first and work in developing skills in those they serve (Hernandez, 2000; Jensen, 2000).

**Need for training**

Boggs (2002) has posited that the success of community colleges will "...depend upon the quality and characteristics of their future leadership" (p. vii).  He continued by noting, "Opportunities must be provided to encourage even more of our best people to prepare for positions of leadership.  Mechanisms must be put in place to develop these potential leaders-leaders who are not afraid of change but who also embrace the community college mission and values" (p. vii).  Successful community colleges will be the ones that encourage the

development of new leaders at all levels of the college (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002).

Roueche (2004) agreed with Boggs (2002), and stated, "Leadership is truly the key to an

effective and successful community college, and we must devote our full attention and

energies to preparing the next generation of community college leaders" (p. 5).

The need for the training of potential leaders is ever-present. Filan (2002) stated:

As we examine the community college movement of the past years and look
at its rich history, we realize that the time is near when a significant number of
our current leaders will be leaving our ranks due to retirement. Immediate
action needs to be taken by colleges to identify and develop our future leaders.
Community and technical colleges need to look at how they are going to
'grow' and mentor their future successors internally. (p. 6)

O'Rourke (1997) remarked that the very skills needed to continue to work in and

improve the community college system are not necessarily the same skills that were needed

to establish the college system. Training of this next generation of leaders will be vital to

community colleges. Shek (2001) added:

Training for future community college presidents must meet the challenges
faced by current administrators, who indicated in the survey that their roles
have changed over the decades. Many surveyed presidents said there is a lack
of understanding from the public and other institutions of the overwhelming
nature of the job. They reported that they also were unprepared for the level
of politics involved, the fundraising, budgeting, and the amount of
relationships they are expected to build throughout their tenure. (p. 10)

Leadership can be learned (AACC, 2005; Clark, 1998; Filan, 2002). Beverly Simone

agreed, and added: "Leaders aren't born; they are developed" (Carter et al., 2002, p. 22).

With this belief as a foundation, it is up to the colleges to work to develop future leaders and

provide them with the skills needed to be successful. Leadership can be learned—it is a

process that involves a theoretical base and hands on experiences (Anderson, 1997;

O'Banion, 2007). Leadership development must be viewed as an ongoing process that takes

time, opportunity, and direction (Amey, 2004; Boggs & Kent, 2002; Burnham, 2002; O'Banion, 2007).  The AACC website (2005) stated that "Learning leadership is a lifelong process, the movement of which is influenced by personal and career maturity as well as other developmental processes".  As a part of the Leading Forward summit (2004), leadership development was described as "…an investment in a process that provides individuals with opportunities and experiences that enable them to be effective leaders in community colleges.  It is a process of skill and knowledge building as well as reflection on values" (para. 19).  Roueche (2002) stated, "Leadership is not about being right or having the right values and goals; it is, rather, a process of learning to be effective and to achieve worthy goals and objectives with the full and enthusiastic support of faculty, staff, and community organizations" (p. 5).  It would appear that the time is here to establish well-designed programs to develop the next generation of community college leaders.

Future leaders may well be in the employee ranks of current community colleges. Anderson (1997) reported that over 90% of the current presidents came from within the community college system.  In researching desired leadership skills for their study, Ebbers and McFarlin (1998) commented, "Literature reviewed for the study strongly suggests that the majority of the next generation of senior community college leaders are already employed as mid-level professionals in community college systems" (p. 45).  In a study of exemplarily leaders in community colleges, McFarlin and Ebbers (1998) found that "insiders" in the system were often the outstanding leaders.  Thus, it is important for current leaders to reach out to those individuals and assist in their development (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

The "Grow Your Own" process of leadership development has gained in popularity (Campbell, 2002). Anderson (1997) suggested that one effective method of preparing future leaders is to develop programs that provide opportunities for current community college staff to learn about issues and strategies, visit with current leaders, and develop a mentor relationship as a way to develop the needed skills. Watts and Hammons (2002) described three ways potential leaders can gain the needed skills: (a) graduate programs intended for educational leadership; (b) in-house programs; and (c) institutes and/or workshops. Vaughan (2001) believed that the graduate programs alone will not meet the needs the community colleges will be facing. The need for local programs that will provide opportunities for up and coming leaders is great.

As with community colleges nationwide, the need for training potential leaders is great within Iowa's community colleges. Ebbers et al. (2003) remarked:

> Preparation of leaders for all phases of community college functions will be critical to the continued success of community colleges in the state of Iowa. These individuals will need a rich and varied combination of work experience and educational credentials to provide the leadership needed. They also will need to be aware of local, regional, and national issues in the field of education. (p. 232)

Cooper and Pagatto (2003) noted, "As the crisis in leadership for community colleges of our nation deepens, the need for a willing core of new leaders who are prepared for the challenges they will face becomes even greater" (p. 36). Burnham (2002) also stressed the importance of training: "...the achievement of a new generation of community college leaders will require opportunity, guidance, and training" (p. 18). Garmon (2001) perceived that training will provide a way to offer community colleges an "...agile leader who is thoroughly prepared through training, experience, and self study" (p. 13).

**New Leaders, New Skills**

The development of new leaders is most important to the success of the community colleges. Evans (2001) remarked, "Logically, a changing world demands new actions, behavior, and coping mechanisms; it demands new leadership skills" (p. 182). Thus, it would appear that the time is here to establish well-designed programs to begin to develop the next generation of community college leaders.

Many have worked to identify the skills that will assist leaders in being successful. McFarlin and Ebbers (1997) researched those skills and characteristics held by exemplary leaders in community colleges and found nine common factors in these presidents: (1) a terminal degree; (2) field of study in community college leadership; (3) active pursuit of research; (4) training as a change agent; (5) experience; (6) a mentor relationship; (7) a strong peer network; (8) participation in a leadership preparation activity; and (9) knowledge of technology. A follow up study to the original study by Crittenden (1997) confirmed the results of the first study. McFarlin (1999) also stated that the ability to select people and bring conflicts to a successful resolution were important skills to possess.

To meet the challenges, leaders of community colleges are expected to possess many professional, personal, and social skills. There are a wide range of expectations for emerging leaders (Kelly, 2002). The AACC has worked to define the competencies that will be required of new leaders. As the result of a project funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the AACC has studied the role of the community college leaders, and identified the skills and competencies needed for successful leadership. This process, named Leading Forward, has involved a wide variety of current leaders. By working together, community college leaders identified six essential competencies as being critical for new leaders to possess. Those

participating in the process identified these competencies as either "very" or "extremely" critical to effective leaders in the community college (AACC, 2005). While many of the skills overlap, the competencies offer a clear picture of what is needed for successful leaders in the community college system (Viniar, 2007). This framework—Competencies for Community College Leaders—can be useful in assisting potential leaders in preparing for their new role to provide guidance to those developing new programs and advice to those hiring new leaders. (AACC, 2005).

The first of the essential competencies identified through the Leading Forward (2004) process is ***organizational strategy***. The study described this skill as "strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends" (AACC, 2005). The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (n.d.) described the challenges for leadership in general as becoming more complex and requiring the need for new and innovative approaches for resolution. Today, leaders are being asked to assume many roles that are different than in the past. Kemppainen (1999) believed that leaders "...are being viewed more as designers and facilitators of the learning environment, and they are being expected to concentrate their efforts on building new and better ways to accomplish education's mission" (para. 3). Leadership in community colleges today is more difficult than in the past, and will require skilled leaders with a wider range of skills and innovative approaches (CCLDI, 2001; Evans, 2001; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Kelly, 2002; Romero, 2004).

This generation of leaders will need to be visionary thinkers who understand the role and mission of the colleges and work to better define the values of the college and its mission

and role in the community (AACC, 2001; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Lorenzo, 1998; Roueche, 2004). Leaders must have a clear understanding of the role of the community college if they are to shape the future for the colleges. Hammons and Keller (1990) noted that "Future CEOs will need to be visionaries with a knowledge of, and commitment to the community college mission. They will need to be competent as leaders, planners, delegators, decision-makers, and as selectors of personnel" (para. 27). As the vision for the college is created, leaders must also be willing to communicate that vision and engage others to work toward that vision (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Hammons & Keller, 1990).

Leaders must be able to develop a shared vision and communicate that vision to the college community (Fulton-Calkin & Milling, 2005). The leaders must also be able to develop goals that will support the community college values of open access and low cost to students (Villadsen, 2002). They must be able to facilitate learning within the institution, understand the changing and diverse student population (Kelly, 2002), and lead the college to a common goal (Bagnato, 2004). Leaders will need to develop the ability to see the big picture while addressing each of the goals of the college (Kellogg Foundation, 1999) and leading change within the college (Wallin, 2002).

Community college leaders must have a firm understanding of their own institution and the climate of the college (Barwick, 2002; CCLDI, 2001; O'Rourke, 1997). As leaders, they are the key to developing and sharing the vision of the college and defining the mission of the college (Barwick, 2002; Bennis, 1991; Boggs, 2003; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Garmon, 2001; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Hines, 1992; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Kubala, 1999; McClenney, 2001; Myran et al., 2004; Wharton, 1997). Leadership must have the conviction to establish the climate of the college (Barwick, 2002),

model the desired ethics of the institution, and provide the guidance in the organizational development of the college (CCLDI, 2001). To accomplish these tasks, leaders will need to be skillful strategic planners (Boggs, 2003; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Johnson, 1998), be able to determine key issues for the college and develop solutions (Carter et al., 2002).

There will be many decisions that will need to be made and the ability and willingness to make decisions will be critical (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991). The decision-making process must be strategic and involve data, and the evaluation of ideas must be forward-looking, inclusive and based on the consensus of the college community (Boggs, 2003; Campbell & Leverty, 1997; Hines, 1992; Gibson-Benninger et al., 1996; McClenney, 2001; Villadsen, 2002). A creative approach to decisions, while displaying firm judgment and independence of thought, will be important (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991). Leaders must remain open to new ideas and approaches (Boggs, 2003) and, as decisions are made, there must be a willingness to examine situations from multiple perspectives (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). Decisions must be made that will provide direction to the college, and it will be up to the leader to serve as a catalyst to get things done (Boggs, 2003). Throughout this progression, it will be important to ensure faculty are part of the decision-making process (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

The role of technology and managing technology will play a greater role for all leaders. Leaders must understand the importance of technology, and be ready to manage the many changes and challenges technology will bring (AACC, 2001; Bennis, 1991).

Change will play a large role in the future of community colleges, and leaders must remain flexible and responsive to change and have a high comfort level with the changing

environment (Goff, 2002; Hines, 1992; Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Change must be viewed in terms of potential and leaders must be ready to create opportunities from the change around them (Carter et al., 2003; Garavalia & Miller, 1996). The many changes facing the colleges will require the ability to project trends and a creative spirit of problem solving to meet the needs of the college (Carter et al., 2003; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McClenney, 2001; Wharton, 1997). These new situations and the people involved must be addressed in a judgment free environment (Boggs, 2003; Hines, 1992; Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Innovation, discovery, and a comfort with ambiguity will also be important for leaders (Boggs, 2003; McClenney, 2001). Filan (2002) posited, "The leader of the future must be a tireless, inventive, observant, risk-taking, and an ever-hopeful builder and enabler of management and leadership teams within the college" (p.6). Leaders of the future will need to maneuver in an environment which changes quickly; therefore, they must learn to be creative in their work.

*Resource management* was also an important skill identified by leaders in the AACC survey. The survey identified successful leaders with these skills as having ability to "equitably and ethically sustain people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community colleges" (AACC, 2005). The role of leaders will be to protect the assets of their colleges (Wharton, 1997) and to be accountable in all reporting matters. In doing so, the leader must be a keen financial planner and a skillful budget manager (Barwick, 2002; Boggs, 2003; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Kelly, 2002; Kubala, 1999). Viniar (2007) remarked that leaders must be prepared for "…finding, gathering, and cultivating all the resources needed to fulfill the college's mission" (p. 66).

As financial recourses become tighter, the ability to raise funds for the college as alternative methods of support will become important (Kelly, 2002; Kubala, 1999). As with many tasks, a more entrepreneurial approach to locating additional funds may need to be embraced (Kelly, 2002). Decisions regarding technology and associated expenses will become a needed skill for all leaders. Leaders must learn to balance the need for technology to enhance their institution while working to ensure that those who cannot afford the technology are not excluded from the college.

One of the most important resources for colleges is their people (Jensen, 2000). Leaders will be asked to work with a number of different constituencies to lead them to a common goal (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991). In doing so, leaders must be able to share authority with these groups to make decisions and resolve conflicts (Hines, 1992; Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002). Hernandez (2000) referred to leaders as "builders of people" (p. 5). The continued development of those in the colleges to become new leaders will be important (Carter et al., 2002; CCLDI, 2001; Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hines, 1992; Wallin, 2002). Leaders must maintain a commitment to facilitate both individual and organizational learning (Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002). In developing potential leaders for the college, current leaders should remember to look throughout the institution to identify new leaders and create opportunities for them to learn (Fullins-Calkins & Milling 2005). Thus, the success of the college must be the primary business of everyone at the college (Garmon, 2001).

Tichey and Cohen (2003, as cited by George, 2003) remarked:

…the ultimate test for leaders is not whether they can make smart decisions and take decisive action, but whether they can teach others to be leaders and build an organization that remains successful even when they are not around. The key ability of winning organizations and winning leaders is creating leaders. (p. 8)

41

With an increased emphasis on developing others, more time must be spent coaching and mentoring (CCLDI, 2001; Duncan, 1991).

The Board of Trustees oversees the policies and procedures of the colleges. College leaders must be prepared to work effectively with their boards (Burnham, 2001). As partnerships are developed in the college and community, the board will be an important partnership to develop.

The third skill identified in the AACC survey is that of *communication*. The survey defined communication as the ability to use "clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission" (AACC, 2005). The importance for leaders to maintain excellent communication skills cannot be understated (Bennis, 1991; Brown et al., 2002; Boggs, 2002; Burnham, 2001; Hernandez, 2000; Hines, 1992; Patton, 2005). Leaders must model open communication and establish an environment where there can be an open and honest exchange of ideas among employees (Garmon, 2001; Hernandez, 2000; Johnson, 1998). A good leader is a good listener (CCLDI, 2001; Hernandez, 2000; Hines, 1992; Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Additionally, leaders must be able to clearly communicate (Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Garmon (2001) stated that the key ingredient for leaders is "…open, accurate communication, with a good dose of willingness to trust and constant dedication to the success of students and to those who serve students" (p. 8).

The survey also identified *collaboration* as an essential skill for all leaders to possess. A collaborative leader is described as one who "develops and maintains responsive,

cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of all students, and sustain the community college mission" (AACC, 2005).  The ability to bring people together for a common goal, and to mediate and build coalitions will be critical (Bagnato, 2004; Kellogg Foundation, 1999).

Leaders must possess the ability to work with people to modify their values, attitudes, and behaviors.  In doing so, they will need to model fairness, integrity, consistency, and model the honest and ethical standards they expect of others (Boggs, 2003).  Barwick (2002) stressed that a collaborative leadership style is the most effective component for change to occur.  Leadership of the college is distributed among more staff as it is no longer reserved for a few, thus increasing the challenge to develop leadership in others (Carter et al., 2002; O'Rourke, 1997).  Romero (2004) noted, "Leadership in the community college is not limited to any particular role or function.  These institutions need leaders who share common goals and strategies at every level of the organization." (p. 34).  Shults (2001) stressed the importance of sharing in the governing process, while Garavalia and Miller (1996) added empowerment as a key ingredient to developing and building leadership within the college. Therefore, leaders must also work to encourage others, and provide support for risk taking and attempting new practices (Boggs, 2003).

The new leaders will be faced with the need to build consensus among groups and will often find themselves leading through others (Lashway, 1995; Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002; McClenney, 2001).  The development of teams and empowering those teams to accomplish tasks will be a way of life.  Thus, leaders must be able to bring people together and lead through others to get things accomplished (CCLDI, 2001; Chieffe, 1991; Hammons & Keller, 1990; McClenney, 2001; O'Rourke, 1997; Wallin, 2002; Wharton, 1997).

Working with effective teams will be one way to accomplish more and make a greater impact (CCLDI, 2001).  In addition, just as the students in the community colleges will be more diverse, the college's partners will represent many different constituencies.  As partnerships are developed, leaders will need to maintain the skills to work with people, issues, and concerns without judgment (Boggs, 2003).  Therefore, an understanding of, a commitment to and an appreciation of diversity will be required of all leaders (AACC, 2001; CCLDI, 2001; Kelly, 2002; McClenney, 2001; O'Rourke, 1997).

Building and sustaining coalitions and partnerships will be very important (Boggs, 2003; Goff, 2002; Shults, 2001).  Successful partnerships will require a leader who is not only able to work as a collaborator, but also model the importance of partnerships (Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Woodard et al., 2000).  In many situations, the ability to resolve conflicts will prove helpful (McClenney, 2001; Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002; O'Rourke, 1997; Wallin, 2002).  To do so, leaders must work as true collaborators and model the importance of collaboration as an important trait (Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Woodard, 2000).

Community college leaders must be able to work with a variety of people, as they are expected to bring groups together and serve as successful facilitators (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Goff, 2002; Lorenzo & DeMarte, 2002), and build teams that can work together (Chieffo, 1991; Hammons & Keller, 1990).  Leaders must also be able to mediate and form coalitions within the college as well as in the community they serve to build strong teams (Bagnato, 2004, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McClenney, 2001; Romero, 2004; Wallin, 2002).  As coalitions are established it will be very important for community college leaders to be able to have the skills to work with people, and address issues and concerns without judgment (Boggs, 2003).

While the building of coalitions within the college is important, leaders must also possess the ability to develop and maintain partnerships outside the college (AACC, 2000; Boggs, 2003; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Lorenzo, 1998; McClenney, 2001; Romero, 2004). To develop these partnerships, one must be adept in political skills, be adaptive, and model integrity, honesty and ethical standards (Boggs, 2003; Barwick, 2002; Burnham, 2001). The partnerships established outside the college will consist of a variety of groups including educational, political, economic, media, civic partners, and partners in the business community (CCLDI, 2001; Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005). In many ways, the leaders of the community colleges establish the relationship in the community, and serve as the link between the community and the college (Barwick, 2002; Wharton, 1997).

The ability and willingness to serve as an *advocate for the community college* is the fifth skill identified by the AACC survey. A skilled leader who serves as an advocate is one who "understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college." (AACC, 2005). The AACC Leadership 2020 (2000) identified the ability to understand and implement the community college mission as a required skill as well for being an effective advocate for the community college. Leaders must serve as the primary advocate for the college (Myran et al., 2004; Wharton, 1997). In doing so, this next group of leaders must develop a complete understanding of the history and mission of the community college as well as the importance of the foundation of the values of access, equity, and the opportunity for excellence (AACC, 2001; CCLDI, 2001; Garmon, 2001; Hernandez, 2000; McClenney, 2001; Shults, 2001). Clearly, a passion for the role of the community college and a willingness to serve as needed is critical.

It is the leaders who will set the tone and philosophy of their colleges. Colleges must be student centered, and there must be an emphasis on teaching and learning (AACC, 2001; Barwick, 2002). The needs of the students must be addressed, thus the development of a student-centered organization that understands and promotes student success will be a critical role for leaders (AACC, 2001). Excellent teaching, and a continual reminder that teaching and learning is the core mission of the colleges will be important for all leaders (CCLDI, 2001; Hines, 1992). Garmon (2001) stressed the importance of a commitment and dedication to student success and all those who serve students. She exclaimed, "Above all, the community college is a learning-centered organization" (para. 4). Thus, it is important to remember students in all actions of the college (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

There are many more voices and perspectives to be heard within the community colleges today. It is important for leaders to interact with a variety of people and seek out multiple viewpoints while leading the college to a collective vision (AACC, 2001; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Myran et al., 2004; Rousche, 2004). A willingness to embrace diversity, compassionate behavior, and sensitivity to the needs and desires of different constituencies will be essential (Brown et al., 2002; Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Hernandez, 2001; Hines, 1992; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McClenney, 2001).

An important advocacy role for leaders will be to work with outside groups to gain support for the role of the college in the community. The story of the community college must be told to the public (Viniar, 2007). Leaders must be comfortable and capable in working with legislators to inform and influence policy that will help those whom the colleges serve (AACC, 2001; Anderson, 1997; Burnham, 2002; Duncan & Harlacher, 1991;

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Wharton, 1997). As an advocate for the college, leaders will also find themselves in the role of fundraiser for the colleges (AACC, 2001).

Carreon (2005) stressed the importance of reaching beyond the college for involvement. There is also an expectation that colleges provide leadership in the communities they serve, and the president, in particular, become active in the communities by serving as a public servant, working on economic development issues, and building partnerships (Barwick, 2002; Kubala, 1999). A survey of presidents revealed that 31% of their time is spent with external relations (Weiseman & Vaughan, 2002). Therefore, the need to represent the colleges in the community will no doubt continue.

McClenny (2001) posited, "There is more to community college leadership than knowledge and skills. By and large, community college leaders choose to be where they are because they are filled with passion for values fundamental to the movement: access, equity, opportunity with excellence" (p. 27).

*Professionalism* is the last competency for community college leaders listed by the Leading Forward project committee. It is defined as the willingness to work "ethically to set high standards for self and others, continuously improve self and surroundings, demonstrate accountability to and for the institution, and ensure the long-term viability of the college and community" (AACC, 2005). Although this attribute may have been listed last, it certainly is not the least important skill for leaders. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1999) described the role of leadership as: "Future leaders, like their predecessors, must have a deep sense of mission and passion guided by strong moral, ethical, and spiritual values" (p. 3). Rouche et al. (1989) stated: "We believe what is needed to enhance the quality and clarity of the community college mission is excellent leadership; that is, colleges need leaders who can

perceive and integrate the global picture of community needs with existing institutional resources and future potential" (p. 9-10). The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1999) described the personal attributes of leaders: "…effective leaders are humble, self aware, and have a high degree of accountability. They believe in the need for many people to have a seat at the table, and recognize the importance of diverse perspectives and skills" (p. 3). Thus, leaders have great influence over the entire college community

While the skills are critical to the success of leaders, behaviors also make the difference as it is the behaviors of the leaders that helps set the tone and character of the college. Wharton (1997) remarked, "The climate established by a leader's behavior will determine the quality of relationships within the college, which in turn will determine the energy, dedication, and spirit of the staff" (para. 18). Wharton continued by explaining that, while skills are important, it is the leader's behavior that will make the difference. He commented, "The spirit and dedication we need from community college staff is dependent not on the latest effectiveness technique, not on the beauty of a particular management model, and certainly not on empty posturing by leaders. That spirit and dedication connects directly to how our leaders behave." (para. 48).

Successful leaders will be those individuals who are in touch with their skills and strengths, and are aware of their areas in need of improvement (Bennis, 1991). Leaders must be prepared to continually evaluate their skills and engage in continuous learning (Hammons & Keller, 1990; Kellogg Foundation, 1999). Villadsen (2002) has written of the importance for leaders to be "solidly in touch with themselves and with their own values" (p. 40). Continued self assessment is a large part of a successful leader. Fullins-Calkins and Milling (2005) noted:

> ...the true leaders must be willing to constantly delve deep within the self- not afraid to look at the doubt within, not afraid to analyze the mistakes made, not afraid to admit that the answers are not always there. In fact, the true leader accepts that mistakes are inevitable, is willing to pull mistakes into the open light to analyze the why, while not demeaning the self in the process, but growing from it…Leadership is never a destination. It is a life-long journey- one of constantly seeking self knowledge. Only through a leader's taking that journey can she or he continue the journey of becoming the best self. Only through a leader's taking that journey can she or he help other leaders to grow in their leadership skills. (p. 237)

The environment for the colleges will be one of change, and leaders must be prepared to deal with the changes and the challenges that will surround that change. Leading in a changing environment will require leaders who are adaptive and ready to embrace change willingly (Roueche, 1996). To address the changes in ways that will benefit the colleges, leaders will also need to develop an entrepreneurial approach to their work and learn to be comfortable with ambiguity (Bennis, 1991; Hammons & Keller, 1990; McClenney, 2001; Shults, 2001).

Colleges will be searching for leaders who demonstrate solid administrative skills (AACC, 2001) and have developed the academic skills to express themselves as skillful writers, critical thinkers, accomplished public speakers, and to have an understanding of effective programming (O'Rourke, 1997). Colleges also have a great need for their leaders to keep current with new trends in the literature and new methods for organizational development and planning as well as communicate a vision (Kubala & Bailey, 2001). Successful leaders are the ones who have a commitment to lead (Hockaday & Puyear, 2000), know the bounds of their position, are willing to accept responsibility (Garavalia & Miller, 1996), and are willing to be held accountable (Kellogg Foundation, 1999). McClenney (2001) addressed the importance of creating and managing continuous change.

Technology will continue to play a large role in the colleges, and leaders must not only have technical skills themselves but also be ready and willing to keep up with the latest trends. The knowledge and ability to use technology has been listed as an important skill by a several researchers (Bagnato, 2004; Brown, 1992; Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Goff, 2002; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; McClenney, 2001).

Personal characteristics such as integrity, a sense of confidence, sound judgment, courage, concern, a desire to lead, persistence, a high level of creativity, and flexibility must be developed in future leaders (Duncan & Harlacher,1991; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Goff, 2002; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Hines, 1992; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McFarlin, 1999; McPhail, 2000; Pierce & Pedersen, 1997; Shults, 2001). Additionally, as with current leaders, leaders in the future must maintain the exemplary personal skills of excellent follow through, self control, a positive attitude, high standards, ethical and moral behavior, and be trustworthy, and adaptable (Duncan & Harlacher,1991; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Hammons & Keller, 1990; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Pierce & Pedersen, 1997). Patton (2005) described the importance of a willingness to learn from mistakes and energize oneself as being important. Leaders must also learn to select their battles carefully (AACC, 2001) and be inclusive in their decision making. They must model the very behavior they expect of others (Wharton, 1997) and, in doing so, model trust, honesty, unity, mutual respect of others, integrity, ethical standards, teamwork, risk taking, innovation, and shared learning experiences (Boggs, 2003; Myran et al., 2004). Hammons and Keller (1990) addressed the need for a healthy sense of humor needed to be successful. Additionally, leaders must have the physical qualities of stamina, high levels of energy and be required to keep up with the job (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991). The importance of

excellent physical, mental, and emotional health cannot be overlooked (Hammons & Keller, 1990; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000).

The Leading Forward Summit (2005) described a successful leader as one who is able to provide an environment that embraces change and values people by providing a open and trusting environment that encourages diversity, creativity, respect for others, and is committed to education.  Successful leaders have faith in people, openly enjoy their job, believe in students, and model an inclusive leadership style.  The skill for seeing talent in others was also identified as a trait of successful leaders (Garavalia & Miller, 1996; McFarlin, 1999).

Hines (1992) posited that successful college leaders must model the very principles of the college:  good teaching, the importance of teaching leadership to others, adapting to change, and creating a community within the college.  In doing so, they must move forward and maintain the highest levels of personal qualities.  Leaders must display a belief in their actions (Hahn, 1995), maintain a personal code of ethics and model trust (Bennis, 1991), and maintain a firm belief in lifelong learning (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Hahn, 1995).  Duncan and Harlacher (1991) reported that colleges are searching for leaders who show consistency in their behavior and actions, maintain a positive orientation, show an interest in people, and demonstrate compassion and a high level of sensitivity to the needs of different constituencies.

The respect and acceptance of others is very important.  Leaders must maintain a genuine interest in people, and show an understanding and appreciation, compassion and sensitivity to those of different constituencies (Duncan & Harlarcher, 2001; Shults, 2001).  A respect for people and their experiences is important as well as the ability to teach the

importance of tolerance and compassion toward others (Kellogg Foundation, 1999).

Important qualities in leaders consist of a commitment to fairness, an openness to new ideas,

and the ability to confront people and ideas without judgment or prejudice (Boggs, 2003).

Sevier (2004) described the three key roles of leadership as being the developer of

groups, the example of expected behavior, and the willingness to accept responsibility:

> Leaders might do all manner of other things, but exceptional leaders must
> continually address those big three. Without a synergistic team, the leader is
> doomed. If the leader is not the living symbol, who will be? If the leader is
> not willing to back up his or her troops, you will not get their best work and
> the team will be picked apart. (p. 2)

The expected personal qualities of leaders will require great skills. Hockaday and

Puyear (2000) exclaimed that "Leadership is not an art, not a science; it is more persuasion

than precision" (p. 3).

**Training**

As community colleges prepare to look for new leaders, knowing they may face a

shortage, it appears to make sense that leadership development must be a primary goal of the

colleges. Leaders do not just happen on their own; they are developed (Clark, 1998; Piland

& Wolf, 2003). Excellent leadership is the result of a blend of talent, opportunities, and

preparation (Piland & Wolf, 2003.) A deliberate plan for leadership development must be in

place if colleges are to ensure there are potential leaders to step forward to lead the colleges

(Piland & Wolf, 2003). Roe and Baker (1989) perceived that, without training and

development opportunities, many who are currently employed in the community college

system may be overlooked. Opportunities for leadership development will only happen if it

becomes a priority of the college and a conscious choice is made to invest in programming

(Piland & Wolf, 2003). Ebbers et al. (2003) commented that, "...leadership programs must be developed in order for them to be facile with change strategies, contemporary management techniques, and entrepreneurial approaches to resource acquisition" (p. 236). Boggs and Kent (2002) quoted trustee Jim Tatum from Crowder College who stated:

> …leadership development is not so much about learning as it is about a CEO becoming a whole person, that learning is part of a journey that connects one's personal and professional lives … people who have a broad understanding of what affects people, who have a real desire to serve, who have a passion for what they do, who have a sense of humor, and who care deeply make the best CEOs. (p. 56)

Leadership development, as described by the Leading Forward project (2005) summit is "An investment in a process that provides individuals with opportunities and experiences that enable them to be effective leaders in community colleges" (Leading Forward Website, 2007). The summit committee continued by describing development as "creating institutional capacity," and "a process of skill and knowledge building as well as reflection on values" (Leading Forward website, 2007). It is important to remember that leadership development is a process that continues throughout one's career, and it must involve developing analytical and reflective skills as well as a commitment to lifelong learning (Amey, 2004).

Traditionally, leadership development has been the focus for the role of the president with few opportunities for other positions (Filan, 2002). However, midlevel managers are often placed in positions that also require a new and different set of skills and behaviors, yet they are often untrained and unprepared for these roles (Filan, 2002). Thus, development opportunities must assist those aspiring to serve as leaders at all levels as well assist new presidents who have indicated they did not fully understand the job and the role of a

president when they accepted the job (Shek, 2001). Serving in a leadership position does require additional skills and the ability to look at the entire institution (Filan, 2002). Professional development programs should provide needed skills and help participants to understand the role of leaders and ease into the transition. Future leaders need a vehicle to learn new skills and a chance to practice them (Boggs, 2003). Thus, development is critical to gain the needed skills.

In a study of exemplary leaders, McFarlin (1999) made the recommendation that current middle managers in community colleges should be made aware of:

> …preparation factors and career paths so they can make more informed decisions regarding their professional development. Literature reviewed for this study strongly suggested that the majority of the next generation of senior community college leaders are already employed as mid-level professionals in community college system (para. 31)

Burnham (2002) concurred:

> As a new generation of leadership emerges in the 21$^{st}$ century environments of community colleges, efforts by Presidents, Vice Presidents, Deans, and senior leaders must be made to identify individuals within the institution who possess the fundamental capability to lead. Once recognized, however, they must be afforded meaningful opportunities to acquire more of the traits of the paradigm through training, mentorship, and experience. (p. 18)

Brown, Martinez, and Daniel (2002) reported that, while the roles and responsibilities of leaders have changed, many training programs have remained the same. Historically, leadership development has come about as a result of a combination of on-the-job training, graduate courses, and shorter-term training. However, the activities have not been intentional nor have they built upon one another (Piland & Wolf, 2003). Limited dollars have been allocated for training and mid-level managers have not always been provided opportunities for training (Filan, 1999). There is a need for leadership development training

that can work to address the goals and the foundation of the community colleges as well as the challenges leaders will encounter (Goff, 2002; Piland & Wolf, 2003).

Vaughan (2001) outlined three primary paths to train potential leaders: (1) increase funding to AACC for the development of leadership programs; (2) offer graduate programs developed through a collaborative effort between the community colleges and the AACC.; and (3) institutions need to "grow their own" leaders. Brown, Martinez, and Daniel (2002) perceived that growing one's own leaders may be the best path to follow. They stated:

> "...although the literature reveals that the roles and responsibilities of community college leaders have changed over a period of 30 years, there is no documentation of the restructuring of university higher education leadership programs to prepare students for the new community college leadership positions. (pp. 45-46)

After surveying 300 community college leaders about their views of leadership preparation, they posited that preparation can be effective at the local level. The authors stated that local programs can address local needs because:

> …on-site leadership training can take into consideration the characteristics and traits of the leaders, characteristics of the led, context or situation, structure, goals, location, training and ability of subordinates, motivation, organizational culture, size of organization, communication patterns, economics, politics, and other external influences. (p. 63)

Local programs may offer the best opportunities for faculty to become involved in training for new leadership roles (Cooper & Pagatto, 2002). Hockaday and Puyear (2000) remarked that, "Some of the best leadership development for community college leaders takes place within individual community colleges. In colleges where presidents and trustees believe that upward mobility of employees is a responsibility of the institution, emerging leaders are a valued asset" (p.8). The skills and attributes identified by AACC's Leading Forward project can assist in the development of programs.

It is important to learn from current leaders and their experiences. Sitting presidents have reported they felt unprepared for their role as a new president. As new leaders, they often found themselves in situations they did not expect and for which they were not prepared (CCLDI, 2001). In addition to feeling unprepared for the job itself, they reported feeling unprepared for the politics of the position, serving as a fund raiser, budgeting, working with boards of trustees, and the emphasis on the relationship building needed (Boggs, 2003; Shek, 2001; Shults, 2001). Presidents have indicated that they did not understand the full scope of the job and additional training would have been beneficial (Shults, 2001).

The role of a mentor can play a significant part of the development process (Bagnato, 2004). Studies have revealed that successful presidents reported having a mentor, and approximately 50% of those surveyed in an AACC survey indicated a mentor relationship was important to their development (Amey & Vander Linden, 2002; McFarlin, 1998; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). In their research on exemplary leaders, Ebbers and McFarlin (1998) found those leaders considered to be outstanding leaders had developed a relationship with a mentor. Cooper and Pagatto (2003) emphasized the fact that an important aspect of the Community College Leadership Development Initiatives is that participants are assigned a coach or mentor and other participants serve as a support group.

Ebbers et al. (2003) stated:

...leaders will be asked to function in a more agile, creative environment. In order to do this, leadership programs both internal and external, must be developed in order for them to be facile with change strategies, contemporary management techniques, and entrepreneurial approaches to resource acquisition. In addition, current administrators should be vigilant about identifying and supporting faculty who may have a strong acumen for leadership. Special attention needs to be given to identifying persons of color

and women who have identified leadership attributes. New models of
leadership which allow institutions to maintain these theretofore nimble
natures must be encouraged to breed within a new set of leaders the
enthusiasm and desire that was so vital to the creation of the community
college movement. (p. 236)

Just as many have provided input on the requirements for leaders, there are many thoughts of

what must be included in leadership development programs. Watts and Hammons (2002)

stressed the importance of establishing clear and consistent program goals to help improve

the quality and effectiveness of the program. Programs must also be accessible, maintain a

high quality, and be designed for working professionals (AACC, 2006). Ebbers and

McFarlin (1998) emphasized the importance of including the skill sets proven to assist in

making leaders successful.

The Leading Forward Website (2006) addresses the importance of leadership training

for potential leaders. According to the site:

Leadership development is an investment in a process that provides
individuals with opportunities and experiences that enable them to be effective
leaders in community colleges. The process includes identifying potential
leaders and providing support and encouragement to participate in structured,
ongoing growth and development activities.

Nevertheless, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1999) stressed that, while the programs are

important, one must remember that developing leadership skills is a life-long process.

The skills identified by many fit well into the six basic competencies identified by the

Leading Forward project and can provide guidance for training programs. Using the work of

the Leading Forward project as a basis, the following skills sets are ones that must be

covered in a leadership development program to prepare future leaders.

**Organizational strategy**

*Managing internal functions:*  Leadership programs must provide participants a method to learn about their colleges and how to establish a positive climate within the college setting (Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).  Romero (2004) commented that new leaders must be educated "in knowledge and research about leadership development that truly prepares them for the unique environments in which they operate.  Training programs must address the policy dynamics, research and practice skills, and values and behaviors that support and affirm the egalitarian climates in which community college leaders work" (p. 24).  Filan (2002) stressed the importance of leaders knowing their college.

*Vision and culture:*  Programs must include discussion on creating a vision for the college and how to set the institutional culture of the college (CCLDI, 2001; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000).

*Planning, organizational development*:  The ability to make decisions that will help to improve the college will be important.  Programs must include models for planning and strategic thinking as well as decision-making strategies (Bennis, 1991; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Carter et al., 2002; CCLDI, 2001; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McPhail, 2000; Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*Institutional leadership ethics*:  Since it will be the leaders' role to define the values and ethical standards of the college, programs must assist participants in examining the ethics of leadership.  Thus, discussions on modeling these behaviors must take place (CCLDI, 2001, Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*Education, teaching, and learning:*  The awareness of trends in education will be important as well as an emphasis on the student and student success (CCLDI, 2001).

*External environment*:  An understanding of the role of the college in the community and the many relationships that must be developed will be critical to new leaders.  The state governing system and the role of the state legislature should also be covered (Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).  Leaders must learn to work within the political and economic landscape in which they operate, be prepared to interact with the media, and form civic partnerships in their communities (Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*The ability to develop priorities*:  Community college leaders balance many tasks and responsibilities.  The skill to develop priorities must be included in any program (Goff, 2002).

*Board relations*:  A successful leader must be able to work with his or her Board of Trustees.  A leadership development program must provide guidance on the role of elected boards and various approaches in working with board members (McClenney, 2001; McPhail, 2000).

*Changing environments*: Leaders serve as change agents and a leadership development program should foster discussion on how best to create change and work in a changing environment.  Since the colleges will be working in an environment that will be constantly changing, an understanding of change and its impact is important (Cooper, 2002).

*Legal aspects of leadership*:  There will be a variety of challenges that will require consultation with legal counsel.  Legal issues for the community colleges must be covered in a program (Carroll & Romero, 2003).

*Facilities planning*:  Facility planning and challenges in working with existing facilities must be covered (Carroll & Romero, 2003).

**Resource management**

*Financial planning and budgeting:* Leaders must understand the development of the budget, the impact the budget has on the institution, and how to manage the budgets (Carroll & Romero, 2003; McClenney, 2001; McPhail, 2000).

*Fund raising:* As the financial picture of the colleges become bleaker, it will be more important for leaders to be able to raise funds within their communities (McClenney, 2001). It will take creative approaches to raise alternative revenue resources (Ebbers et al., 2003)

*Developing leadership skills in others:* Leadership programs must assist new and potential leaders to learn how to create leadership opportunities for others in order to expand the leadership capacity of the colleges (Carroll & Romero, 2003; CCLDI, 2001; Gibson-Benninger et el., 1996; Kellogg Foundation, 1999; O'Rourke, 1997; Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*Work with ambiguity:* Because of the changing environment, potential leaders will be faced with uncertainty. Discussion on working in such an environment will be important.

*Teaching and learning:* Programs must emphasize the importance of the role of teaching and learning in the college and how they, as leaders, can promote excellent teaching, learning, and creativity in the classroom (Carroll & Romano, 2003; CCLDI, 2001; Leading Forward, 2005; McPhail, 2000; Wallin, 2002). As stressed in the Claremont study (2001), leaders must remember that the colleges are in place for the students.

**Communication**

*Communication skills:*  Time and time again it has been stressed that communication skills will help the leader to stay in touch with those whom they serve. Programs must include discussion on how to foster honest conversation and establish an environment for a healthy exchange of ideas among employees (CCLDI, 2001; McPhail, 2000).  Because leaders will also be faced with media relations, public speaking, and conducting interviews, these skills should also be included (CCLDI, 2001; Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*Balance:*  A leadership position places many demands on individuals and requires much time and energy.  Programs for new leaders should include discussion on balancing both from a professional and personal point of view.  New leaders should be provided assistance on balancing multiple agendas and priorities.

**Collaboration**

*Working with individuals as well as groups:*  Leaders must learn to collaborate to develop a shared vision for the college.  Often, they must also facilitate conflict resolution within groups (Kellogg Foundation, 1999; Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).  Cooper and Pagotto (2003) expressed the need to learn how to develop teams and empower the teams to accomplish their tasks.

*Developing partnerships:*  New leaders must learn how and when to develop partnerships that will assist in promoting the college. (McClenney, 2001)  Leaders will be in a position to develop political, economic, media, and civic partnerships as they represent their college (CCLDI, 2001).

*Establishing the college culture:*  Leaders must understand the culture of the institution and how they impact that culture. They must understand the norms of the college as well as the history, traditions, and culture. (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Wallin, 2002).  Thus, discussion on creating and promoting a shared vision will be important (McClenney, 2001).

**Community college advocacy**

*History, mission of higher education, in particular, the community college:* Celebrating the traditions of community colleges and learning from the past are important as colleges plan for the future (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005).  Leaders must have a clear understanding of the role of the community college and the values that have set the colleges apart from other forms of higher education (CCLDI, 2001; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Wallin, 2002; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).  McClenney (2001) exclaimed there must be a passion for the community college values for a leader to be successful.

*Diversity:*  The importance of diversity in leadership has become more and more important.  Leaders must examine how they as new leaders can work to promote varying viewpoints for the college and they must develop a healthy respect for differing viewpoints (Carroll & Romero, 2003; Filan, 2002; Gibson-Benninger et al., 1996; O'Rourke, 1997; Wolf & Carroll, 2002). Leaders must learn to view situations from multiple perspectives and voices (CCLDI, 2001; Wallin, 2002).

**Professionalism**

*Self awareness:*  Several researchers have stressed that leaders must be aware of their strengths, opportunities for improvement and management style.  Thus, programs must assist

potential leaders to examine their abilities; leaders must "Know thy self" (CCLDI 2001;

Filan, 2002; Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Wolf & Carroll, 2002).  Self assessment,

identification of leadership style, inquiry, and reflection must be built into any leadership

program (Amey, 2004; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Kellogg Foundation, 1999).  There must be

a willingness to make mistakes and learn from those experiences (Fulton-Calking & Milling,

2005).  Self assessment must be a key component of any leadership development programs.

Carroll and Romero (2003) remarked that successful programs "Require participants to look

inward toward a leader's values and leadership style and outward toward the institutional

environment" (p. 87).

*Conflict resolution:*  Methods and practice in problem solving and conflict resolution

will be important for new leaders (Kellogg Foundation, 1999; McPhail, 2000).

*Ethics:*  Participants in leadership programs must be able to explore ethical practices

and have discussion on practices (Wolf & Carroll, 2002).

*Values:*  Leadership must be steeped in values (Fullins-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

Those persons who are developing leadership skills must be provided the opportunity to

explore their own values and determine how they fit in a leadership role.

*Leadership styles:*  The exploration of various leadership and management styles will

prove helpful (Carroll & Romero, 2003; Ebbers et al., 2003)

### Summary

The research has shown that community colleges will be facing changes in their

leadership with a high number of anticipated retirements.  Additionally, community college

faculty and mid-level managers are also planning their retirements.  The challenge for all

colleges will be to develop current employees who are ready to step into leadership positions at all levels of the colleges.

Ebbers and others (2003) stressed:

Preparation of leaders for all phases of community college functions will be critical to the continual success of community colleges in the state of Iowa. These individuals will need a rich and varied combination of work experiences and educational credentials to provide the leadership needed. They also will need to be aware of local, regional, and national issues in the field of education. (p. 232)

The training of the next group of community college leaders is important. Potential leaders must know what skills will be needed, the challenges before them and what will be expected of them. Programs such as Iowa's LINC and CLIC, hopefully, assist to create a pool of ready and able future leaders. The programs provide a great introduction to Iowa's community college system and offer a skill set to be successful. The programs also provide opportunities for future leaders. It is important that the programs stay current with the need of the colleges, and monitor the impact on individuals and the community colleges.

Since leaders of this generation will play a role in determining the future of the community colleges, they must be strong individuals who are prepared for the tasks before them. Programs that assist in the development of new leaders can be guided by the research documenting the very skills needed by community college leaders. Ultimately, what is desired of future leaders has been described by Goff (2002): "...agile leaders who are thoroughly prepared through training, experience, and self-study" (para. 24).

There is a plethora of research regarding the need for skilled leaders in the community college system and the skills they must possess to successfully lead their colleges. The research can be helpful to enable administrators, program developers and

others to design and evaluate leadership development programs that will assist in creating

new leaders for the future.

# CHAPTER 3.  METHODOLOGY

## Introduction

A review of the current literature in the previous chapter revealed a potential shortage of community college leaders.  Increasing numbers of retiring leaders in the community college system has provided concern regarding the need to prepare for the next generation of leaders.  It has been suggested that there is a need for training potential leaders and that an intentional plan must be developed for this training (Goff, 2002; Piland & Wolf, 2003).  The purpose of this study was to provide information about two existing leadership development programs in Iowa.  The study gathered information on the Leadership Institute in a New Century (LINC) and Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC) programs to assess the satisfaction of individuals completing the program, the effectiveness of the programs in preparing leaders for the community college system in Iowa, the impact the programs have had on the careers of the individual participants, and the effectiveness of the topics covered in the programs. Two data sources were used for the study.  The first source was a participant survey.  The results from the survey provided information about the participants and enabled them to share their perceptions of the programs.  To gather additional information, interviews were conducted with three groups of stakeholders. Interviews were conducted with three current community college leaders as well as three individuals who have served in staff positions with the LINC and CLIC programs.  Focus groups were held on the campuses of three community colleges in Iowa to learn more about the perceptions of those who have completed the two programs.  Information from the interviews and focus groups allowed for a description of the impact of the LINC and CLIC

leadership development programs have had on its participants and the community colleges that have supported the programs.

## Background

An identified need to provide leadership development opportunities was presented in 1989 by Iowa's community colleges. This need resulted in the development of the leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) program in 1989, with a goal of providing leadership development opportunities for women and minorities. The Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC) was developed in 1995 as a way to provide leadership development opportunities for men. Both programs have been offered yearly and, since the spring of 2005, they have served a total of 465 community college staff (275 in LINC and 190 in CLIC). The goal of both programs has been to expand the leadership capacity of the colleges in the state. As the programs have evolved, they have included men and women. LINC has developed into an entry-level leadership program, while CLIC has focused on developing skills for those in mid- and upper-level administrative positions.

In addition to serving the needs of community college staff, the programs have enrolled staff from the Iowa Department of Education as well as other colleges in the Midwest. For the purposes of this study, only community college employees who were employed in the state at the time of their participation in the programs and had completed the programs by the spring of 2005 were considered. Participants who began the programs in the fall of 2005 had not completed the programs at the time of the survey; therefore, they did not have the time to reflect on the impact of the programs on their careers. Thus, these participants were not included in the survey.

This study gathered information on both programs and provided feedback from the participants and their satisfaction with the programs. The outcomes explored in this study centered on the participants' satisfaction with the programs, their own skill development, and their career and degree advancement, as well as recommendations for program improvement. Participant feedback was helpful in identifying how the programs have impacted the participants' careers. It was anticipated that the results of this study will provide information on the impact the programs have had on participants and will allow for recommendations for the future.

## Research Design

The LINC program was first evaluated 1992 by Vianna Kelly as a part of her Master's thesis at Iowa State University. Kelly developed the Satisfaction and Perception Survey (SPS) as an evaluation tool. The goal of the survey was to gather information from participants of the program, and learn about their personal and career characteristics as well as their level of satisfaction with the LINC program as its content (Gallisath, 1995). The survey included background information on the participants as well as information on their LINC experience. A second evaluation was completed in 1995 by Glenda Gallisath as part of her Doctoral dissertation research at Iowa State University. Gallisath made modifications to the survey developed by Kelly, and updated the evaluation information. While the LINC program has been evaluated each year by the participants, a survey had not been completed since 1995 to ascertain the program's impact on its participants. As with the LINC program, the CLIC program has been evaluated yearly by participants who completed the program. Thus, a formal evaluation of the CLIC program has not been completed.

The SPS survey developed by Kelly in 1992 and modified by Gallisath in 1995 was used as a basis for the current study. Additional modifications were made based on recommendations of the LINC/CLIC staff and current research. The modified survey was reviewed by LINC/CLIC staff and approved prior to its use in this study.

Because the same survey instrument was used for both programs, a question was added for participants to determine the programs in which they had participated. A question was also added to determine the year participants had participated in the program. Additional questions were added to gather information on the participants who may have retired since the last survey was completed. Employment titles in questions 8 and 9 were also updated using the Department of Education's most recent report on community colleges. Since graduate credit has been awarded for participation in both programs, a question asking the importance of the credit earned in the programs was added as question number 16. Question 20 which addressed how LINC or CLIC contributed to promotions was modified to include questions centering on the improvement of skills in working with groups as well as gaining a better understanding in how to develop leadership skills in others. When asking about skills developed as a result of participating in the program, questions were added that focus on leading a college, such as: developing a campus climate (question 46); decision-making roles (question 48); developing leadership styles in others (question 50); leadership ethics (question 54); how best to develop priorities (question 56); an understanding of the history of the community colleges (question 45); legislative priorities (questions 71 and 72); how best to work in a changing environment (question 47); the importance of diversity (question 62); strategic planning (question 57); and the role of fund raising (question 63).

Questions were also added to enable the participants to assess their personal growth. These new questions included: the importance of networking (question 81); communication skills (question 52); assessing individual strengths (question 78); developing teams (question 51); and gaining a better understanding of ones own leadership style (question 69). These items were added based on research of desired skills for community college leaders. In addition, open-ended questions were placed at the end of the survey for participants to indicate which sessions they found most beneficial, any topical areas that were not covered but would have been helpful, and which objectives they achieved. Last, two open-ended questions were added so participants might explain the impact of either LINC or CLIC on their career, as well as other leadership programs in which they may have participated.

The questions on the previous survey relating the number of children the participants had, whether they rode to the programs with board members or their president, and the selection/nomination process for their college were omitted. The original questionnaire was reformatted, and the changes in the questions required renumbering the questions.

The new 167-question participant survey contained questions relating to the background of the participants, their experience in the programs, and the impact the program had on their career. A set of five-point Likert items were used to measure the satisfaction and perception of the individuals with the two programs. Open-ended questions were included in the survey to gather additional participant insights. The survey results are reported in total frequencies and percentage for each question.

The survey was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee in December 2005 (Appendix A). While the original SPS survey was distributed by mail (Appendix B-1), the new version of the survey was sent electronically to participants

of the two programs (Appendix B-2). The database for all LINC and CLIC participants and current recorded e-mail addresses was obtained from Iowa State University and used for survey distribution. E-mail addresses not available from ISU were obtained from the 2005 AACC Membership Directory and the 2006 Higher Education Directory. In addition, several colleges were contacted to obtain as many addresses as possible. Some participants had changed employment and their current location was unable to be found. Ninety-two LINC and CLIC participants were unable to be located (62 LINC and 30 CLIC). Although e-mail addresses were not available for 17 LINC participants and 5 CLIC participants, it was possible to obtain postal addresses for those individuals. The participants received a copy of the survey by U.S. Mail and provided an option to return the survey via mail in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope or to complete the survey on-line. All participants were provided the link to the survey as well as a password and user identification. A total of 213 surveys were sent to LINC participants and 160 to CLIC participants.

The electronic survey was sent in early March 2006. Participants were sent an e-mail with the link to the survey, their personal password and user identification. Participants were given four weeks to complete the survey on line. An independent Website was created for the survey, and all survey responses were sent to the Website and responses from the survey were input directly to a database. A Web consultant was available to answer any questions or to provide technical guidance as needed. After four weeks, a reminder e-mail was sent to those who had not yet completed the survey. The Website was closed in late April, 2006 and no more submissions were taken at that time. Participant consent for participation in the study was implied by the return of the survey.

One hundred thirty-five LINC surveys (Appendix C) were completed for a 63.4% return rate. Ninety-one CLIC surveys were returned for a 56.8% return rate. The total return rate for the two programs was 60.6%. Appendix C also provides details on the return rate by program, and by year. The survey results were analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) software, and appear in Appendix C.

The intent of the study was to describe the experiences of the participants, determine the satisfaction of the participants for the programs, and the impact of the experience on their professional life. The study also examined the impact the programs have had on preparing leaders for community colleges in Iowa. The study was descriptive in nature, and investigated the development and changes in the participants' careers and leadership skills as well as recommended changes for the programs. A combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques was used. The survey questions were intended to provide summative information about both programs (Krathwohl, 1998). All results were reported in frequencies and percentages. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used when comparing the means of the three employment groups. Chi-square analysis was used for the nominal data to determine differences in the experiences and leadership development of the participants of the programs based on their positions at the time of program participation. A significance level of $p=.05$ was used as this level is common in educational research. The focus groups provided a rich description of the participants' perceptions of the program and their individual experiences in the programs. In addition, the interviews with community college leaders and LINC and CLIC staff helped the researcher to gather information on their perceptions of the programs and the impact of the programs on its participants.

## Research Questions

Four research questions guided this research study. Each of the questions were addressed by gathering information from the SPS survey, interviews with community college leaders and LINC and CLIC staff, and focus groups with participants.

1. ***What has been the impact of the LINC and/or CLIC programs on the participants' careers?***

This question was addressed by viewing the results from a number of questions on the survey. Participants were asked their reasons for participating in the programs in question 17. This question provided insight to the reasons that participants chose to participate in the program. Questions 8 and 9 reviewed changes in leadership positions from the initial involvement in the programs to the time in which the survey was completed. Participants recorded their employment level when participating in the programs as well as the level of employment when completing the survey. Employment levels were as follows:

Level 1: Executive Vice-President, Vice-President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

Level 4: Participants were able to list their position if it did not fit the other three categories

For those individuals who were working in the same leadership level as when they were in the programs, question 10 allowed for a description of any changes they have experienced in responsibilities while not changing leadership levels. Promotions of the participants are recorded in question 18. Question 20 enabled participants to indicate the impact the LINC and/or CLIC programs had on their promotion. Participants could indicate

the degree of the impact on their promotion, ranging from a significant impact to no impact at all. Information for these questions was provided in frequencies and percentages using SPSS.

Promotions by employment level was also be reviewed to determine if the various employment levels have different experiences in the program. A chi-square test was used to determine if there were significant differences in the number of promotions based on initial employment level.

Participants were asked about their future employment plans in the survey. Question 22 recorded participants' desires to stay employed with a community college, while question 24 asked the level of employment participants would like to attain in the near future. The impact the programs had on clarifying their career goals is recorded in question 23. The SPSS statistical software was used to determine frequencies and percentages. Responses from the focus groups provided additional information on the impact the programs had on the participants' careers and some insights into their experiences in the programs.

2. *Did involvement in the programs impact the degree attainment by the participants?*

The LINC and CLIC programs offered graduate credit for those participating in the programs and participants were encouraged to continue their education. The importance of that credit is documented in question 16. Question 15 records the number of participants who have earned degrees since their participation in the programs. Question 12 provided data on participants who were currently enrolled in a program, while question 13 recorded the degree the participants were working to achieve. A list of those programs of study is provided in the report. Question 14 asked participants if they were not currently pursuing a

degree, if they planned to start within the next five years.  Data for each of these questions were recorded by frequency and percentages using SPSS.

Degree attainment by employment level is also provided for both the LINC and CLIC programs.  The number of degrees earned since participating in the programs is reported. Using the SPSS software package, a chi-square test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in degree attainment between employment levels.

The focus groups for the participants further described the impact the programs had on the participants' plans for their education.  Additionally, program staff shared observations on the goals set by participants as they complete the programs.

### 3. *Did involvement in the program result in an improvement of leadership skills?*

The development of leadership skills was the basis for both programs.  Questions 42 through 75 offered participants an opportunity to share their perceptions of the skills they were able to improve as a result of the program.  Each of these questions was scored using a 5-point Likert range.  The Likert items were used to determine the level of agreement with the statements by participants:  5 = strongly agreed; 4 = agreed; 3 = not sure; 2 = disagreed; and 1 = strongly disagreed.  Frequencies, percentages, and mean scores were calculated for each of the statements by using SPSS.  An ANOVA model was estimated to determine if there were significant differences in the improvement of leadership skills based on employment levels.

Survey question 165 asked participants to indicate if they had achieved specific objectives in the programs—if they had developed or improved their leadership skills, had a better understanding of the community college system, and had a better understanding of the

role of leaders in the community college.  The results of this question were reported in frequencies and percentages by using SPSS.

A comparison of the varying leadership levels was also made to determine if there were significant differences in the levels in gaining a better understanding of the community college system, the role of leaders, and developing and/or improving one's leadership style. A chi-square test was conducted to determine significant differences between employment levels.

Observations from community college leaders and staff of the LINC and CLIC programs offered a greater insight to the impact the programs have on participants.  Those observations were ascertained as a result of the interviews.

4. *Do the topics covered in the programs meet the needs to develop new leaders for the community college system in Iowa?*

It is critical to offer the skill sets needed to successfully lead in a community college in today's environment.  Questions 42 through 82 offered insight to the topics the participants perceived they had gained a better understanding, while questions 83-122 and 123 through 162 provided the participants an opportunity to indicate which topics were of greater or lesser value to them.  Participants rated each of these topics on 5-point Likert items, with 5 indicating "strongly agree" with the statement and 1 indicating "strongly disagree" with the statement.  Frequencies, percentages, and mean scores were calculated for each statement using SPSS.

Open-ended questions at the end of the survey enabled participants to provide suggestions, or additional skills or topics that would be helpful to them if addressed by the

programs. Those suggestions were included in the results. Information from the interviews and focus groups provided additional insight to the topics addressed in the programs.

## Interviews

After the participant surveys were completed, interviews were conducted with participants, community college leaders, and the program staff from both programs. The intent of the interviews was to gain a greater understanding of the impact of the program on participants.

Three sets of interviews were conducted to gather additional information about the LINC and CLIC programs. Personal interviews were conducted with three current community college leaders in the state of Iowa. Three members of the LINC and CLIC staff who provided direction for the program sessions and worked directly with the participants were also interviewed to gather their perceptions of the programs and the changes they had observed. Focus groups were held on the campus of three colleges to meet with former participants of the programs and to gather additional information about their experiences. Focus groups were selected based on the colleges that had sent employees to the programs. The leaders were selected based on their time in office and their recommendation of staff for both programs. The goal of the interviews was to provide a more in-depth look at the programs, the impact on the participants, and the impact on community college leadership in Iowa.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted using open-ended questions to gather information from the interviewees (Krathwohl, 1998). Specific questions were asked of each former LINC and CLIC participant, the community college leaders, and LINC/CLIC

program staff.  Responses were recorded using a tape recorder. Follow-up questions were asked in response to some of the answers to gather additional information or clarification to the response.

Program participants were asked the following questions:

1. When did you participate in the LINC/CLIC program?
2. Why did you choose to participate?
3. Has your position changed since you participated in the program?
4. What has been the impact on your skills as a result of participating in LINC/CLIC?
5. Has your career goal changed since you participated in LINC/CLIC?
6. Have your educational goals changed since your participation in LINC/CLIC?
7. Has your leadership style changed since participating in the program?
8. What specific skills did you gain in LINC/CLIC?
9. What were the benefits of the program for you?
10. Did the LINC/CLIC prepare you to be a leader?
11. Have you maintained contact with those who were in LINC/CLIC at the same time as you?
12. Were there any disappointments in the program?
13. Any recommendations for change?
14. Other comments?

The LINC and CLIC programs have enrolled participants from each of the 15 community colleges in Iowa, and it was important to gather information on the impact the programs have had on the colleges.  Interviews were held with two sitting and one former president whose staff had completed both programs.  Each of the individuals has been in their positions for more than five years.  Community college leaders support the programs by paying the program fees and providing for time away from work; therefore, their input is important.  In one case, the individual interviewed was one of the leaders who originally

supported the development of the programs. Another leader interviewed was a product of

one of the programs.

Interview questions were as follows:

1. Why do you support the LINC/CLIC programs?
2. How do you select participants for the program?
3. Has LINC/CLIC impacted your college?
4. How do you select leaders within your college?
5. Do you believe LINC/CLIC is developing new leaders for the Iowa community college system?  Why, or why not?
6. Have you seen a growth/change in those from your college who have participated in LINC/CLIC?
7. What do you see as the role of LINC/CLIC in the future?
8. Have you encouraged staff to become involved in other leadership programs?  If so, which ones?
9. What skills sets do you believe must be covered in LINC/CLIC?
10. What recommendations would you have for the program?
11. Will you continue to support the programs in the future?
12. Comments?

The LINC/CLIC program has had staff who have worked with the program

throughout its existence.  This group was interviewed to ascertain their perceptions and

insights to the program.  The staff knew the history of the programs since inception, followed

the development, knew the participants who had been a part of the LINC/CLIC programs,

and was perceived by this researcher to be able to offer some keen insights.

Three staff members were interviewed using the following questions as a guide:

1. What is your role in the LINC/CLIC program?
2. How long have you been associated with LINC/CLIC?
3. What is your role in the development of the program topics?
4. What do you see as the impact of LINC/CLIC in the community college system in Iowa?

5. How do you see emerging leaders identified?

6. Can you identify growth in the program participants?  How?

7. Share your reflections on the program.

8. Recommendations for the future?

9. Comments?

All interviews were tape-recorded to ensure the accuracy of the statements.  The tapes were transcribed and themes were developed for all interviews.  The tapes will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

The compiled survey results and interviews offer a more comprehensive picture of the LINC and CLIC programs and the impact the programs have had on its participants and the community colleges in Iowa.  Through the interviews and focus groups, themes were developed by categorizing comments into similar areas.  These data will assist the researcher to provide feedback to the program leaders on the impact of the LINC and CLIC programs, and suggestions for improvement.

## Qualitative/Quantitative Methods

Qualitative methods were used for several reasons.  The methods are helpful when viewing individuals' perceptions of a certain situation or experience.  Qualitative methods also enable researchers to provide a better understanding of how individuals view the situation and react to the information offered (Krathwohl, 1998).  In this study, perceptions are critical to providing a complete picture of the two programs.  Since this study explores the perceptions of participants in both the LINC and CLIC programs and determines the impact of the programs on their careers, the qualitative methods are most appropriate.

Quantitative methods were used to report the results of the SPS survey completed by the participants.

Results from the survey were, in a large part, reported in total frequencies, means, and percentages using SPSS. This reporting provided for an overall picture of the program. The survey provided a method to measure the impact of the program on participants and to gather perceptions from a variety of participants.

**Validity**

Three community college leaders in the state of Iowa were interviewed for this study. There has been a high turnover of leadership in the state and many leaders may not be familiar with the LINC and CLIC programs. The leaders selected have been in their positions for more than five years and have recommended staff for both of the programs.

The format and subject matter of the programs may change from year to year. The LINC program is in its 18th year of operation while the CLIC program is in its 12th year. The programs evolve based on feedback each year from the participants as well as the current issues at hand for the year. Participants change yearly and the make-up of participants determines the interaction within the group. Therefore, it is challenging to provide a consistent and direct comparison for each year of the programs.

It is also important to note that the researcher is an alumnus of the LINC program and has recommended staff for participation in the program. Additionally, the researcher has served as a presenter for the program.

It is difficult to determine if growth in an individual is the result of a specific program or a combination of learning opportunities and work experience. Those participants

completing the programs earlier had the benefit of work experiences, which may have

impacted their views and perceptions of the programs.

## Trustworthiness

It is critical to maintain trustworthiness so the results of this study can be used to

determine the effectiveness of the LINC and CLIC programs.  The following methods were

used to assure the trustworthiness of the study:

- Limitations were reviewed
- The researcher was familiar with the programs
- All interviews were tape recorded so the exact words of the interviewee could be documented.
- The survey results were submitted and recorded by a third party
- A peer de-briefer was used to review the information gained from the focus groups. This individual has completed one of the programs and is familiar with the goals of both programs.

# CHAPTER 4.  RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of this study.  The chapter is organized according to the four research questions.  Results are presented for the Satisfaction and Perception survey (SPS), the semi-structured interviews with community college leaders and staff who have worked in both the LINC and CLIC programs, and information from the focus groups with past participants.  Results from the SPS are presented first as aggregate data followed by comparative data for each of the programs.

Surveys were sent to 213 of the 275 LINC participants and 160 of the 190 CLIC participants who were employed at a community college at the time of their participation.  In many cases, participants had left their institution and could not be located.  One hundred and thirty five LINC participants completed the survey, for a 63.4 % return rate.  Ninety-one CLIC participants returned their survey, for a 56.8% return rate.  In total, 226 participants of the leadership programs provided feedback on the programs.  This represents a 60.6% return for the two programs.  Appendix C provides detailed information on the survey distribution.

The results presented will provide a glimpse of the impact of the LINC and CLIC programs on community college employees in the state of Iowa.  Past participants had an opportunity to describe their experiences and share how the programs assisted them in their careers.  The results are organized based on the four research questions.  First, results are presented for the LINC program, followed by results for the CLIC program.  A summary of the results from the interviews and focus groups will conclude each section.

**Research Question 1 – Career Impact of the LINC and CLIC Programs**

The first research question explored the impact of the LINC and CLIC programs on the participants' careers. Participants were asked to provide information about promotions, their continued education, and other changes in their career goals in this portion of the survey.

**LINC program survey results**

Participants were asked to provide information on their positions as they entered the program as well as at the time of completing the survey.  Positions were placed into four categories of employment.  These categories were based on the previous survey and job titles as reported by the Iowa Department of Education.   The category levels for the survey were:

Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions

Survey questions 8 and 9 recorded the leadership level of the participants during the program and at the time they complete the survey.  Participants' reasons for participating in the program were recorded for question 17.  Question 18 asked participants if a promotion followed their experience in LINC/CLIC.  Participants were asked to provide additional information about the promotion in question 19.  For those participants who did not receive an advancement in their position, information was gathered on changes in their role at the

college. Question 20 asked to what degree the LINC/CLIC experience had on the promotion. Question 21 provided additional information on the impact the programs had on the participants and their careers.

**Aggregate data**

Participants were asked to indicate their rationale for wanting to participate in the LINC program (question 17). Of those responding, 42 (31.1%) respondents indicated their primary reason for participating in the program was to *"gain a better understanding of community colleges."* Forty-two also indicated they participated in the program because they were *"asked by their supervisor."* Career advancement was listed as the primary reason for participating in the LINC program by 22 (16.3%) participants.

Leadership levels for participants were recorded at the time of participation as well as at the time of survey completion. Table 1 provides the results for time of participation and survey completion for the LINC program. Those indicating "other" on their survey recorded positions such as: Assessment Coordinator, Chief Financial Officer, graduate student,

Table 1. Comparison of leadership levels of LINC participants regarding time of participation and survey completion (Q 17)

| Category | Level (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Time of Participation | 13 (9.6%) | 48 (35.6%) | 66 (48.9) | 8 (5.9%) |
| Time of Survey Completion | 37 (27.4%) | 41 (30.4%) | 40 (29.6%) | 10 (7.4%) |

KEY:
Level 1: Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.
Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.
Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.
Level 4: Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Resource Development Officer, Assistant Professor, President of own firm, and Director of

Institutional Research.

Survey question 18 asked participants if they had earned a promotion since

participating in the LINC program. Of those responding to the survey, 56 (41.5%)

participants indicated they had earned a promotion since participating in the LINC program.

While some participants had not received promotions to new positions, they reported that

they had assumed additional responsibilities and leadership roles on their college campus.

Survey question 19 requested information on the promotions (Table 2). As shown in Table

2, the largest percentage receiving promotions were Dean/Director (35.7%), followed by

Gained Additional Duties (18%).

Table 2.    Number of promotions since participating in the LINC program (Q 18)

| Promotion to | Number in position | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| President | 2 | 3.5 |
| Vice President | 6 | 10.7 |
| Provost | 1 | 1.8 |
| Executive Dean/Director | 5 | 8.9 |
| Dean/Director | 20 | 35.7 |
| Associate Dean/Director | 3 | 5.3 |
| Chief Academic Officer | 1 | 1.8 |
| Coordinator | 1 | 1.8 |
| Instructor | 3 | 5.4 |
| Counselor | 1 | 1.8 |
| Manager | 3 | 5.3 |
| Gained Additional Duties/Pay | 10 | 18.0 |
| Total Promotions | 56 | 100.0 |

Survey question number 20 asked participants to what degree they believed the LINC program had an impact on their promotion. As shown in Table 3, slightly more than 40% indicated the program impacted them moderately, and approximately 40% indicated the impact was either very (17.8%) or somewhat (17.8%).

Table 3.    Impact of LINC program on promotion (Q 20)

| Impact | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Very | 10 | 17.8 |
| Moderately | 23 | 41.1 |
| Somewhat | 9 | 16.1 |
| Minimally | 10 | 17.8 |
| Not At All | 2 | 3.6 |
| Don't Know | 2 | 3.6 |
| Total | 56 | 100.0 |

Survey question 21 enabled participants to indicate how the LINC program impacted their promotion. The response marked most often was that the LINC program helped participants to clarify their professional goals (Table 4). Of those answering this question, 17 respondents, or 12.7% of those responding to the survey, believed that the program helped to clarify their professional goals. The second highest response item for the impact of the LINC program on promotions was that the program helped to broaden the individuals understanding of the community college system. Fifteen participants (11.1%) of those responding believed that this was the biggest impact on them.

Seventy-seven participants, or 82.9% of those responding to the survey, indicated that they had not changed leadership levels since participating in the LINC program. Some participants recorded they had changed roles within the same leadership levels. Enhanced

leadership, added or enhanced responsibilities, additional instructional responsibilities,

serving in leadership roles on college committees, and district-wide responsibilities were

listed as changes for these individuals.  Additional information on those who have not

changed leadership levels is also noted (Table 4).

Table 4.    Participants working at same leadership level as when participating in LINC
(Q 21)

| Leadership level | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Position title has remained the same but leadership responsibilities have been enhanced. | 31 | 40.3 |
| Position title has not changed and leadership responsibilities have not been enhanced. | 24 | 31.2 |
| Position title has changed but remained within the same leadership level. | 16 | 20.8 |
| Other | 6 | 7.7 |
| Total | 77 | 100.0 |

When considering promotions and those who have gained additional leadership

responsibilities on their campus, 87 individuals, or 64.4% of those responding to the survey,

are working in a different capacity than when they participated in the LINC program.

Question number 23 asked participants if their LINC experience helped to clarify

their career aspirations.  As shown in Table 5, more than half (N=78; 57.7%) responded yes.

Table 5.    Did the LINC experience help to clarify career aspirations? (Q 23)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 78 | 57.7 |
| No | 22 | 16.3 |
| Unsure | 31 | 23.0 |
| No Response | 4 | 3.0 |
| Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Those completing the survey were offered an opportunity to provide comments

regarding the questions of how LINC helped to clarify their professional goals.  Comments

showed that the LINC program helped to:

- Broaden participants' knowledge
- Strengthen commitment to the community college career
- Confirm the desire to work in higher education
- Confirm commitment to the community college system
- Deepen the understanding of the mission of the community college
- Focus on goals and priorities
- Offer a better understanding of the system and the desire to advance
- Provide direction
- Give confidence and connections needed to aspire for "bigger things"
- Develop skills and gain more confidence in decisions, more aware of the college
- Participant to realize they could take a leadership role
- Increase understanding of the roles within a community college
- Give confidence to participate on local and state committees, and taught to be more comprehensive and futurist in thinking
- Realize individual strengths

Question 22 surveyed participants as to their desire to continue working for a

community college.  The responses showed that a majority of those responding would like to

do so.  As shown in Table 6, the majority (N=117; 86.7%) wished to continue employment at

a community college.

Table 6.    Participants wishing to continue employment at a community college (Q 22)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 117 | 86.7 |
| No | 6 | 4.4 |
| Unsure | 8 | 5.9 |
| No Response | 4 | 3.0 |
| Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Respondents planning to continue their work in a community college setting, they were asked to which level of employment they would desire to attain within the next five years. As shown in Table 7, the largest number of participants (N=47; 38.5%) indicated they planned to continue in their current position.

Table 7.  Level of employment desired by participants (Q 22)

| Position | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| President | 5 | 4.1 |
| Vice President | 18 | 14.8 |
| Dean | 22 | 18.0 |
| Department Chair | 4 | 3.3 |
| Continue in Current Position | 47 | 38.5 |
| Unknown | 10 | 8.2 |
| Other | 16 | 13.1 |
| Total | 122 | 100.0 |

Question 166 at the end of the survey enabled participants to share comments on the program and the impact the program had on their careers. Participants shared the following of their LINC experience:

- "Reconfirmed that I am capable of professional growth and advancement and can make the decisions required of a community college leader."

- "I feel I am a stronger leader and have a better understanding of the community college statewide system."

- "It helped me define the direction I wanted to go. I was able to see that I was more satisfied by working with issues which directly impacted students. I moved from the academic side of the college to student service administration. I would never have envisioned myself in this role prior to my participation."

- "Yes, my LINC experience broadened my vision of my own college and to community colleges in general. I was able to be a more knowledgeable and savvy employee in my position at that time and to feel prepared to assume my "new" position as a director at the same college."

- "I have been promoted since LINC and am more driven now to advance into my next leadership position. I know I can make a difference and be a positive change agent for my institution."

- "It helped me clarify and then helped me be more determined to pursue a position of leadership and influence. It made me believe that maybe, just maybe, I had the "stuff" it would take. Experiencing the power of a true network was amazing to me and I still remember that feeling of being buoyed up by all of that support. It provided a model of sharing, support, and information that I have tried to replicate in some small way with the wonderful people I supervise. You know, I was different after that year - my eyes were opened, my world made larger, and my personal power increased. What had been just a feeling about leadership, was demystified and presented as a possibility - by the end of LINC it was an "I can do this".  I feel lucky and honored to have been chosen."

- "LINC helped me transition from a department mentality to a college-wide vision. I learned to see the big picture and have been able to use that to gain stature and respect and more responsibility even in the same position."

- "It was one of the top three leadership experiences in which I've participated (and I've participated in many). I still have contact with almost half of my LINC class on a regular basis almost six years after we finished the program. My participation in LINC spurred me to pursue my Ph.D. and I'm now ABD with an August 2006 graduation in site."

- "As I reflect, my experience with LINC was truly a turning point in my career. The greatest impact of the program was the opportunity to learn more about the evolution of the comprehensive community college movement, the speakers, and the ability to network with other professionals in the state. My LINC experience has had a tremendous impact on my career."

- "It gave me more self-confidence, and a greater understanding of the role of leaders and leadership."

- "It provided me with the first step to complete a graduate degree. It also provided me with the recognition of participation in LINC. It was one step in allowing me to assume more responsibilities at the College."

A majority of those participating in the LINC program are employed at the same college as when they participated in the program.  Results from question 7 revealed that 112 respondents, or 82.9% of those who participated in LINC, were currently employed at the same college they were when they participated in the program.  Nine had accepted employment at different community colleges, five are working at colleges in another state, three have left higher education and six have since retired.

**Comparative data**

The promotions of those in the different levels were compared to determine if there
was a difference in promotions between levels of employment (Table 8).  The employment
levels were gathered to indicate the position level of the person when they participated in the
program as well as at the time of completing the survey.  A chi-square test was conducted to
determine if there were any significant differences in promotions based on leadership levels
of the participants. A chi-square value of 6.955 ($p$=.325) indicated no difference in
promotions between the leadership levels.

Table 8.    Promotions by leadership level after completing LINC

| | Promotion after LINC | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Employment level | Yes | No | Total |
| *Level 1* | | | |
| Count | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| Percent | 61.5 | 38.5 | 100.0 |
| *Level 2* | | | |
| Count | 24 | 23 | 47 |
| Percent | 51.1 | 48.9 | 100.0 |
| *Level 3* | | | |
| Count | 21 | 42 | 63 |
| Percent | 33.3 | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| *Level 4* | | | |
| Count | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Percent | 37.5 | 62.5 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | | |
| Count | 56 | 75 | 131 |
| Percent | 42.7 | 57.3 | 100.0 |

KEY:

Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate
          Dean, Assistant Dean.

Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head
          or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.

Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office
          Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.

Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Note:  No Response = 4; 1 cell had an expected count less than 5.

**CLIC program survey results**

Survey questions 8 and 9 recorded the leadership level participants were in at the time of participating in the program and when completing the survey. Changes in positions represent increased responsibilities and a greater impact on the colleges. Respondents were able to record their reasons for participating in the CLIC program as a part of question 17. Question 18 asked participants if a promotion followed their experience in CLIC with additional information about the promotion gathered in questions 19. Question 20 asked to what degree the CLIC experience had on the promotion. Question 21 provides additional information on the impact the CLIC program had on the participants' careers.

### Aggregate data

Participants were asked to indicate the reasons they chose to participate in the CLIC program. The reason most often cited, by 27 or 29.7% of those responding, was because they "were asked by supervisor." The second reason cited by 21 of those responding or 23.1%, was "career advancement".

Leadership levels for participants were recorded at the time of participation as well as for their current position (Table 9). Positions were placed into three categories of employment. The category levels for the survey were:

Level 1: Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

Level 4: Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions

Table 9.   Comparison of leadership levels of CLIC participants

| Category | Level (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Time of Participation | 28 (30.8%) | 46 (50.5%) | 14 (15.3%) | 3 (3.2%) |
| Time of Survey Completion | 38 (41.8%) | 36 (39.6%) | 6 (6.6%) | 9 (9.9%) |

KEY:
Level 1: Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.
Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.
Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.
Level 4: Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Survey question 18 asked participants to indicate if they had received a promotion following their CLIC experience. A total of 23 participants, or 25.3%, had received promotions since participating in the CLIC program. Promotions included a variety of position as well as changes in levels of responsibility. Slightly more than 50% (N=13; 56.7%) of the position changes were to Dean/Director (N=7; 30.5%), followed by Executive Dean/Director (N=6; 26.2%) (Table 10).

Table 10.   Promotions since participating in the CLIC program (Q 18)

| Promotion to | Number in position | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| President/Chancellor | 1 | 4.3 |
| Vice President/Vice Chancellor | 4 | 17.5 |
| Associate Vice President | 1 | 4.3 |
| Executive Dean/Director | 6 | 26.2 |
| Dean/Director | 7 | 30.5 |
| Associate Dean/Director | 1 | 4.3 |
| Controller | 1 | 4.3 |
| Registrar | 1 | 4.3 |
| Promoted to Administration | 1 | 4.3 |
| Total Promotions | 23 | 100.0 |

Three respondents indicated that as a result of their experience in CLIC they have experienced a growth in responsibilities and additional leadership roles within the college. One indicated they have left the state for a position at a university.

Survey question 20 asked individuals to what degree the CLIC program had on their promotion. Approximately one-third (N=8; 35.0%) of the participants indicated CLIC somewhat impacted their position, followed by equal representation (N=5; 21.7 %) for moderately and minimally impacting their position (Table 11).

Table 11.  Impact of the CLIC program on promotion(s) (Q 20)

| Impact | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Very | 3 | 13.0 |
| Moderately | 5 | 21.7 |
| Somewhat | 8 | 35.0 |
| Minimally | 5 | 21.7 |
| Not At All | 1 | 4.3 |
| Don't Know | 1 | 4.3 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 |

Question 21 asked participants to indicate the top reasons that CLIC was instrumental in their promotion. The most frequent answer was that the program "broadened my understanding of community colleges in the state" with 9.9% of the participants indicating this was the most influential for them. The second highest response was that the program helped them to clarify their professional goals. Of those responding, 6.6% indicated this response.

For those indicating the same leadership level, question 10 provided additional information. As shown in Table 12, two-fifths (N=24; 40%) indicated their position title

Table 12.   Explanation for remaining in same leadership level (Q 10)

| Leadership level | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Position title has remained the same but leadership responsibilities have been enhanced. | 22 | 36.7 |
| Position title has not changed and leadership responsibilities have not been enhanced. | 24 | 40.0 |
| Position title has changed but remained within the same leadership level. | 11 | 18.3 |
| Other | 3 | 5.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |

and their leadership responsibilities had not been enhanced, followed by those who indicated their title remained the same and the leadership responsibilities had been enhanced (22; 36.7%).

When considering promotions and those who have had their leadership roles within the college enhanced, 45 (49.5%) of the respondents were working in a different role than when beginning the CLIC program.

Question 22 asked participants if they planned to continue their employment in the community college system.  As shown in Table 13, the majority (84.7%) indicated they planned to continue their employment in the community college system.

Table 13.   Participants wishing to continue employment with a community college (Q 22)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 72 | 84.7 |
| No | 4 | 4.7 |
| Unsure | 9 | 10.6 |
| Total | 85 | 100.0 |

Question 23 asked participants whether their CLIC experience helped to clarify their

career aspirations.  As shown in Table 14, nearly half (47.7%) indicated yes.

Participants were able to provide written comments about the impact the CLIC

program had on their career aspirations.  The following comments describe how the CLIC

program helped participants:

- Became more knowledgeable about the breadth of opportunities
- Gained a better understanding of the system
- Gained insight to leadership roles
- Developed a career plan
- Gained focus to career
- Gained greater appreciation for the community college system
- Gained a better understanding of the college's administrative roles and responsibilities

For those respondents wanting to continue their work in community colleges,

question 24 asked them to which level of responsibility they desired.  Approximately half

(N=38; 47.5%) desired a presidency or vice presidency while 25% (N=20) wished to stay in

their current position (Table 15).


Table 14.   Did the CLIC experience help to clarify career aspirations? (Q 23)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 41 | 47.7 |
| No | 23 | 26.7 |
| Unsure | 22 | 25.6 |
| Total | 85 | 100.0 |

Table 15.   Level of employment desired by participants (Q 24)

| Position | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| President | 13 | 16.3 |
| Vice President | 25 | 31.2 |
| Dean | 9 | 11.2 |
| Department Chair | 2 | 2.5 |
| Continue in Current Position | 20 | 25.0 |
| Other | 4 | 5.0 |
| Unknown | 7 | 8.8 |
| Total | 80 | 100.0 |

Those completing the survey were provided the opportunity to explain how the CLIC

experience impacted their career in question 166.  Participants shared that the program:

- Gave focus to career
- Gave confidence to pursue PhD
- Offered a vote of confidence by administrative staff
- Developed relationships
- Allowed progress toward graduate degree
- Made the participant a better manager
- Increased awareness of possibilities for career advancement
- Made the participant think more intentionally about career
- Increased self-confidence
- Helped to established contacts
- Encouraged the participant to develop a career plan
- Provided a greater understanding of the big picture
- Helped participants to understand community college system
- Allowed for networking opportunities
- Helped to broaden perspectives on a variety of issues

Seventy respondents (76.9%) indicated they were employed at the same college as

when they participated in the CLIC program.  Three respondents (3.3%) indicated they have

retired.  Six individuals (6.6%) are currently employed at different community colleges in

Iowa while seven (7.7%) are working in colleges in another state and five (5.5%) have left

higher education all together.

### Comparative data

The promotions of those in the different levels were compared to determine if there

was a difference in promotions between levels of employment.  A chi-square test was

conducted to gather this information (Table 16).  A chi-square value of 8.515 ($p=.203$)

indicated there was no relationship between the level of employment and earning a

promotion.

Table 16.  Promotions by leadership level after completing CLIC

|  | Promotion after CLIC | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Employment level | Yes | No | Total |
| *Level 1* | | | |
| Count | 7 | 20 | 27 |
| Percent | 25.9 | 74.1 | 100.0 |
| *Level 2* | | | |
| Count | 11 | 33 | 44 |
| Percent | 25.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 |
| *Level 3* | | | |
| Count | 8 | 5 | 11 |
| Percent | 61.5 | 38.5 | 100.0 |
| *Level 4* | | | |
| Count | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | | |
| Count | 26 | 61 | 87 |
| Percent | 29.9 | 70.1 | 100.0 |

KEY:

Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.

Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.

Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.

Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Note:  No Response = 4; 2 cells had an expected count less than 5.

**Semi-structured interviews**

Discussion with community college leaders, participants of both programs, and staff

of the programs offered insight into the impact the LINC and CLIC programs have had on

participants. Through these discussions, several themes emerged when looking at the impact

the LINC and CLIC programs have had on the participants of the programs. Themes were

developed by listing all comments in like categories. Those who were interviewed believed

that the programs were:

- creating opportunities to expose potential leaders to the skills needed to lead a college
- allowing participants to gain the self-confidence needed to lead
- allowing participants to evaluate their skills and determine how they want to proceed with their career
- providing networking opportunities for participants which have assisted them to develop contacts to utilize in their work
- providing role models for participants
- assisting colleges to develop their own leaders for their colleges

The LINC program was initiated by community college presidents who saw the need

for a program to assist in the development of new leaders. While the development of leaders

was important, it was believed that, by exposing potential leaders to topics and other

colleges, the participants would gain skills. One of the leaders interviewed was a part of

initiating the LINC program. When reflecting on the initial goals for the LINC program, the

college leader stated:

> *So I thought if there was some special attention given to those folks, that in*
> *addition to the academic value and the learning that's going to take place*
> *regarding community colleges as a field of study, that psychologically there*
> *would be some benefits to those folks because they could say, "Somebody has*
> *an interest in our moving forward."*

This leader continued to remark that the programs have allowed for doors to be

opened for new leaders. He stated that, as participants complete the programs, they bring

their new knowledge base home with them and continue to influence those around them at their colleges. He indicated that those in the program were coming back to their college enthused about what they were learning, and with a new knowledge base and new ideas. This enthusiasm has made an impact on the colleges and the individuals in the program.

Leaders tended to agree that the programs offer a new picture of the role of the community colleges and employees come back with new perspectives. One leader, a graduate of one of the programs, said of her own experience:

> *So I think one of the things I found interesting was the broader, a little more diverse group so that you got perspectives from different parts of an organization rather than just going to meet with people with your same kind of position you got perspectives of people from other parts of the college so it really broadened my understanding of not only the local college, but the state system of colleges and beyond the local/state situation as well.*

When asked about the impact on staff from one community college, the leader stated:

> *It is such an eye-opening experience, that's the wonderful piece about it and I have never had anyone tell me it was not a good experience, it wasn't worth their time, they should not have done it, or anything like that. It's always a, "wow, I did not realize the complexity of community colleges in general"; "I did not realize, I had not been to the legislature and watched them in action." To go witness the president's meeting to see what happens there; to get in on some of the discussions that take place at a totally different level than what most people perceive because they are so engrossed in their own little area of work. And if nothing else, I want it just to open their eyes to the big picture of the community colleges and the other piece is the networking opportunity and the friends and colleagues they make from around the state.*

An opportunity to begin to grow their own leaders was another theme of the interviews. The leaders saw both the LINC and CLIC programs as a good way to begin to grow their leaders from within their colleges. One of those interviewed shared that many of the promotions within the college have come from people at the college. All of the

community college leaders believed that they programs were impacting those who attended the programs. One leader stated:

> *I think it has been a very positive impact. It still tends to open people's minds up to the fact that, particularly women and minorities, that there are opportunities out here if I want to pay the price and devote the energy and effort- and this is a great place to begin. Because it is a value added experience.*

Many participants shared that the programs had helped them to learn more about themselves and to gain self-confidence in their role at their colleges. One participant said that the program provided a better understanding herself. This insight helped to begin planning for her career. There were several participants who indicated that the programs gave them the opportunity to evaluate their career and helped to determine their next step. One participant shared:

> *I was an interim administrator, just coming from faculty, and it was supposed to be short term, trail basis. I think CLIC helped me decide to go off the interim. I was seriously thinking that I really loved being a teacher- that comfort zone- and I will try this to help out.*

Another shared:

> *I would say it solidified my professional goals. It didn't really change or where I was going to go- but kept me going.*

Still another commented:

> *What I felt me doing a lot, questioning where I might want to go. Was I on the right path? Feeling the climate; maybe it solidified my commitment here.*

Self-confidence was the one word used most often by LINC and CLIC staff when asked the impact of the programs on participants. Each of the three who had served in a staff role indicated that they had noted a growth in self-confidence of the participants in the programs as they moved through the year. Staff reported seeing participants *"step out of*

*their comfort zones"* and begin to explore the opportunities they might have. One of the staff remarked:

> *One of the things that I think really is not measured, but is fun to watch, is that self-confidence that happens over that year. And I think part of that is their growth in themselves as they do a lot of self-examination but also that getting out of their little world and comparing notes with others builds their self-confidence...*

One of the staff shared that she saw many changes in the skill level of the participants and growth in self-confidence. She reported that many came into the programs thinking they could not be in a leadership position in their college and left believing they could indeed contribute.

The chance to develop relationships with others across the state of Iowa as well as gain new perspectives were also benefits listed by staff members. As noted with one of the community college leaders, the programs offer participants the opportunity to work with staff from other colleges and positions, and staff members believed this was a great learning experience. Participants found the networking to be helpful in that it provided contacts from around the state for them to call on in the future. One participant said:

> *I would have to say that the networking was very valuable for me in my position. I do a lot of work independently and don't interact as much with other folks as in other jobs. It was valuable for me to get out of my office and talk with folks who are doing other things and getting ideas on different things that I could look at or study.*

During the focus groups, program participants described ways in which the programs had impacted them. In doing so, most agreed that the programs helped them to learn about the community college system in Iowa and to learn from other participants. One former participant described the impact in this way:

*And so CLIC gave me an opportunity to see the big picture, to understand, to interact, to get to know people. It was wonderful for networking and to learn about the community college system in Iowa.*

Several participants shared that it was of great value to be able to listen to state and national community college leaders. They found this to be a way to compare their own leadership style with that of successful leaders. Participants shared that it was helpful to see that there is a need for diversity in leaders who find different ways to lead their institutions. One participant indicated that the program speakers offered an opportunity for a *"value check"* to learn what was truly important in a leadership position. The speakers in the programs served as role models for the program participants.

While many of the past participants were in the same job they had when participating in the programs, one did indicate that she had changed jobs three times within the same institution. This participant shared that the program was a good experience, and offered the opportunity to explore and see what else was available.

### Research Question 2 – Impact of Involvement on Degree Attainment in the LINC and CLIC Programs

The purpose of research question 2 was to gather information to determine if the LINC/CLIC program encouraged participants to work toward advanced degrees.

**Aggregate data – LINC program**

Question 11 recorded the degree attainment by those who participated in the LINC program (Table 17). As shown in Table 17, more than half (N=81; 60%) had received a Master's degree.

Table 17.   Highest degree completed by LINC participants (Q 11)

| Degree | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|--------|--------------|-------------|
| Associate | 7 | 5.2 |
| Bachelor | 26 | 19.3 |
| Master | 81 | 60.0 |
| Specialist | 20 | 14.8 |
| Doctoral | 1 | 0.7 |
| Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Question 15 asked participants if they have earned a degree since their participation in LINC.  As shown in Table 18, slightly less than one-third (N=42; 31.1%) said they yes, but more than half (N=81; 60%) said no.

Question 12 asked participants to indicate if they were currently working on a degree, while question 13 recorded the degree on which they were working if they indicated they were pursing a degree.  The results are shown in Tables 19 and 20, respectively. Approximately one-fourth (N=31; 23%) of those responding have continued their education.(Table 19).  Among those working on a degree, two-thirds (N=20; 64.5%) indicated they were working on their doctorate, and less than one-third (N=9; 29%) were working on their Master's degree (Table 20)

Table 18.   Degrees earned since participation in LINC (Q 15)

| Degree received since LINC | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Yes | 42 | 31.1 |
| No | 93 | 68.9 |
| Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Table 19.   Number and frequency of participants currently working toward a degree (Q 12)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 31 | 23.0 |
| No | 104 | 77.0 |
| Total | 135 | 100.0 |

Table 20.   Degree sought by LINC participants who were pursuing one (Q 13)

| Degree | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor | 2 | 6.5 |
| Master | 9 | 29.0 |
| Doctoral | 20 | 64.5 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |

Question 13 enabled participants to indicate which field of study they are pursing. Fields such as Curriculum and Instruction, Business Administrative, Education, Educational Administration, Higher Education, Higher Education Administration, EMS, and Public Administration were listed.  The field of study mentioned by more than half of the participants (N=16; 51.6%) was the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program.

Question 14 asked participants if they planned to begin working on a degree within the next five years.  More than half (N=55; 52.9%) responded no; and over one-third (N=36; 36.5% indicated they did not know if they would pursue a degree (Table 21.

Table 21.   Intent to pursue a degree within five years (Q 14)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 11 | 10.6 |
| No | 55 | 52.9 |
| Unknown | 38 | 36.5 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

When reviewing degrees earned since participating in the LINC program and participants currently working toward a degree, 73 (54%) of the individuals had changed their educational status since completing the program. Credit is awarded for those who participate in the LINC program. Question 16 inquired about the importance of the credit earned through the LINC program. Of those responding, more than three-fourths (76.3%) indicated that the credit earned from the LINC program was important to them.

**Comparative data – LINC program**

Table 22 displays the degree attainment by participants by leadership level when they were in the program. A total of 42 individuals have earned degrees since completing the

Table 22. Degree attainment by leadership level

| Employment level | Earned degree | | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Yes | No | |
| *Level 1* | | | |
| Count | 4 | 9 | 13 |
| Percent | 30.8 | 69.2 | 100.0 |
| *Level 2* | | | |
| Count | 14 | 34 | 48 |
| Percent | 29.2 | 70.8 | 100.0 |
| *Level 3* | | | |
| Count | 24 | 42 | 66 |
| Percent | 36.4 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| *Level 4* | | | |
| Count | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | | |
| Count | 42 | 93 | 135 |
| Percent | 31.1 | 68.9 | 100.0 |

KEY:

Level 1: Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.

Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.

Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.

Level 4: Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Note: 2 cells had an expected count less than 5.

program.  A chi-square value of 4.548 (*p*=.208) indicated there is no significant relationship between employment level and degree attainment.

**Aggregate data – CLIC program**

Research question 2 reviewed information to determine if the program had an impact on the degree attainment by the participants.  Question 11 asked the highest degree the participants have obtained.  As shown in Table 23, more than one-half completed the Master's degree (N=55; 60.4%), and equal numbers completed Bachelor's and Doctoral degree programs (N=14; 15.4%).

Participants were also asked if they had earned a degree since their participation in the CLIC program.  As shown in Table 24, slightly more than two-fifths responded yes (N=21; 23.1%), whereas more than three-fourths responded no (N=70; 76.9%).

Table 23.   Highest degree completed by CLIC participants (Q 11)

| Degree | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Associate | 3 | 3.3 |
| Bachelor | 14 | 15.4 |
| Master | 55 | 60.4 |
| Specialist | 5 | 5.5 |
| Doctoral | 14 | 15.4 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |

Table 24.   Degrees earned since participation in CLIC (Q 15)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 21 | 23.1 |
| No | 70 | 76.9 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |

Question 12 requested information regarding the number of participants who were currently working toward a degree. As shown in Table 25, more than one-fourth (N=27; 29.7%) responded "yes", whereas the majority (N=64; 70%) responded "no".  Among those pursuing a degree, the majority was pursuing a Doctoral degree (N=19; 70.4%), and slightly more than one-fourth (N=7; 25.9%) were working on their Master's program of study (Table 26).

Table 25.   CLIC participants currently pursuing a degree (Q 12)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|----------|---------------|-------------|
| Yes | 27 | 29.7 |
| No | 64 | 70.3 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 |

Table 26.   Degrees pursued by CLIC participants (Q 13)

| Degree | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|--------|---------------|-------------|
| Bachelor | 1 | 3.7 |
| Master | 7 | 25.9 |
| Doctoral | 19 | 70.4 |
| Total | 27 | 100.0 |

Participants also indicated a field of study if they were currently pursuing a degree program.  A variety of degree programs were listed including: Accounting and Finance, Business, Community College Education, Community College Leadership, Human Relations, Education, Education Leadership and Policy Studies, Health Education, Higher Education, MBA, MPA, and Philosophy.  The field of study mentioned by nearly half of the participants (N=13; 48.1%) was the Community College Leadership program, followed by one-third (N=9; 33.3%) in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program.

Those participants who were not currently working toward a degree were asked if they might be doing so within the next five years. As shown in Table 27, more than half of the participants (N=33; 54.4%) did not have an advanced degree in their plans, whereas nearly 20% (N=11; 17.5%) were planning to pursue a degree within five years.

Table 27.   Plan to pursue a degree within next five years (Q 14)

| Response | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 11 | 17.5 |
| No | 33 | 54.4 |
| Unknown | 19 | 30.1 |
| Total | 63 | 100.0 |

When considering those who had earned degrees since participating in the program and those who were currently pursuing a degree, a total of 48 (52.7%) respondents had changed their educational level. As with the LINC program, credit is awarded to those who complete the program. The credit awarded from the program proved to be important to 57.1% of those answering this question.

**Comparative data – CLIC program**

Table 28 displays the information regarding the earning of degrees by leadership level while in the program. The greatest number of degrees was earned by those in employment Level 2. A chi-square value of 1.803 (p=.614) indicated there is no relationship between employment level and degree attainment.

Table 28.   Degree completion by leadership level

| Employment level | Earned degree | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | |
| *Level 1* | | | |
| Count | 5 | 23 | 28 |
| Percent | 17.9 | 82.1 | 100.0 |
| *Level 2* | | | |
| Count | 12 | 34 | 46 |
| Percent | 26.2 | 73.9 | 100.0 |
| *Level 3* | | | |
| Count | 4 | 10 | 14 |
| Percent | 28.6 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| *Level 4* | | | |
| Count | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TOTAL | | | |
| Count | 21 | 70 | 91 |
| Percent | 23.1 | 76.9 | 100.0 |

KEY:
Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.
Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.
Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.
Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.
Note:  3 cells had an expected count less than 5.

**Interviews**

During the focus groups, former participants reflected on the impact the LINC and CLIC programs had on their degree attainment.  While several had earned their PhD before entering the program, there were a number who found the programs served as a springboard for an advanced degree.  Several others indicated that they would, indeed, return to school at a later date.  The credit awarded for participation in the programs was important for those continuing their education as they could apply the credit to their program of study.  One participant used the credit for a double degree while another found that the credit awarded was very helpful.

111

One participant stated:

*It {the credit} was really important for me.  As I said, I was using this to jump start myself on my master's degree.  And just that little extra push, that little extra jolt at the beginning was enough to really get me revved up, get me motivated; it was very helpful.*

Another participant indicated that a degree was not planned when beginning the program, but the encouragement from the program staff provided a reason to reconsider.  The participant shared:

*I had small children at the time so I was not looking at the degree and Dr. Ebbers constantly encouraged me – you got to get rolling on this.  I was kind of dinking around here and there and needed the extra push.  I think having the peer pressure was kind of good.  I might have sat back and decided that I don't need this.*

While the credit was helpful to many participants, some found that the programs impacted the actual degree focus for them. One participant indicated that, as a result of involvement in the CLIC program, a new focus for the PhD was developed.  The participant determined there could be the opportunity for a larger impact with a PhD in administration rather than with the original area of study.

The LINC and CLIC staff reported that many of the participants do not come into the programs with the intent of earning an advanced degree, but once they find there are opportunities for them, they refocus their goals.  One staff reported:

*...from the first meeting when we talk about how they will get this many graduate credits and you will have a chance to get special projects for credit and you can just see them start going, "No, I am not doing an advanced degree.  I am not doing a Master's degree."  And then in December we sort of review again, about the master's program and the fact that by the time you get done with LINC you have all most a year done, then they start thinking, "Well, maybe."  It is fun to see the group that ends up in the cohort group in the fall.  Some are very clear when they start, they are not doing a master's degree and then you just watch them turn around.  I think their college has that intention, I don't think they even realize it.*

One of the community college leaders, a graduate of the LINC program, reported that the program:

> *...helped me to stretch my thinking about what I wanted to do with my future and thinking about pursuing a PhD and all those kinds of things.  It gets people back in touch with sometimes the higher education system and you start thinking maybe I could get this terminal degree.  That was the first time I got to thinking about the PhD.*

## Research Question 3 – Impact of Involvement on Improvement in Leadership Skills in LINC and CLIC Programs

### Aggregate data – LINC program

Research question 3 asked if involvement in the programs resulted in an improvement in leadership skills.  Evidence of improvement in leadership skills can be found in several areas of the survey.  Questions 43-82 measured participants' perceptions on gaining better understanding of a variety of topics.  Participants rated each question based on a five-point Likert range, with 5 indicating "strongly agree" and 1 indicating "strongly disagree".  A neutral rating would be 3.0, with all scores above 3.0 indicating a positive impact.

Table 29 shows those areas identifying improved leadership skills.  A closer look at the results in the table indicate that 89.6% either agreed or strongly agreed that they gained a better understanding of the history of the community colleges while 88.9% gained a better understanding of the vision, philosophy, mission, goals, and ideals of the colleges.  When asked if participants gained a better understanding of their leadership style, 81.4% either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Table 29.  Improvement in leadership skills following the LINC program

| Following my LINC experience, I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| the history of the community college. | 128 | 2 | 5 | 4.45 | .697 |
| my own leadership style. | 125 | 1 | 5 | 4.34 | .843 |
| vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges. | 128 | 2 | 5 | 4.43 | .706 |
| the interaction of college leaders with external constituencies. | 126 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | .819 |
| the role of leadership in the community college. | 126 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | .719 |

Participants were able to assess their own improvement in leadership skills in question number 165. The survey asked if they had achieved certain objectives, including developing or improving their own leadership style. As shown in Table 30, the yes responses regarding the LINC program were dramatic for each category—nearly or slightly above 90%.

Colleges are using the LINC program as a way to develop potential leaders. The survey showed that the LINC program was the first and only leadership program in which 58 participants had participated.

Table 30.  Development of and/or improvement in leadership style from the LINC program

| Objective | Yes | No | NR |
|---|---|---|---|
| Developed/improved leadership skills | 119 (88.1%) | 7 (5.2%) | 9(6.7%) |
| Gained a better understanding of the community college system | 123 (91.1%) | 3(2.2%) | 9 (6.7%) |
| Gained a better understanding of the role of leaders | 120 (88.9%) | 6 (4.4%) | 9 (6.7%) |

**Comparative data – LINC program**

An ANOVA model was estimated to determine if improvement in leadership skills varied between leadership levels. The ANOVA results indicated there was no significant difference between the leadership skills developed by those in the varying leadership levels (Table 31).

Table 31. Improvement in leadership skills in the LINC program by employment level

| Following my LINC experience, I have a better understanding of: | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| History of community colleges | Between Groups | 1.835 | 3 | .612 | 1.267 | .289 |
| | Within Groups | 59.884 | 124 | .483 | | |
| | Total | 61.719 | 127 | | | |
| Vision, philosophy, mission, goals | Between Groups | 1.467 | 3 | .489 | .979 | .405 |
| | Within Groups | 61.900 | 124 | .499 | | |
| | Total | 63.367 | 127 | | | |
| Interaction of leaders with external customers | Between Groups | 1.524 | 3 | .508 | .753 | .522 |
| | Within Groups | 82.254 | 122 | .674 | | |
| | Total | 83.778 | 125 | | | |
| Role of leadership | Between Groups | 3.219 | 3 | 1.073 | 2.129 | .100 |
| | Within Groups | 61.487 | 122 | .504 | | |
| | Total | 64.706 | 125 | | | |
| My own leadership style | Between Groups | 1.153 | 3 | .384 | .534 | .660 |
| | Within Groups | 87.055 | 121 | .719 | | |
| | Total | 88.208 | 124 | | | |

A comparison for the responses of the varying leadership levels for survey question number 165 was also completed. A chi-square test was completed to determine if there were any differences among the leadership levels in gaining a better understanding of the community college system, in gaining a better understanding of the role of leaders in the colleges, and in developing and/or improving one's own leadership style. A chi-square value of 4.878 ($p=.560$) for gaining a better understanding of the role of leaders indicated no

significant difference between the leadership levels. A chi-square value of 5.646 ($p$=.464) for gaining a better understanding of the community college system indicated no significant difference between the leadership levels. Last, a chi-square value of 5.863 ($p$=.439) for the question on developing and/or improving leadership skills indicated no significant difference between the leadership groups. Individuals in each of the leadership levels gained skills as a result of the program.

**Aggregate data – CLIC program**

Research question 3 asked if involvement in the program resulted in an improvement in leadership skills. Evidence of improvement in leadership skills can be found in several areas of the survey. Questions 42-82 measured respondents' perceptions of gaining better understanding of a variety of areas. Participants rated each question based on a five-point Likert range. A neutral rating would be 3.0, with all scores above the 3.0 indicating a positive impact.

Table 32 shows those areas identifying improved leadership skills. A closer look at the results indicate that 81.4% either agreed or strongly agreed that they gained a better understanding of the history of the community colleges while 87.9% gained a better

Table 32.   Improvement in leadership skills following the CLIC program

| Following my CLIC experience, I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| the role of leadership in the community college | 86 | 1 | 5 | 4.28 | .792 |
| vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges. | 85 | 2 | 5 | 4.27 | .697 |
| the history of the community college. | 85 | 1 | 5 | 4.22 | .850 |
| the interaction of college leaders with external constituencies. | 86 | 1 | 5 | 4.14 | .799 |
| my own leadership style. | 86 | 2 | 5 | 3.99 | .847 |

better understanding of the vision, philosophy, mission, goals and ideals of the colleges. When asked if participants gained a better understanding of their own leadership style, 86.9% either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Question 165 asked participants to assess the achievement of a variety of objectives, one being the development and/or improvement of their own leadership skills. As shown in Table 33, approximately 80% of the CLIC participants indicated they gained a better understanding of the community college system (N=81; 89%) and of the role of leaders (N=79; 86.8%). In addition, the SPS survey reported that the CLIC program was the first and only leadership development program in which 35 individuals had participated.

Table 33. Development of and/or improvement in leadership style from the CLIC program

| Objective | Yes | No | NR |
|---|---|---|---|
| Developed/improved leadership skills | 69 (75.8%) | 14 (15.4%) | 8 (8.8%) |
| Gained a better understanding of the community college system | 81 (89.0%) | 2 (2.2%) | 8 (8.8%) |
| Gained a better understanding of the role of leaders | 79 (86.8%) | 4 (4.4%) | 8 (8.8%) |

**Comparative data – CLIC program**

A one-way ANOVA model was estimated to determine if improvement in leadership skills varied between leadership levels. In all cases, there was no difference in the perception of the participants in the varying leadership levels (Table 34).

A comparison for the responses of the varying leadership levels for survey question number 165 was also completed. A chi-square test was completed to see if there were any significant differences among the leadership levels in gaining a better understanding of the community college system, in gaining a better understanding of the role of leaders in the

Table 34.   Improvement in leadership skills in the CLIC program by employment level

| Following my CLIC experience, I have a better understanding of: | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| History of community colleges | Between Groups | 1.862 | 3 | .621 | .854 | .469 |
| | Within Groups | 58.891 | 81 | .727 | | |
| | Total | 78.384 | 84 | | | |
| Vision, philosophy, mission, goals | Between Groups | .919 | 3 | .306 | .622 | .603 |
| | Within Groups | 39.858 | 81 | .492 | | |
| | Total | 40.776 | 84 | | | |
| Interaction of leaders with external customers | Between Groups | 2.569 | 3 | .856 | 1.356 | .262 |
| | Within Groups | 51.757 | 82 | .631 | | |
| | Total | 54.326 | 85 | | | |
| Role of leadership | Between Groups | 2.412 | 3 | .804 | 1.296 | .281 |
| | Within Groups | 50.890 | 82 | .621 | | |
| | Total | 53.302 | 85 | | | |
| My own leadership style | Between Groups | 1.642 | 3 | .547 | .756 | .522 |
| | Within Groups | 59.347 | 82 | .724 | | |
| | Total | 60.988 | 85 | | | |

colleges, and in developing and/or improving one's own leadership style.  A chi-square value

of 1.993 ($p$=.920) for gaining a better understanding of the role of leaders indicated no

significant difference between the leadership levels.  A chi-square value of 1.320 ($p$=.971)

for gaining a better understanding of the community college system indicated no significant

difference between the leadership levels.  Last, a chi-square value of 4.960 ($p$=.549) for the

question on developing and/or improving leadership skills indicated no significant difference

between the leadership groups.  Individuals in each of the leadership levels gained skills as a

result of the program.

**Interviews**

While an increase or improvement leadership skills may be somewhat difficult to

measure, there was a theme during the interviews and focus groups that there had been an

improvement in skills as a result of the participating in the programs. One of the community college leaders stated:

> *Is it automatic, can you measure it? No. Because we normally select people who want to be leaders and they are stepping forward already to do things. But do they come back with a different perspective on the whole agenda and a more broad understanding of what administration is all about and what the community college movement in Iowa is all about? Absolutely. And that makes them better employees.*

Another community college leader stated that the programs provide staff with connections throughout the state which leads to contacts with other people and colleges. The leader observed that this opens the door for exploration to different approaches to a variety of situations.

LINC and CLIC staff have an opportunity to work with program participants throughout the year and are able to see growth in the participants. Staff identified increased skill levels in participants as well as the already mentioned increase in self-confidence, both leading to improved leadership skills. Staff reported that as participants enter the program many do not believe they could be in a leadership position. As the year-long program proceeds, participants are connected with state and national leaders and they begin to see that they do have something to offer in the area of leadership. One staff member commented that the programs tend to draw out leadership abilities in the participants and offer them tools to work with as leaders.

Program participants also reflected on their growth in leadership skills. Many indicated that, while they may not have changed their styles as a result of the programs, they did feel validated that they were on the right track. One participant stated that the program offered a *"value check"* for leadership and allowed for an exploration of what was important

in providing leadership for those she served. Participants stated that it was very helpful to see the varying kinds of leaders and that it was a bit comforting to know there was not just one style of leadership. One participant mentioned that it was helpful to see the *"humanness"* of the leaders who spoke with the groups and to see that as leaders, they too have a life away from the college the lead.

The availability of courses that followed the LINC and CLIC programs served one of the participants interviewed well. This participant found that it was not only handy, but also very beneficial to have a course offered at the conclusion of one of the monthly LINC programs. The participant stated:

> *The two things together were very helpful. And if I would not have done that extra, I don't think I would have gotten as much out of it.*

### Research Question 4 – Impact of LINC and CLIC Program Topics

Research question 4 asked participants to indicate which topics were more beneficial to them. Questions 26 through 42 asked participants to share their perceptions of the program using a 5-point Likert range. Participants rated their perceptions on the 5-point scale, with 5 indicating "strongly agree" and 1 indicating "strongly disagree" with the statement. All other ratings fell between those two scores. The questions centered on the participants' experience in the program, with a score of 3.0 indicating a neutral score. The mean score for all of the questions fell above the 3.0 score.

**Aggregate data – LINC program**

Participants were also asked to determine the skills in which they gained a better understanding during the LINC program (Q 43 – 82). A 5-point Likert range was used to

assist the participants in indicating their perceptions with the program. All topic areas in the program were rated above the 3.0 median, indicating a satisfaction with the program. Table 35 provides general information regarding satisfaction in the LINC program topics, whereas Table 36 indicates the topics participants found to be most helpful. The lowest rated topics—those included in the LINC program in which the participants did not believe they had gained a better understanding—are presented in Table 37.

Participants were also able to indicate those topics they believed needed more time or attention in the program. Questions 123-162 asked participants to provide information on those topics needing more time or attention. When reviewing the topics and comparing those who were satisfied, it was ascertained that 70% of those completing the survey believed there was not a need to spend more time or attention on the topics.

Table 35. Participant satisfaction with topics in the LINC program

| Satisfaction in the LINC program topics: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience was positive | 131 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 | .400 |
| Program effectively administered | 131 | 3 | 5 | 4.64 | .557 |
| Presentations interesting | 131 | 2 | 5 | 4.54 | .558 |
| Specific topics were complete | 131 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | .600 |
| Presentations valuable | 130 | 2 | 5 | 4.48 | .587 |
| Campus visits valuable | 126 | 1 | 5 | 4.47 | .745 |
| Social time important | 128 | 1 | 5 | 4.30 | .779 |
| Networking improved | 130 | 2 | 5 | 4.29 | .849 |
| Time for discussing campus issues adequate | 131 | 2 | 5 | 4.12 | .860 |
| Improved management skills | 128 | 1 | 5 | 3.92 | .884 |
| Improved communication skills | 130 | 2 | 5 | 3.84 | .979 |

Table 36.  Participant satisfaction with specific topics in the LINC program

| I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| state governance | 128 | 2 | 5 | 4.45 | .708 |
| history of the community colleges | 128 | 2 | 5 | 4.45 | .697 |
| varying leadership styles | 127 | 2 | 5 | 4.43 | .752 |
| vision, mission, goals | 128 | 2 | 5 | 4.43 | .706 |
| role of leadership in the colleges | 126 | 2 | 5 | 4.42 | .719 |
| state and local funding | 126 | 2 | 5 | 4.37 | .733 |
| local governance | 127 | 2 | 5 | 4.35 | .802 |
| my own leadership style | 125 | 1 | 5 | 4.34 | .843 |
| role of the Board of Directors | 125 | 1 | 5 | 4.32 | .850 |
| legislative issues | 124 | 1 | 5 | 4.26 | .824 |
| IACCP | 125 | 1 | 5 | 4.26 | .753 |
| networking | 126 | 2 | 5 | 4.25 | .797 |
| developing leadership styles | 129 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | .822 |

Table 37.  Topics rated lowest by LINC participants

| I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| balancing tasks | 128 | 1 | 5 | 3.72 | .980 |
| collective bargaining | 122 | 1 | 5 | 3.67 | 1.032 |
| negotiation skills | 124 | 1 | 5 | 3.56 | .990 |
| resume writing | 125 | 1 | 5 | 3.48 | 1.119 |
| interview skills | 125 | 1 | 5 | 3.41 | 1.078 |

An open-ended question was also available for participants to share comments or

indicate those topics they believed to be of most assistance to them.  The following is a

summary of some of the comments shared on the survey.

- leadership styles, conflict resolution
- Leadership styles; governance
- Opportunities to share experiences with other participants and to talk about what we were learning and able to apply from what we were learning.
- funding process

- Attending the meetings with the Presidents and Board members. Hearing from sitting CC Presidents and Executive administrators Discussions involving the role of legislature

- All those concerning the history and governance and mission of the comprehensive community college.

- Listening to the community college presidents discuss their career paths, challenges and opportunities.

- History, legislative, strategic, state level budgeting and operations, college climates and change factors

- Frank discussions about current campus issues that were a part of each month's meetings.

- Public policy development and history of the community college

When asked if objectives were met, a majority of those responding believed they had achieved the objectives of the program (Table 38). Question 165 provides the information for this question, and Table 38 reveals the level of satisfaction with the specific objectives of the program.

Table 38. Participant achieved or did not achieve objectives in the LINC program

| Item | Achieved | | Did not achieve | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| I was able to network with others working in community colleges | 121 | 96.0 | 5 | 4.0 |
| I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system. | 123 | 97.6 | 3 | 2.4 |
| I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the colleges. | 119 | 94.4 | 7 | 5.6 |
| I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges. | 120 | 95.2 | 6 | 4.8 |
| I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style. | 119 | 94.4 | 7 | 5.6 |

**Comparative data – LINC program**

Objectives achieved by the LINC participants were compared by employment level to determine if there were any significant differences in achieving the objectives by level. The employment levels used are as follows:

Level 1: Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

Level 2: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

Level 3: Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

Level 4: Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions

The chi-square tests conducted for each of these questions showed no significant difference between the leadership levels identified (Table 39).

**Aggregate data – CLIC program**

Research question 4 asked participants to indicate which topics were of greater assistance to them. Questions 26 through 42 asked participants to indicate their perceptions of the program using a 5-point Likert range. The questions centered on their experience in the program, and a score of 3.0 would indicate a neutral score. As shown in Table 40, in all but three cases, the scores of each question were well above the 3.0 score. This indicated that participants believed the topics made a difference to their development. The mean score for all but three of the questions fell above the 3.0 score (Table 40).

Table 39.   Achievement of CLIC program objectives by employment level

| Objective | Level | Achieved | | Did not achieve | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| I was able to network with others working in community colleges. | 1 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 | 43 | 93.5 | 3 | 6.5 |
| | 3 | 57 | 96.6 | 2 | 3.4 |
| | 4 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system. | 1 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 |
| | 2 | 45 | 97.8 | 1 | 2.2 |
| | 3 | 58 | 98.3 | 1 | 1.7 |
| | 4 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the colleges. | 1 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 |
| | 2 | 42 | 91.3 | 4 | 8.6 |
| | 3 | 57 | 96.6 | 2 | 3.4 |
| | 4 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges. | 1 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.7 |
| | 2 | 43 | 93.5 | 3 | 6.5 |
| | 3 | 57 | 96.6 | 2 | 3.4 |
| | 4 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style. | 1 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2 | 42 | 91.3 | 4 | 8.7 |
| | 3 | 56 | 94.9 | 3 | 5.1 |
| | 4 | 8 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |

KEY:

Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.

Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.

Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.

Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

Participants were also asked to determine those skills they gained a better understanding of during the CLIC program.  Once again, a 5-point Likert range was used to assist the participants is indicating their perceptions with the program.  As shown in Table 41, all but two topic areas in the program were rated above 3.0, indicating satisfaction with the program topics.  The areas that fell below average were interview techniques and resume writing.  The lowest rated topics for the CLIC program are shown in Table 42.

Table 40.  Participant satisfaction with CLIC program topics

| Item | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience was positive | 87 | 4 | 5 | 4.72 | .475 |
| Campus visits valuable | 86 | 3 | 5 | 4.56 | .662 |
| Program effectively administered | 87 | 2 | 5 | 4.55 | .605 |
| Social time important | 87 | 3 | 5 | 4.47 | .626 |
| Presentations interesting | 87 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | .543 |
| Presentations valuable | 85 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | .586 |
| Networking improved | 87 | 2 | 5 | 4.28 | .788 |
| Specific topics were complete | 87 | 2 | 5 | 4.23 | .642 |
| Time for discussing campus issues adequate | 87 | 3 | 5 | 4.02 | .807 |
| Improved communication skills | 86 | 1 | 5 | 3.60 | .871 |
| Improved management skills | 76 | 1 | 5 | 3.48 | .926 |

Table 41.  Participant satisfaction with specific topics in the CLIC program

| Following my CLIC experience, I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| the role of leadership in the community college. | 86 | 1 | 5 | 4.28 | .792 |
| vision, mission, goals | 85 | 1 | 5 | 4.27 | .697 |
| state governance | 84 | 2 | 5 | 4.25 | .726 |
| the history of the community college. | 85 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | .850 |
| the role of the Board of Directors.. | 86 | 2 | 5 | 4.21 | .671 |
| varying leadership styles | 86 | 2 | 5 | 4.19 | .805 |
| state and local funding | 86 | 2 | 5 | 4.19 | .711 |
| organizational cultures | 86 | 2 | 5 | 4.17 | .654 |
| legislative and public policy issues | 86 | 1 | 5 | 4.16 | .765 |
| interaction of leaders with external public | 86 | 1 | 5 | 4.14 | .799 |

Table 42.  Topics rated lowest by CLIC participants

| Following my CLIC experience, I have a better understanding of: | N | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| resume writing | 79 | 1 | 5 | 2.71 | 1.167 |
| interview skills | 77 | 1 | 5 | 2.74 | 1.207 |
| negotiation skills | 85 | 1 | 5 | 3.22 | 1.106 |
| collective bargaining | 84 | 1 | 5 | 3.23 | 1.090 |
| conflict resolution | 86 | 1 | 5 | 3.42 | 1.046 |
| how to develop priorities | 86 | 1 | 5 | 3.49 | .930 |
| strategic planning | 86 | 1 | 5 | 3.50 | .979 |
| balancing multiple/tasks/priorities | 86 | 1 | 5 | 3.51 | .955 |

Participants also were able to indicate the topics they believed need more time or attention in the program. Questions 123-162 asked participants to provide information on those topics needing more time or attention. When looking at the topics and comparing those who were satisfied, most believed there was adequate time and attention spent on each topic, with two exceptions. When asked if more time and attention needed to be spent on interviewing and resume writing, 36.3% indicated a desire to see more time on interviewing while 37.4% of those completing the survey wanted to see more time and attention allocated to resume writing.

An open-ended question was also available for participants to share comments to indicate those topics they believed to be of most assistance to them. Following is a summary of some of the comments made by the CLIC participants:

- campus climate, leadership styles, legislative issues
- Presentations by presidents
- Ethics and integrity
- History of and legislation governing community colleges
- Campus visits
- Legal information
- Leadership styles
- Board relationships

When asked if objectives were met, a majority of those responding believed they had achieved the objectives of the program. Question 165 provides the information for this questions and Table 43 illustrates the high level of satisfaction with the objectives of the program. The percentages for 4 of the 5 objectives were 95% or above; the lowest percentage was above 80% (83.1%).

Table 43.  Participant achieved or did not achieve objectives in the CLIC program

| | Achieved | | Did not achieve | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Objective | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| I was able to network with others working in community colleges | 81 | 97.6 | 2 | 2.4 |
| I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system. | 81 | 97.6 | 2 | 2.0 |
| I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the colleges. | 79 | 95.2 | 4 | 4.8 |
| I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges. | 79 | 95.2 | 4 | 4.8 |
| I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style. | 69 | 83.1 | 14 | 16.9 |

**Comparative data – CLIC program**

Participant responses as to which objectives they believe they had achieved were

compared by employment level to determine if there were any significant differences in

achieving objectives based on employment levels.  The employment levels used are as

follows:

Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions

A chi-square test conducted for these questions indicated no significant difference in

participants meeting the objectives of the programs based on leadership levels (Table 44).

Table 44.   Achievement of CLIC program objectives by employment level

| Objective | Level | Achieved | | Did not achieve | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
| I was able to network with others working in community colleges. | 1 | 25 | 96.1 | 1 | 3.8 |
| | 2 | 40 | 97.6 | 1 | 2.4 |
| | 3 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system. | 1 | 25 | 96.1 | 1 | 3.8 |
| | 2 | 40 | 97.6 | 1 | 2.4 |
| | 3 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the colleges. | 1 | 23 | 88.4 | 3 | 11.5 |
| | 2 | 41 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 3 | 12 | 92.3 | 1 | 7.6 |
| | 4 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges. | 1 | 24 | 92.3 | 2 | 7.7 |
| | 2 | 39 | 95.1 | 2 | 4.8 |
| | 3 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style. | 1 | 20 | 76.9 | 6 | 23.1 |
| | 2 | 33 | 80.5 | 8 | 19.5 |
| | 3 | 13 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 4 | 3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |

KEY:
Level 1:  Executive Vice President, Vice President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.
Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller.
Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant.
Level 4:  Allowed participants to add a position if it did not fit the above listed positions.

**Interviews**

Staff for the two programs indicated that they have worked hard to stay current with topics and ensure the programs are timely for the college employees.  Program staff reported they worked to design program topics to meet the needs of the state.  One staff remarked that they worked to stay current in terms of leadership and leadership theory.  One staff member shared:

> *We try to give them this broad picture, but we also try to take what's happening now in the world or in the community college arena and focus on that and I think we spend a little more time on self-development the last few years, which I think is good.*

All in all, those who have worked as staff members for LINC and CLIC believed that the programs were able to *"get to the heart of what is needed—creating opportunities"*.

Community college leaders reflected on the topics that needed to be covered and found a variety of potential topics.  One leader stressed the importance of providing help in working with boards as well as making sure participants understand the history of the colleges.  Another community college leader explained that there must be more of an emphasis on focusing on the future and change.  This leader saw the need to work on developing a vision for the colleges and to focus on future thinking and cutting edge technology.  The leader suggested that it would be helpful for the programs to begin covering how best to think like the proprietary colleges do or to learn how to think like a corporate university.  While there is an impressive list of speakers meeting with the program each year, the community college leader suggested that the programs could reach outside the educational community for speakers.  The leader commented that *"The days of business as usual are gone"* and stressed the importance of looking at models outside of education.  It was also suggest that as speakers come in from the national level, that perhaps it could be feasible to invite alumni from the programs to be a part of that session.

When asked about the format of the programs one leader suggested that CLIC be expanded to more meetings as five meetings a year may not be enough.  This leader also suggested that more time be spent with the LINC group and perhaps the program should be expanded to two days each month rather than the current one and half days each month. More time for both programs would allow for additional development of the participants.

Participants also offered some suggestions for program topics.  While most indicated that the programs were meeting their needs, there were a few topics that would be helpful.

Participants believed that more of an emphasis on the financial aspect of running a college would be helpful as well as assistance of developing formal mentorship. Other participants asked for more help in knowing how to work in the "trenches" of the colleges, how to be a strong team member. One participant stated:

> *It is real good to know yourself, know your style, and how to work with those you supervise. I think what is missing is how to work with those who are members and the importance of that. If we don't support each other, it is a bad day. Because we are so needed; to support one another.*

This same participant also asked for more attention on the changing roles of the presidents.

Many of the participants noted that the programs were very helpful to them and the topics covered were also very helpful. The exposure to community college leaders provided additional insight to the foundation of the colleges. In each of the focus groups, participants discussed the emphasis on becoming a community college president. Most participants were interested in becoming stronger leaders in their current positions and would have enjoyed an emphasis on the importance of leadership at all levels in the college. They believed that leadership is critical at all levels of the college, not just at the CEO level.

While not in the area of topics, there were several comments about the communication with the current community college presidents about the programs. Concern was expressed that, with so many new presidents in the state, this may be the time to market the LINC and CLIC programs to this group. In addition to marketing the programs, it was also suggested that there be regular communication with the presidents about those in the program, the positions they hold in their colleges, and the achievements of the graduates of the programs. The concern was expressed that without marketing the programs, they may loose support.

Incredible support was shown for both the LINC and CLIC programs during the interviews and focus groups. Program staff were proud to be associated with the programs and were eager to share their experiences with the program participants. Community college leaders were supportive of the program and looked to the programs to assist in developing leaders for their colleges. For several of the colleges, the programs were an important component of their staff development programs and helping them in succession planning. One college had only used LINC and CLIC for their leadership development, and program participants spoke very highly of the programs and their experiences. Each participant took something from the programs that helped them in their careers.

Throughout the interviews and focus groups, one common concern was expressed by each group—the future of the LINC and CLIC programs. It was expressed, time and time again, that the programs have been helpful and the community colleges have grown to depend on these programs. Potential staff changes at the university are causing concern regarding the future of the programs. Those interviewed have seen strong leadership at the University for the LINC and CLIC programs, and believed that those who have provided leadership for the programs have a strong knowledge of the community colleges and their roles in the state. There is a great hope there will remain a commitment to the need for leadership development for the community colleges.

## CHAPTER 5.  SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to provide information on the impact on the participants of two leadership development programs.  This chapter is organized into five sections.  (a) Summary; (b) Limitations; (c) Discussion, which corresponds to the four research questions; (d) Recommendations; and (e) Final Thoughts.

### Summary

The programs, Leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) and the Community College Leadership Consortium (CLIC) were developed as a partnership between Iowa State University (ISU), the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents (IACCP), and the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees (IACCT) as a way to expand the capacity of leadership in the community college system in Iowa.  This study gathered information on the impact the programs had on the participants' careers, educational attainment, and perceptions of the program.  The study also gathered information from community college leaders and staff of the two programs.

The LINC program was established in 1989, and 275 individuals had participated in the program by the fall of 2005.  The program was evaluated in 1992 by Vianna Kelly using the Satisfaction and Perception survey (SPS) designed by Kelly for the program.  Using an updated SPS, Glenda Gallisath surveyed program participants in 1995.  An evaluation of the program had not been completed since that time.  The CLIC program was implemented in 1995 and as of the fall of 2005, 190 participants had completed the program.  The program has not had a formal evaluation.  The SPS survey was modified for this study and was used to gather information for both programs.

The survey was sent to all LINC and CLIC participants whose addresses could be verified.  Surveys were sent to 213 former LINC participants and 160 former CLIC participants.  One hundred thirty-five LINC participants returned the survey for a 63.4% rate, while 91 CLIC participants returned the survey for a 56.8% return rate.

After the surveys were returned, interviews were held with three community college leaders in Iowa who were familiar with the programs and had recommended staff for participation.  Three LINC and CLIC staff members were also interviewed.  Each shared their perceptions of the programs and provided unique insight into the impact the programs have had on participants.  Sixteen former LINC and CLIC participants attended focus groups held on three community college campuses.  Participants shared their experiences in the programs and their perceptions on the impact the programs have had on their careers.

## Limitations

There are several limitations that should be addressed when considering the results and findings of this study:

1. The LINC program was implemented 18 years ago, and the CLIC program was first offered 12 years ago.  Both programs have evolved as issues and the community environment have changed.  Not all participants have experienced the same content and program format.  This may impact their view of the programs.

2. As with all programs, the experiences in these programs may vary from participant to participant depending on the level of involvement and participation.

3. Participants have experienced different opportunities and experiences since completing the programs.  It may be difficult to separate the impact of the programs

from work experience and other leadership opportunities that may have occurred since program participation.

4. Since the inception of the LINC program, there has been a large turnover of community college presidents in Iowa. Currently, only one president was serving in their current role when the LINC program began. There may be a varying degree of familiarity or background information for all presidents to provide valuable information.

5. The study only looked at the perceptions of community college leaders and participants to learn about the impact of the programs. This study focused on the ways LINC and CLIC have influenced the participants and their leadership development. It is reasonable to assume time, opportunities and individual goals impact advancement in position.

6. Addresses were not known for all participants who had completed the programs. While an attempt was made to find as many as possible, there were some missing addresses.

7. Since those in the programs for the 2005-2006 academic year had not completed the program when the survey was administered, they were not included in the program numbers and results.

8. The study relied on voluntary participation from those who were contacted.

9. All responses to the survey and interview were based on self-reporting of former participants and programs staff.

10. The surveys and interviews provided a point-in-time assessment of the participants.

## Discussion

**Themes**

Several themes merged for each research question.  They are presented below, and

are discussed in depth by research question in the following subsection.

### *Research question 1- Career impact of the LINC and CLIC programs*

The LINC and CLIC programs…
- create opportunities to expose participants to skills needed
- build self-confidence of the participants
- assist in evaluating skills and strengths
- provide networking opportunities
- provide role models
- assist the colleges to grow their own leaders

### *Research question 2 – Impact of involvement on degree attainment in the LINC and CLIC programs*

Based on the LINC and CLIC programs…
- the credit awarded for program participation is important
- participants feel encouraged to continue their education and see it as a feasible option
- participants are enrolling in programs for community college leadership

### *Research question 3 – Impact of involvement on improvement in leadership skills in the LINC and CLIC programs*

Following the LINC and CLIC programs, the participants are leaving with …
- a better understanding of their leadership styles
- a better understanding of the community college system and its history, mission, and philosophy
- a desire to become stronger leaders for their colleges and in their current positions

### *Research question 4 – Impact of involvement on improvement in leadership skills in the LINC and CLIC programs*

The LINC and CLIC program…
- topics are meeting the needs of the participants
- leadership will want to review the results of the Leading Forward project and follow the recommendations for program topics

**Research question 1 – Career impact of the LINC and CLIC programs**

The first research question examined the impact the LINC and CLIC programs had on the participants' careers. Both programs provided an opportunity for participants to assess their skills, gain new skills, and begin to set goals for their career.

For those participating in the LINC program, most indicated they did so to either learn more about the community college system or because they were asked by their supervisor to attend. Several of the community college leaders shared that involvement in the LINC program is a way to expose potential leaders to growth opportunities. LINC is also a part of staff development plans for several colleges. When asked about promotions, 56 respondents (41.5%) indicated they had earned a promotion since their involvement in the program. Participants have been promoted to a variety of positions, including 2 who are serving as presidents, 6 who have been promoted to the role of vice president, 1 as a provost, 5 as executive deans or directors, and 22 who are serving as deans or directors. Thirty-three individuals (58.9%) indicated that the LINC program had an impact on that promotion by assisting them to clarify their professional goals and/or broadening their understanding of the community college system.

While not all participants had earned promotions, many were serving their college in expanded roles. Thirty-one individuals indicated that they have enhanced leadership responsibilities or have assumed additional responsibilities while experiencing no change in position title. During the focus groups several participants shared they wanted to be in the programs to strengthen their skills for their current roles at the college. Of those responding to the survey, 38.5% shared they desire to stay in the current positions.

Participation in the LINC program does assist individuals in clarifying their career aspirations, as nearly two-thirds (57.8%) indicated they had accomplished this objective. Participants indicated the programs helped to deepen their commitment to the community colleges and better understand the community college system, and assisted them to identify or realize their strengths. Several participants shared that the programs increased their confidence to be able to serve in a leadership role.

The LINC program appears to be serving as a strong retention tool for the community colleges. A majority of those responding (82.9%) reported they were working for the same college as when they participated in the program. Nine individuals were working for different colleges in Iowa and five are working for colleges other states. Only three had left education altogether. One hundred seventeen LINC participants (86.7%) shared that they wish to continue working in a community college. Some of the participants had set goals for their future and aspired to be promoted; 19% responded they would like to serve in either the role of president or vice president, while 18% desired to serve at the dean level.

The CLIC program has also been making an impact on its participants. When asked why they chose to participate in the program, 29.7% indicated they were doing so at the request of their supervisor, whereas 23.1% shared they were doing so for career advancement. Several had earned career advancement. Twenty-three (25.3%) indicated they had earned a promotion since their involvement in the CLIC program. One participant was currently serving in the role of chancellor, 4 were working as vice presidents, 1 as an associate vice president, 6 were serving in the role of an executive dean or director and 7 had been promoted to the dean's position. As with the LINC program, not all participants had

earned promotions. Among the individuals who had not earned promotions, several indicated they had assumed additional leadership roles on their campuses.

Participants in the CLIC program shared that the program did have an impact on the promotions they earned. Of the 23 who earned promotions, 8 indicated the program had a positive impact on their promotion. The program helped participants to gain a better understanding of the community college system and assisted them in clarifying their professional goals.

The CLIC program has also been serving as a strong retention tool for the community colleges. Seventy respondents (76.9%) reported working for the same institution as when they participated in the program. Only 5 had left higher education, whereas 6 were working at different colleges in Iowa and 7 were working at colleges in other states. Seventy-two of those responding (84.7%) shared that they would like to continue working for a community college. As participants looked to their futures, 47.6% indicated they would like to work as either a community college president or vice president whereas 11.3% desired to work in a dean's position. Twenty-five percent of the participants indicated they would like to continue working in their current position.

As participants reflected on their experiences in the CLIC program, 47.7% revealed that the program helped them to clarify their career goals. Participants shared that the program helped them to learn more about community colleges, assisted them in developing a career plan, or gave them focus to their career.

During the interviews participants shared that the programs helped them to learn more about themselves and the skills they had to offer. Participants were able to assess their current skills and gain new skills. The exposure to national leaders in the community college

system provided them with new insights as well as role models. LINC and CLIC staff also reported observing their own skill sets strengthened from interacting with the participants as well as the development of new relationships with other professionals in the community colleges throughout the state.

There was little doubt that the LINC and CLIC programs are impacting the careers of the participants. Participants are returning to their campuses with a better sense of the skills they have to offer and a direction for their future. With the emphasis on preparing leaders at all levels of the college, the LINC and CLIC program were clearly enabling leadership development (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Barwick, 2002; Carter et al, 2002; Ebbers et al., 2003, Oglesby & Windham, 1996; Shults, 2001). The LINC or CLIC experiences are the first formal development program in leadership acquisition in which they have been able to participate. The programs are, indeed, placing skilled people in the leadership pipeline that so many have indicated as important (McClenney, 2001; Shults, 2001). Thus, the LINC and CLIC programs are enabling Iowa community colleges to begin to "grow their own leaders."

Research has indicated that leadership development is an on-going process that requires time, opportunity, and direction (Amey, 2004; Boggs & Kent, 2002; Burnham, 2002; O'Banion, 2007). With the support of the college presidents, both LINC and CLIC are providing the opportunity for many. The programs provide the theoretical base followed by experience on the campuses that Anderson (1997) and O'Banion (2007) defined as being important. Participants are exposed to new trends, state and national leaders, and discussion of critical issues effecting community colleges today. Participants are able to develop a network of colleagues to call on for discussion and new ideas. Additionally, the programs are helping to ensure there are skilled potential leaders at all levels of the colleges. Research

by Ebbers and McFarlin (1998) determined that outstanding leaders in the community college system tended to be those who are working in the colleges, have developed a network with their peers, and have participated in leadership development programs.

**Research question 2 – Impact of involvement on degree attainment in the LINC and CLIC programs**

The second research question gathered information to determine if the LINC and CLIC program had an impact on the degree attainment of the participants. Participants are able to earn credit for their participation in both programs and they were provided with information on advanced degrees to assist them in their career planning.

The results of the survey validated that LINC participants have continued their education and have earned advanced degrees. The survey results indicated that 31.1% of those responding had earned an advance degree since participating in the program. An additional 31 individuals (23%) were working on a degree at the time of completing the survey. A large portion, more than two-thirds, of the degrees pursued (64.5%) were Doctorate. A review of the program of study for LINC participants indicated that most (51.6%) were earning a degree in Educational Leaders and Policy Studies (ELPS). When considering those who have earned a degree since participating in the program and those who were working on a degree at the time of the survey, 73 (54%) had changed their degree status.

LINC participants shared that the credit earned for participating in the program was important to them. A total of 76.3% indicated that the credit was important and several reported that the credit provided incentive for them to continue their education.

It appears that participants in the CLIC program have also been impacted by the program. Twenty-three percent of those responding reported earning a degree since their involvement in the program. An additional 27 people (29.7%) were working toward a degree at the time of completing the survey, 19 of which are the doctoral degree. As with the LINC program, the Education Leadership and Policies Study program has attracted a number of students. One-third of those either earning a degree or working toward a degree listed ELPS as their major. When considering those who have earned a degree and those who were working toward a degree, 48 individuals had changed their educational status since participating in the program. CLIC participants also shared that the credit awarded through the program was helpful to them. Fifty-seven percent of those responding indicated that the credit was important to them.

Participants commented that the credit awarded through both programs provided a jumpstart for them. Some found that they were encouraged to continue their education and, while they had no intention of continuing when they began the program, they were able to visualize that it was possible for them. One participant shared that she had not considered pursuing a doctorate until her involvement in the LINC program. The program served as an impetus for her return to school. Thus, the credit awarded through the programs seems to offer a head start for participants and, once earned, the remainder of the degree program—either the MS or PhD—seems more doable.

The LINC and CLIC programs are providing opportunities for participants to continue their education. Participants noted that the flexibility of the university helped them to continue with their education. Seminars scheduled around the LINC and CLIC sessions were especially helpful and convenient. As participants noted their area of study, either for

the MS or PhD degree, 38 participants identified ELPS or Higher Education Leadership as their major area of study whereas an additional 18 listed Higher Education as their program of study.  In a study of exceptional leaders in the community college system, Ebbers and McFarlin (1998) revealed that two of the traits the leaders had in common were a terminal degree and a program of study in community college leadership.  Thus, the LINC and CLIC programs are preparing community college staff to have the skill requirements to be strong leaders.

## Research question 3 – Impact of involvement on improvement in leadership skills in the LINC and CLIC programs

Research question 3 asked program participants to assess improvement in their leadership skills.  Through a variety of questions, participants were able to indicate if they believed they were able to improve their skills as a result of participating in the programs.

Research has indicated that strong community college leaders must have an understanding of the history of the colleges as well as the role of the colleges in today's world (AACC, 2001; Garavalia & Miller, 1996; Lorenzo, 1998; Roueche, 2004).  Research findings have also confirmed that leaders must have an intimate knowledge of their own colleges (Barwick, 2002; CCLDI, 2001; Filan, 2002; O'Rourke, 1997).  The LINC and CLIC programs are helping participants to learn more about the community college system and their own colleges.  The development of skills and awareness of various leadership styles has also been listed as key in the development of skills (Carroll & Romero, 2003; Ebbers et al., 2003).  The LINC and CLIC programs are addressing these topics and making participants more aware of what will work best for them.

143

The LINC participants reported that the programs did, indeed, help them better understand the history of the colleges and provided a deeper understanding of the mission, philosophy, and goals of the colleges.  When asked about gaining a better understanding of the history of the colleges, 89.6% of those responding either strongly agreed or agreed they had achieved this goal.  Additionally, 88.9% either strongly agreed or agreed they had gained a better understanding of the vision, philosophy, mission, and goals of the colleges.

The LINC program encourages participants to assess their skills and provides information about various leadership styles.  Participants indicated that they had gained a better understanding of their own leadership style.  When asked if they had a better understanding of their styles, 81.4% either strongly agreed or agreed they had accomplished that goal.  Self-reports on the improvement of leadership skills revealed that 88.1% either strongly agreed or agreed they had improved their leadership skills.

While there are a variety of leadership development programs available, it is clear that the LINC program is very important to community colleges in Iowa.  When asked about other leadership programs in which they might have participated, 58 participants indicated that the LINC program was the first program in which they had participated.  During the interviews, several of the colleges shared that the LINC program was one of the first opportunities for leadership development provided for staff.  They shared that the program offered a great beginning before staff become involved in other programs.

CLIC participants also shared that they had gained skills from the program.  When asked if they had gained a better understanding of the community college history, 81.4% either strongly agreed or agreed. When asked about gaining a better understanding of the vision, philosophy, and mission of the colleges, 87.9% indicated either strongly agreed or

agreed.  CLIC participants also gained a better understanding of their own leadership style, with 86.9% indicating either strongly agree or agree.  When asked if they had improved their skills, 75.8% reported strongly agree or agree they were leaving the program with stronger skills.

As with the LINC program, CLIC is important to the development of community college staff.  Thirty-five individuals indicated that CLIC was the first leadership development program in which they had participated.

Community college leaders interviewed observed participants returning to their campuses with a renewed enthusiasm for their work and with a much different perspective. They perceived the connections with other community college staff the participants had made in the programs were important for their development.  LINC and CLIC staff mentioned a number of times that they saw a growth in self-confidence that would potentially translate to stronger leadership.  Participants frequently indicated that they did not believe they changed their leadership style as a result of the program, but they were able to search what was important to them and validate that they were on the right track.  Participants also reported feeling more comfortable and confident in their abilities to serve in a leadership role.

While the LINC or CLIC program was the first experience for some of the participants, there were others who have participated in other programs. Those responding to the survey indicated they had participated in college-sponsored programs as well as the Chair Academy, local programs, various workshops and seminars, and Leadership Iowa.  One of the community college leaders indicated that the LINC and CLIC programs were the only programs their college used for their leadership development.  Another shared that these programs are the first step before other opportunities are offered.

**Research question 4 – Impact of involvement on improvement in leadership skills in the LINC and CLIC programs**

Research question 4 provided participants an opportunity to share their perceptions of the value of the topics covered in the program.  Participants were asked to indicate which topics were most helpful to them, and if there were topics they would have liked to have covered.  During the interviews, community college leaders were offered the opportunity to address their thoughts on the topics covered in the programs and provide suggestions for future changes.

LINC participants reported that the experience in the program was a positive one for them.  Participants were asked to indicate their satisfaction with the program using a five point Likert range.  When asked if the program was a positive experience for them, the mean for the LINC participants was 4.80.  Overall, 97.1% of those responding either strongly agreed or agreed that the LINC program was a positive experience for them.  When asked to indicate which skills they had gained a better understanding of, the mean for all the skills listed was greater than 3.0 on the Likert range, indicating above average satisfaction with the program.  The highest rated topic for participants was state governance (mean = 4.45) and the history of the community college system (mean = 4.45).  A better understanding of varying leadership styles had a mean of 4.43, while the role of leadership in the colleges had a mean of 4.42.  More than 80% of those responding either strongly agreed or agreed they had gained a better understanding of each of these areas.

There were a few topics in which the participants were not as satisfied.  While all topics were rated above the 3.0 mean on the Likert range, indicating above average satisfaction, they did rank lower than other topics.  The topics that were least helpful to the

participants were: interview skills, resume writing, negotiation skills, collective bargaining, and balancing priorities.

Participants were asked to indicate the topics that were most helpful to them in their own development. While a variety of topics were noted, leadership styles, frank discussions on current issues at the colleges, observing at the presidents meeting, and learning about career paths of presidents were some of the topics most often listed. Participants were also asked if there were topics that were not covered that would have been helpful to them. The LINC participants listed that more time with funding and budgeting issues would have been helpful, as well as more information on collective bargaining, human resources, legal issues, management strategies, and legislative concerns and issues.

The CLIC participants also shared their thoughts on the topics that were of greater value to their development. When asked if the CLIC program was a positive experience for them, 94.5% either strongly agreed or agreed. As the CLIC participants viewed the topics covered in the program and shared if they were able to gain a better understanding of the topics, all of topics were rated above the mean of 3.0 on the Likert range. The highest rated topics covered in the program were the role of leadership (mean = 4.28), and the vision, mission, and goals of the colleges (mean = 4.27). These topics were followed by a better understanding of the state governance of the community colleges (mean = 4.25), and the history of the community college system (mean = 4.22). In each of these areas, over 80% of the participants either strongly agreed or agreed they were leaving the program with a better understanding of the topics.

When asked about those topics that were not as helpful, resume writing, interview skills, and collective bargaining were the three lowest-rated topical areas. When asked if

there should be more time spent on these areas, 36.3% indicated they would like to see more time on the interviewing skills, and 37.4% asked for more time on resume writing.

Participants shared that the topics that were of most help to them were: learning about leadership styles, legislative issues, campus climate, ethics, board relations, and the campus visits. When asked if there were topics that were not covered that might have been helpful, participants had a variety of suggestions. They indicated it would have been helpful to receive more information on: budgets and funding issues, strategic planning, employment law, economic development and the role of the colleges, and legal issues in the community college. Participants perceived that it would be helpful to have greater attention paid to the financial aspect of running colleges.

Through the interviews and focus groups, there were a few areas of interest for the programs. Current leaders perceived that the most important topic to cover was the history of the colleges; there was a feeling that staff must understand the origin of the colleges and why they are in place. Leaders also requested topics that would cover working with boards, and those that place an emphasis on future thinking, and cutting-edge technology.

The role of a mentor was discussed several times in the focus groups. Participants shared that they believed it would be helpful to have a formal mentor as a part of the program. Research has indicated that a mentor relationship is helpful, and many current leaders have indicated they did have such a relationship (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Bagnato, 2004; McFarlin, 1998; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). In their research on leaders, Ebbers and McFarlin (1998) revealed that exemplary leaders had participated in a mentor relationship.

Many of the participants noted that the programs were very helpful to them and the topics covered were very helpful. In each of the focus groups participants discussed the emphasis on becoming a community college president. Most participants were interested in becoming stronger leaders in their current positions, and would have enjoyed emphasis placed on the importance of leadership at all levels in the college. They perceived that leadership is critical at all levels of the college, not just at the CEO level. Many participants did share that participating in the programs played a significant role in their development.

While not in the area of topics, there were several comments about the communication with the current community college presidents about the programs. Concern was expressed that, with so many new presidents of colleges in the state, this may be the time to market the LINC and CLIC programs to this group. In addition to marketing the programs, it was also suggested that there should be regular communication with the presidents about those participating in the program, the positions they hold in their colleges, and the achievements of the graduates of the programs. The concern was expressed that, unless sharing information about the programs and the success of the participants is encouraged more vigorously, support may weaken.

Strong support was shown for both the LINC and CLIC programs during the interviews and focus groups. Program staff were proud to be associated with the programs and eager to share their experiences with the program participants. Community college leaders were supportive of the program and looked to the programs to assist in developing leaders for their colleges. For several of the colleges, the programs were an important component of their staff development programs and are helping in succession planning. One college had used only LINC and CLIC for their leadership development, and program

participants spoke very highly of the programs and their experiences.  The participants revealed that each had taken something from the programs that helped them in their careers.

Throughout the interviews and focus groups, one common concern was expressed by each group—the future of the LINC and CLIC programs.  It was expressed time and time again that the programs have been helpful and the community colleges have grown to depend on them.  Potential staff changes at the university are causing concern regarding the future of the programs.  Those interviewed have seen strong leadership at the University for the LINC and CLIC programs, and perceive that individuals who have provided leadership for the programs have a strong knowledge of the community colleges and their roles in the state. There was a great concern and hope Iowa State University will continue the commitment to leadership development for the employees of Iowa's community colleges.

<div align="center">**Recommendations**</div>

Based on the outcomes of this research, the following recommendations are made for practice and future study.

**Recommendations for practice**

The following recommendations have been developed based on the results of the Satisfaction and Perception Survey completed by former LINC and CLIC participants, the interviews with community college leaders and LINC and CLIC staff, and focus groups with participants:

1. The LINC and CLIC programs are providing the time and opportunity for current community college employees to develop skills and are assisting participants in developing their future direction.  The programs are providing a framework to better

understand the colleges and the roles of leaders within the colleges as well as the skills needed to be strong leaders. The programs are offering all community colleges in Iowa the opportunity to grow their own leaders. In short, the programs are assuring there are skilled, potential leaders in the community colleges. The programs should be continued to assure there are potential leaders in Iowa's community college system.

2. The LINC program was originally developed to provide leadership development opportunities to women and people of color. While women have benefited from both LINC and CLIC, there have been few people of color in either program. Of those responding to the survey, a total of eleven individuals indicated they were people of color (8 for the LINC program and 3 for the CLIC program). With the emphasis of diversity in community colleges there is a need for a more diverse leadership. There should be a renewed emphasis on recruiting people of color to participate in both the programs.

3. Community college presidents are key to the success of both the LINC and CLIC programs. They support the programs financially and by assuring there are participants from their colleges. A survey should be completed with all community college presidents to gather their ideas, suggestions, and feedback to learn how the programs are meeting the needs of their colleges.

4. The community college presidents are important stakeholders for the programs. There should be additional information sent to the presidents sharing the participants in the program and roles they hold within their colleges, schedules for the programs, and other information of interest. Interviews with community college leaders found

they were interested in knowing more about the programs so they could support it on their campuses.

5. The differences between the LINC and CLIC programs should be marketed very clearly.  Community college leaders did not always understand the differences and participants reported not clearly understanding why they were in one program rather than the other.

6. There has been a large turn over of community college presidents in the state of Iowa.  Because of this change in leadership, the programs should be marketed to the presidents.  Comments were shared that it will be the newer leaders in the community college system that will determine the future of the programs and as such they need to be knowledgeable about them.

7. Participants indicated satisfaction with the topics introduced in the programs and believed they were leaving the programs with a better understanding of a variety of areas.  There is need, however, to continue to review topics covered to assure the programs are staying on the cutting edge.  One community college leader suggested that the programs may want to do more with future thinking and forecasting and should discuss the increased competition the colleges are experiencing.  It was also suggested that as plans are made to bring in speakers, speakers who are working outside education should be considered to offer a different perspective.

8. Future programs should continue to cover topics such as state governance, the history of the colleges, and leadership styles as these are the topics participants found helpful.  Topics such as collective bargaining, negotiations, strategic planning, and those skills

needed to find employment should be strengthened to assist participants. Additional time should be allocated to funding and legal issues for community colleges.

9. The format of both programs should be reviewed and evaluated. CLIC participants indicated a desire for more time in the program while LINC participants seemed satisfied with the time they spent in the program. Community college leaders suggested that more time could be spent for both programs to offer more in-depth discussions or additional topics.

10. Research has shown that leadership development is an on-going process. With this in mind, as national speakers are invited to meet with either the LINC or CLIC groups, alumni of the programs could be included in these meetings. This would offer former participants an opportunity to either gain new insights or renew their understanding of a particular topic.

11. Participants shared that the programs had significant impact on them and their career development. As a result of participating in the programs, many have earned promotions and/or have continued with their education. These accomplishments should be documented and shared with the community college presidents and trustees.

12. Strong leadership is needed at all levels of the community colleges. Time should be provided to discuss leadership at varying employment levels in the colleges and the impact all people can have on the college.

13. Credit for participating in the programs should be continued. While not all participants need the credit, many are finding it helpful. The awarding of credit made

continuing their studies seem possible for many and for others motivated them to continue once the programs ended.

14. The Leading Forward project offers a plethora of information on the skills needed to be a successful leader. Those skills outlined in the study should be incorporated in those topics offered both the LINC and CLIC programs.

15. Participants should be surveyed on a regular basis to learn their perceptions and any changes in educational or employment status. There is a large group of alumni working in community colleges and an effort to continue to gather information on their accomplishments and insights on the programs will only strengthen the programs.

16. The survey, as modified for this study, should be shortened. The survey was long and took some time to complete. A shortened survey may encourage more participants to complete. The electronic survey was easy to complete and this form should be used for the next survey.

17. The survey has provided a wealth of information on the impact the programs have had on participants and the insights of participants. Information from the survey should be used in planning future LINC and CLIC programs.

18. During the interviews and focus groups concern was expressed on the future of the LINC and CLIC programs. The programs have made a difference to community colleges in Iowa and there is concern that the commitment to the programs may weaken as staffing changes occur. The LINC and CLIC programs provide a strong link between Iowa State University and the community colleges in addition to assisting to educate future leaders. The programs also serve as a pipeline to the

university's Community College Leadership Program. The university should develop

a succession plan for the program to guarantee its viability in the future. Such a plan

could be integrated with a larger university focus on community colleges.

**Recommendations for future study**

Several recommendations were made for future research:

1. Leadership is a broad term and allows for multiple definitions. This term should be
   defined in future studies to assure that those participating in the study are working
   from a common understanding of the term.

2. The survey provides ample information about the perceptions of the participants, but
   it must be shortened. Questions concerning topics that were least helpful or those
   items needing additional time could be eliminated as the information can be gathered
   from other questions.

3. Research has indicated that mentors play a significant role in the careers of many
   community college leaders. This study should be expanded to include the impact of
   mentors on the careers of the participants.

4. The LINC program was originally developed to provide opportunities for women and
   people of color. Future studies should address the need for programs for people of
   color and explore avenues to increase the diversity of leadership in the community
   college system in Iowa.

5. The LINC and CLIC programs provide opportunities for both men and women in the
   community college system. Future studies should examine differences between the

genders in the perceptions of the programs and impact the programs have had on the participants' careers.

## Final Thoughts

As I started this project I knew it was an important topic in which I would learn much. I also knew the evaluation of the LINC and CLIC programs were important and offered me a ready topic for my dissertation research. Little did I realize how close to home the importance of leadership development would be to me. During the last few years I have watched as some of my peers, colleagues, and my supervisor and mentor have retired, thus leaving a void in leadership experience and understanding of the role of the community college. While good people have followed, the void is still ever-present and the absence of history is real.

Community colleges touch the lives of many people and truly make a difference to our students. Our open-door philosophy creates opportunities for students while requiring our colleges to be creative in meeting the needs of the students coming to us. Our role in the communities we serve is vast and our work is important. Our work will require strong, knowledgeable, and committed leaders. There is no doubt that these potential leaders are in our colleges and, if given the opportunity, can be ready to continue the work and mission of the colleges.

As one who did not aspire to be in a leadership role, I am thankful for the opportunities afforded to me. The LINC program helped me to assess my skills and offered me a window to view what I might do. Additional leadership development programs provided a way for me to refine my skills and learn additional skills that have proved helpful.

156

A mentor who demanded only the best set the bar for me and aspired me to work to make him proud.  I have been able to grow in my role as a leader and become comfortable with who I am.  The opportunity to participate was the beginning for me, as I know it has been for many.

It is my hope that the LINC and CLIC programs will continue to provide leadership development opportunities for future leaders.  The programs provide a solid foundation from which new leaders can work.  Both programs have become important in the development of new leaders for the community colleges and I am hopeful ISU will work to maintain the programs for the future.  As the programs continue I would encourage the community college presidents to be surveyed on a regular basis to gather their perceptions of the programs, and gain information on desired topics and the impact the programs are having on their colleges.  Additionally, I would hope that a process to provide on-going communication to the community college presidents would be developed.  This group of leaders should be aware of the programs, the program participants, and the outcomes of the programs.

Programs such as LINC and CLIC help individuals to see themselves as leaders.  With that vision, skills are developed and self-confidence is established.  These programs will keep our colleges full of leaders at all levels, which will allow us to fulfill our mission.

## APPENDIX A.  HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

**DATE:**    December 15, 2005

**TO:**      Karen Vickers

**FROM:**    Office of Research Assurances

**RE:**      **IRS ID** # 05-548
**STUDY REVIEW DATE:** December 15, 2005

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Assurances
Vice Provost for Research
1138 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2207

515 294-4566 FAX
515 294-4267

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed the project, "An Assessment of Leadership Programs for Community College Employees" requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101 (b )(1). The applicable exemption category is provided below for your information. Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.

The IRB determination of exemption means that this project does not need to meet the requirements from the Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human subjects, unless required by the IRB. We do, however, urge you to protect the rights of your participants in the same ways that you would if your project was required to follow the regulations. This includes providing relevant information about the research to the participants.

Because your project is exempt, you do not need to submit an application for continuing review. However, you must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or required by the IRB.

Any modification of this research must be submitted to the IRB on a Continuation and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

cc: ELPS
Larry Ebbers

ORC 04-21-04

# APPENDIX B.  CORRESPONDENCE

## B-1.  LINC Survey Letter

February 27, 2006

Dear {Insert Name},

The Leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) has been offered to community college staff since 1989.  While the program has been evaluated each year by the participants, it is time to gather more in-depth information from former participants.  The information collected will be used to provide insight to the leadership development of those who have participated in the program, to assess the effectiveness of the program, to promote the effectiveness of the program, and to offer suggestions for improvement for the LINC program.

We would ask you, as a former LINC participant, to take a few moments of your time to share your thoughts and perceptions of the program by completing this survey.  There has been space allowed for additional comments you might want to offer.  The survey should take no more than 45 minutes to complete.  Your responses will assist us as we work to determine the impact the program has made on the community college system in Iowa.

We have provided the link to the survey as well as a password and user ID for you to gain access to the survey.  The link to the survey is http://www.kjvickers.org/index.php.  Your user name is {include} and your password is {include}.

All survey responses will remain anonymous.  The user name and password is specific to you and will be used for inventory purposes only.  These two pieces of information will be used only to record the return of your survey.  Procedures for this study have been approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research.

As you work through the survey, please note that you must complete each page before beginning the next page.  Should you experience any technical difficulties, please contact Gary Olson who is serving as a technical advisor for this survey.  Gary can be reached at (563)336-5263 or golson@eicc.edu.  We have also listed his contact information on each of the pages for assistance.

We would ask that you return the survey by March 24th.  If you choose not to participate in the survey, please return the e-mail indicating your desire not to participate.  Please let us know if you are interested in receiving a summary of the results.

Thank you for your time, thoughts, and feedback. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (563)244-7027 or (563) 243-4915.  Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,


Karen J. Vickers                                    Larry Ebbers, PhD
PhD Candidate                                      Advisor
(563) 243-4919                                      (515) 294-8067
vickers@clinton.net                              lebbers@iastate.edu

**B-2.  CLIC Survey Letter**

February 28, 2006

Dear {Insert Name},

The Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC) has been offered to community college staff since 1995.  While the program has been evaluated each year by the participants, it is time to gather more in-depth information from former participants.  The information collected will be used to provide insight to the leadership development of those who have participated in the program, to assess the effectiveness of the program, to promote the effectiveness of the program, and to offer suggestions for improvement for the CLIC program.

We would ask you, as a former CLIC participant, to take a few moments of your time to share your thoughts and perceptions of the program by completing this survey.  There has been space allowed for additional comments you might want to offer.  The survey should take no more than 45 minutes to complete.  Your responses will assist us as we work to determine the impact the program has made on the community college system in Iowa.

We have provided the link to the survey as well as a user name and password for you to gain access to the survey.  The link to the survey is http://www.kjvickers.org/index.php.  Your user name is {include} and your password is {include}.

All survey responses will remain anonymous.  The user name and password is specific to you and will be used for inventory purposes only.  These two pieces of information will be used only to record the return of your survey.  Procedures for this study have been approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research.

As you work through the survey, please note that you must complete each page before beginning the next page.  Should you experience any technical difficulties, please contact Gary Olson who is serving as a technical advisor for this survey.  Gary can be reached at (563)336-5263 or golson@eicc.edu. We have also listed his contact information on each of the pages for assistance.

We would ask that you return the survey by March 24th.  If you choose not to participate in the survey, please return the e-mail indicating your desire not to participate.  Please let us know if you are interested in receiving a summary of the results.

Thank you for your time, thoughts, and feedback. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (563)244-7027 or (563) 243-4915.  Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,


Karen J. Vickers                                Larry Ebbers, PhD
PhD Candidate                                   Advisor
(563) 243-4919                                  (515) 294-8067
vickers@clinton.net                             lebbers@iastate.edu

# APPENDIX C.  LINC AND CLIC PROGRAM SURVEY AND DATA

**LINC/ CLIC  Participant Survey**
**Satisfaction and Perception Survey**

**Participant Background Information**

In which program did you participate?            LINC            CLIC

Please record the appropriate number answer in the space provided.

 1.  What year did you participate in the LINC/CLIC program? _____

___2. Sex:            1.  Female            2.  Male

___3. Marital Status      1.  Single      2.  Married      3.  Divorced4.  Separated      5.  Widow/Widower

_____   4.  What was your age when you were accepted into the LINC/CLIC program?
         1.  21-24            6.  46-50
         2.  25-30            7.  51-55
         3.  31-35            8.  56-60
         4.  36-40            9.  60+
         5.  41-45

_____  5.  What is your age now?
         1.    21-24            6.  46-50
         2.    25-30            7.  51-55
         3.    31-35            8.  56-60
         4.    36-40            9.  60+
         5.    41-45

_____   6.   Ethnic Background (Select all that apply)
         1.    Native American
         2.    Asian
         3.    Black/African American
         4.    Caucasian/White
         5.    Hispanic/Latino

_____  7.  Are you still employed in the community college system?
         1.    Yes.  I am employed at the same college I was when attending LINC/CLIC.
         2.    Yes.  I am employed at a different college than when I attended LINC/CLIC.
         3.    Yes.  I am employed at a community college in a state other than Iowa.
         4.    No.  I have left higher education.
         5.    No.  I have retired.

_____   8.  Identify the level of leadership position you held when accepted into the LINC/CLIC program.

         1.    Level 1:  Executive Vice- President, Vice-President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean,
                 Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

         2.  Level 2:   Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division
                 Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar,
                 Assistant Registrar, Controller

         3.  Level 3:   Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor,
                 Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

         4.  Other:    Please provide position title: _____

____ 9.  Identify the level of leadership position you currently hold.

     1.  Level 1:  Executive Vice-President, Vice-President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean, Executive Director, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean

     2.  Level 2:  Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Manager, Supervisor, Division Chair, Department Head or Chair, Librarian, Registrar, Associate Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Controller

     3.  Level 3:  Program Coordinator, Consultant, Specialist, Instructor, Counselor, Senior Advisor, Advisor, Office Manager, Board Secretary, Administrative Assistant

     4.  Retired

     5.  If retired, did you change roles at your college before your retirement? _____

     6.  Other:  Please provide position title: _____

____ 10.  If you identified the same leadership levels for questions 8 and 9, please explain:
     1.  Your position title has remained the same but your leadership responsibilities have been enhanced.
     2.  Your position title has not changed and your leadership responsibilities have not been enhanced.
     3.  Your position title has changed but remained within the same leadership level.
     4.  Other: Please explain: _____

____ 11.  Highest Degree Completed:
     1.  Associate's Degree
     2.  Bachelor's Degree
     3.  Master's Degree
     4.  Specialist Degree
     5.  Doctoral Degree

____ 12.  Are you currently working on a degree?        1.  Yes        2.  No

____ 13.  If you answered yes to question 12, which degree are you working toward?
     1.  Associate's Degree
     2.  Bachelor's Degree
     3.  Master's Degree
     4.  Specialist Degree
     5.  Doctoral Degree

Please indicate your field of study in the space below.

_____

____ 14.  If you answered no to number 12, do you plan to begin work on a degree within the next five years?
     1.  Yes                    2.  No                    3.  Don't Know

____ 15.  Have you earned a degree since your participation in LINC/CLIC?
     1.  Yes                    2.  NO

____ 16.  Was the credit earned from your LINC/CLIC experience important to you?
     1.  Yes                    2.  No                    3.  Don't Know

**General information about your LINC/CLIC experience:**

____ 17.  Please indicate all of your reasons for participating in the LINC/CLIC program.  If more than one reason applies rank order your responses using 1 as most important
     ____ 1.  Career advancement
     ____ 2.  Statewide contacts
     ____ 3.  To gain a better understanding of the community college system
     ____ 4.  Professional recognition
     ____ 5.  Personal satisfaction
     ____ 6.  Graduate-level course credit
     ____ 7.  The reputation of the program

_____ 8. You were asked to participate by a supervisor
_____ 9. To fulfill a staff development requirement
_____ 10. Other (Please comment) _____

_____ 18. Did you receive a promotion or advancement in your career during for following your
LINC/CLIC experience?
1. Yes                              2. No

_____ 19. If you answered yes to question 18, please list below the promotion (s) you have received.
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

_____20. If you answered yes to question 18, to what degree do you believe that your LINC/CLIC
experience was instrumental in your promotion(s) or advancement(s)?
1. Very  (Please elaborate here) _____
2. Moderately
3. Somewhat
4. Minimally
5. Not at all
6. Don't know

_____ 21. If you answered yes to 18, why do you believe LINC/CLIC was instrumental?  If more than one
answer applies; please rank order your responses using 1 as the most important.
_____ 1. LINC/CLIC improved my self-confidence
_____ 2. LICN/CLIC helped me to clarify my professional goals
_____ 3. LINC/CLIC helped me develop my leadership style
_____ 4. LINC/CLIC helped me improve my management style
_____ 5. LINC/CLIC helped me improve my communication skills
_____ 6. LINC/CLIC improved my visibility with top administration at the college
_____ 7. LINC/CLIC broadened my understanding of community colleges in the state
_____ 8. LINC/CLIC broadened my understanding of my institution
_____ 9. LINC/CLIC increased my state-wide contacts
_____ 10. LINC/CLIC improved my understanding of how to work with groups
_____ 11. LINC/CLIC improved my understanding of how to develop leadership in others
_____ 12. Other (Please explain) _____

**Career Aspirations**

_____ 22`. Do you wish to continue to be employed by a community college?
1. Yes                    2. No                    3. Not sure

_____ 23. Did your LINC/CLIC experience help you clarify your career aspirations?
1. Yes                    2. No                    3. Not sure

If so, in what ways?  _____
_____

_____ 24. If you plan to continue employment at a community college, what level of employment do you
wish to attain within the next five years?
1. Community College President
2. Position at the Vice President level
3. Position at the Dean's level
4. Position at the Department Chair level
5. Other, please identify _____
6. Continue in present position
7. Unknown

_____ 25. Do you think  you will be with the same institution?
Five years from now?                    1. Yes        2. No        3. Don't Know
Ten years from now?                     4. Yes        5. No        6. Don't Know

*Please respond to the following statements by indicating your response in the appropriate boxes.*

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Does Not Apply |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26.  My overall LINC/CLIC experience was positive | | | | | | |
| 27.  My networking opportunities and skills improved because of my LINC/CLIC experience | | | | | | |
| 28.  Overall, the presentations during monthly meetings were interesting. | | | | | | |
| 29.  Overall, the presentations during monthly meetings were valuable. | | | | | | |
| 30.  The campus visits by LINC/CLIC staff are valuable | | | | | | |
| 31.  Overall, the LINC/CLIC program is effectively administered | | | | | | |
| 32.  The time for discussing campus issues is sufficient. | | | | | | |
| 33.  The social time during dinner one evening each month is important | | | | | | |
| 34.  Overall, the specific topics covered during sessions were complete and comprehensive. | | | | | | |
| 35.  Before my LINC/CLIC experience, I had little or no contact with my college's trustees. | | | | | | |
| 36.  Following my LINC/CLIC experience, I feel that my college's trustees now know me | | | | | | |
| 37.  Before my LINC/CLIC experience, I had little contact with my college's president. | | | | | | |
| 38.  Following my LINC/CLIC experience, I feel that the president is more accessible to me | | | | | | |
| 39.  LINC/CLIC helped me improve my management skills. | | | | | | |
| 40.  LINC/CLIC helped me improve my communication skills. | | | | | | |
| 41.  Before my LINC/CLIC experience, I had not attended a meeting of the Iowa Association of  Community College Trustees. | | | | | | |
| 42.  Before my LINC/CLIC experience, I had not attended a meeting of the Iowa Association of  Community College Presidents. | | | | | | |

*Please respond to the following statements by indicating your response in the appropriate boxes.*

Following my LINC/CLIC experience, I have a better understanding of:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43.  State governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 44.  Local governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 45.  The history of the community college system | | | | | |
| 46.  How to develop a campus climate | | | | | |
| 47.  How to work in a changing environment | | | | | |
| 48.  Decision-making roles | | | | | |
| 49.  Varying Leadership styles | | | | | |
| 50.  Developing leadership styles | | | | | |
| 51.  Developing Teams | | | | | |
| 52.  Communication skills | | | | | |
| 53.  Vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges | | | | | |
| 54.  Institutional and Personal ethics | | | | | |
| 55.  Organizational cultures | | | | | |
| 56.   How to develop priorities | | | | | |
| 57.  Strategic planning | | | | | |
| 58.  How to balance multiple tasks/priorities | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 59.  Fiscal resource allocation | | | | | |
| 60.  Capital resource allocation | | | | | |
| 61  Human resource allocation | | | | | |
| 62.  The importance of diversity to a college campus | | | | | |
| 63.  The role of fund raising | | | | | |
| 64.  Formal and informal organizational structures | | | | | |
| 65.  State and local funding of community colleges | | | | | |
| 66. The interaction of college leaders with internal constituencies | | | | | |
| 67.  The interaction of college leaders with external constituencies | | | | | |
| 68.  The role of leadership in the community colleges | | | | | |
| 69.  My own leadership style | | | | | |
| 70.  The role of the board of directors of community colleges | | | | | |
| 71.  Legislative and public policy decision-making processes | | | | | |
| 72.  Legislative and public policy issues for community colleges | | | | | |
| 73.  Collective bargaining | | | | | |
| 74.  Conflict resolution | | | | | |
| 75.  Negotiation skills | | | | | |
| 76.  The Iowa Association of Community College Presidents | | | | | |
| 77.  The Iowa Association of Community College Trustees | | | | | |
| 78.  Assessing individual strengths | | | | | |
| 79.  Resume writing | | | | | |
| 80.  Interview techniques | | | | | |
| 81.  Networking | | | | | |
| 82.  Campus Issues | | | | | |

*Please respond to the following statements by indicating your response in the appropriate boxes.*

Statement:  LINC/CLIC should place more emphasis on the following topics:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 83.  State governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 84.  Local governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 85.  The history of the community college system | | | | | |
| 86.  How to develop a campus climate | | | | | |
| 87.  How to work in a changing environment | | | | | |
| 88.  Decision-making roles | | | | | |
| 89.  Varying Leadership styles | | | | | |
| 90.  Developing leadership styles | | | | | |
| 91.  Developing Teams | | | | | |
| 92.  Communication skills | | | | | |
| 93.  Vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges | | | | | |
| 94.  Institutional and Personal ethics | | | | | |
| 95.  Organizational cultures | | | | | |
| 96.   How to develop priorities | | | | | |
| 97.  Strategic planning | | | | | |
| 98.  How to balance multiple tasks/priorities | | | | | |
| 99.  Fiscal resource allocation | | | | | |
| 100.  Capital resource allocation | | | | | |
| 101  Human resource allocation | | | | | |
| 102.  The importance of diversity to a college campus | | | | | |
| 103.  The role of fund raising | | | | | |
| 104.  Formal and informal organizational structures | | | | | |
| 105.  State and local funding of community colleges | | | | | |
| 106. The interaction of college leaders with internal constituencies | | | | | |
| 107.  The interaction of college leaders with external constituencies | | | | | |
| 108.  The role of leadership in the community colleges | | | | | |
| 109.  My own leadership style | | | | | |

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110. The role of the board of directors of community colleges | | | | | |
| 111. Legislative and public policy decision-making processes | | | | | |
| 112. Legislative and public policy issues for community colleges | | | | | |
| 113. Collective bargaining | | | | | |
| 114. Conflict resolution | | | | | |
| 115. Negotiation skills | | | | | |
| 116. The Iowa Association of Community College Presidents | | | | | |
| 117. The Iowa Association of Community College Trustees | | | | | |
| 118. Assessing individual strengths | | | | | |
| 119. Resume writing | | | | | |
| 120. Interview techniques | | | | | |
| 121. Networking | | | | | |
| 122. Campus Issues | | | | | |

Statement: LINC/CLIC should place less emphasis on the following topics:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 123. State governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 124. Local governance of community colleges | | | | | |
| 125. The history of the community college system | | | | | |
| 126. How to develop a campus climate | | | | | |
| 127. How to work in a changing environment | | | | | |
| 128. Decision-making roles | | | | | |
| 129. Varying Leadership styles | | | | | |
| 130. Developing leadership styles | | | | | |
| 131. Developing Teams | | | | | |
| 132. Communication skills | | | | | |
| 133. Vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges | | | | | |
| 134. Institutional and Personal ethics | | | | | |
| 135. Organizational cultures | | | | | |
| 136. How to develop priorities | | | | | |
| 137. Strategic planning | | | | | |
| 138. How to balance multiple tasks/priorities | | | | | |
| 139. Fiscal resource allocation | | | | | |
| 140. Capital resource allocation | | | | | |
| 141 Human resource allocation | | | | | |
| 142. The importance of diversity to a college campus | | | | | |
| 143. The role of fund raising | | | | | |
| 144. Formal and informal organizational structures | | | | | |
| 145. State and local funding of community colleges | | | | | |
| 146. The interaction of college leaders with internal constituencies | | | | | |
| 147. The interaction of college leaders with external constituencies | | | | | |
| 148. The role of leadership in the community colleges | | | | | |
| 149. My own leadership style | | | | | |
| 150. The role of the board of directors of community colleges | | | | | |
| 151. Legislative and public policy decision-making processes | | | | | |
| 152. Legislative and public policy issues for community colleges | | | | | |
| 153. Collective bargaining | | | | | |
| 154. Conflict resolution | | | | | |
| 155. Negotiation skills | | | | | |
| 156. The Iowa Association of Community College Presidents | | | | | |
| 157. The Iowa Association of Community College Trustees | | | | | |
| 158. Assessing individual strengths | | | | | |
| 159. Resume writing | | | | | |
| 160. Interview techniques | | | | | |
| 161. Networking | | | | | |
| 162. Campus Issues | | | | | |

163. The sessions that were most helpful to me were: _____
    _____

164.  One skill or topic I wish had been covered and was not is: _____
    _____

165.  I achieved the following objectives:  (Please indicated Yes or No)
    ____ a.  I was able to network with others working in community colleges.
    ____ b.  I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system.
    ____ c.  I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the
        colleges.
    ____ d.  I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges.
    ____ e.  I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style.
166.  How has your experience with LINC/CLIC impacted your career?

167.  Have you participated in other leadership development programs?  If so, please list the programs.

Please use the following space to provide any additional information you think may help in planning future LINC/CLIC programs.  Feel free to suggest anything including: speakers, topics, ways to involve past LINC/CLIC participants, scheduling improvements.  Thank you for your time and involvement.

**Program Participation by Community College**
**1989-2005**
**LINC: 1989-2005**
**CLIC: 1995-2005**

|  | LINC | CLIC | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Northeast Iowa Community College | 19 | 17 | 36 |
| North Iowa Area Community College | 18 | 10 | 28 |
| Iowa Lakes Community College | 14 | 16 | 30 |
| Northwest Iowa Community College | 12 | 7 | 19 |
| Iowa Central Community College | 17 | 14 | 31 |
| Iowa Valley Community College | 10 | 7 | 17 |
| Hawkeye Community College | 15 | 9 | 24 |
| Eastern Iowa Community College | 21 | 12 | 33 |
| Kirkwood Community College | 25 | 21 | 46 |
| Des Moines Areas Community College | 29 | 11 | 40 |
| Western Iowa Tech Community College | 30 | 20 | 50 |
| Iowa Western Community College | 16 | 9 | 25 |
| Southwestern Community College | 11 | 7 | 18 |
| Indian Hills Community College | 16 | 10 | 26 |
| Southeastern Iowa Community College | 19 | 12 | 31 |
| Other | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Total | 275 | 190 | 465 |

**Survey Return by Year**
**LINC Program- 1989- 2005**

| Year | # of Participants | # of Surveys Sent | % of Program | # of Surveys Returned | Return % Participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1989-1990 | 20 | 11 | 35.0 | 7 | 63.6 |
| 1990-1991 | 14 | 9 | 35.7 | 5 | 55.6 |
| 1991-1992 | 14 | 11 | 50.0 | 7 | 63.6 |
| 1992-1993 | 15 | 9 | 46.7 | 7 | 77.8 |
| 1993-1994 | 16 | 10 | 31.3 | 5 | 50.0 |
| 1994-1995 | 17* | 10 | 47.1 | 8 | 80.0 |
| 1995-1996 | 19 | 14 | 42.1 | 8 | 57.1 |
| 1996-1997 | 16 | 15 | 37.5 | 9 | 60.0 |
| 1997-1998 | 16 | 11 | 68.7 | 6 | 54.5 |
| 1998-1999 | 17 | 14 | 82.3 | 5 | 35.7 |
| 1999-2000 | 15 | 11 | 73.3 | 7 | 63.6 |
| 2000-2001 | 14 | 14 | 100.0 | 8 | 57.1 |
| 2001-2002 | 14 | 12 | 85.7 | 7 | 58.3 |
| 2002-2003 | 19 | 16 | 84.2 | 13 | 81.2 |
| 2003-2004 | 25 | 24 | 96.0 | 15 | 62.5 |
| 2004-2005 | 24* | 22 | 91.7 | 18 | 81.8 |
| Total | 275 | 213 | 77.4 | 135 | 63.4 |

* Participants from organizations other than community colleges were enrolled this year- no surveys sent to those individuals

**Survey Return by Year**
**CLIC Program: 1995-2005**

| Year | # of Participants | # of Surveys Sent | % of Program | # of Surveys Returned | Return % Participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1995-1996 | 18 | 13 | 72.2 | 8 | 61.5 |
| 1996-1997 | 17 | 13 | 76.5 | 10 | 76.9 |
| 1997-1998 | 20 | 15 | 75.0 | 9 | 60.0 |
| 1998-1999 | 17 | 15 | 88.2 | 3 | 20.0 |
| 1999-2000 | 15 | 11 | 73.3 | 4 | 36.4 |
| 2000-2001 | 16 | 15 | 93.7 | 7 | 43.7 |
| 2001-2002 | 14* | 12 | 85.7 | 8 | 66.7 |
| 2002-2003 | 25* | 24 | 96.0 | 13 | 54.2 |
| 2003-2004 | 22* | 19 | 86.4 | 13 | 68.4 |
| 2004-2005 | 26* | 23 | 88.5 | 16 | 69.6 |
| Totals | 190 | 160 | 84.2 | 91 | 56.9 |

* Participants from organizations other than community colleges were enrolled this year- no surveys sent to those individuals

**Employment Status of Participants**
**LINC and CLIC Programs**

| | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Employed with same community college | 112 (83.0) | 70 (76.9) |
| Employed with different community college | 9 (6.7) | 6 (6.6) |
| Employed at community college in state other than Iowa | 5 (3.7) | 7 (7.7) |
| Have left higher education | 3 (2.2) | 5 (5.5) |
| Retired | 6 (4.4) | 3 (3.3) |
| NR | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 91 (100.0) |

NR= No Response
( ) = Percentage

**Reasons for Participating in LINC Program**

| | | | | | Ranked by Importance (1 = most important) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Response | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | NR |
| Career Advancement | 22 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 1 | -- | 42 |
| Statewide contacts | 8 | 20 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 1 | -- | 35 |
| Better understanding of community college | 42 | 22 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | -- | 21 |
| Professional Recognition | 0 | 9 | 20 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 1 | -- | 53 |
| Personal Satisfaction | 8 | 20 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 | -- | 37 |
| Graduate level credit | 3 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 3 | -- | 53 |
| Reputation of program | 5 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 1 | -- | 54 |
| Asked by supervisor | 42 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 3 | -- | 40 |
| Fulfill Staff Development Requirement | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 23 | 1 | 95 |
| Other | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 130 |

**Reasons for Participating in CLIC Program**

| | | | | | Ranked by Importance (1 = most important) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Response | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | NR |
| Career Advancement | 21 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 0 | -- | 28 |
| Statewide contacts | 9 | 14 | 17 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | -- | 23 |
| Better understanding of community college | 19 | 25 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| Professional Recognition | 1 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 40 |
| Personal Satisfaction | 3 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | -- | 24 |
| Graduate level credit | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 44 |
| Reputation of program | 2 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 3 | -- | 27 |
| Asked by supervisor | 27 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Fulfill Staff Development Requirement | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 1 | 56 |
| Other | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 79 |

**Promotions Received Following Participation in the Programs**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Received a Promotion | 56 (41.5) | 23 (25.3) |
| Did not Received a Promotion | 75 (55.5) | 64 (70.3) |
| NR | 4 (3.0) | 4 (4.4) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 91 (100.0) |

NR= No Response
( ) = Percentages

**Impact Participation in LINC had on Promotion**

Ranked by Importance (1= most important)

| Response | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Improved self-confidence | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Clarify professional goals | 17 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Develop leadership style | 7 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Improve management style | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Improve communication skills | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Visibility to administration | 8 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Better understanding of Community Colleges | 15 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Better understanding of own college | 1 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| State-wide contacts | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| How to work in groups | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| How to develop leadership in others | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

**Impact Participation in CLIC had on Promotion**

| Response | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Improved self-confidence | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Clarify professional goals | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Develop leadership style | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Improve management style | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Improve communication skills | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Visibility to administration | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Better understanding of community Colleges | 9 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Better understanding of own college | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State-wide contacts | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| How to work in groups | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| How to develop leadership in others | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Career Aspirations of Program Participants- Desire to Continue Employment with a community college**

**Wish to be continue employment with a community college?**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 117 (86.7) | 72 (79.1) |
| No | 6 (4.4) | 4 (4.4) |
| Not sure | 8 (5.9) | 9 (9.9) |
| NR | 4 (3.0) | 6 (6.6) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 91 (100.0) |

**Impact of LINC/CLIC experience on decision**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 78 (57.8) | 41 (45.1) |
| No | 22 (16.3) | 23 (25.3) |
| Unsure | 31 (23.0) | 22 (24.2) |
| NR | 4 (3.0) | 5 (5.5) |
| Total | 135 (100.1) | 91 (100.0) |

**Employment level desired by participants within next five years**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Community College President | 5 (3.7) | 13 (14.3) |
| Vice President Level | 18 (13.3) | 25 (27.5) |
| Dean's Level | 22 (16.3) | 9 (9.9) |
| Department Chair | 4 (3.0) | 2 (2.2) |
| Continue in present position | 47 (34.8) | 20 (22.0) |
| Other | 16 (11.9) | 4 (4.4) |
| Unknown | 10 (7.4) | 7 (7.7) |
| NR | 13 (9.6) | 11 (12.1) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 91 (100.1*) |

NR = No Response
( ) = Percentages
* = Rounding

**Items 26-42 Perceptions about the LINC Program**

| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall experience was positive | 105 (77.8) | 26(19.3) | -- | -- | -- | 4(3.0) | 4.80 | .400 |
| Program is effectively administered | 88(65.2) | 37(27.4) | 5(3.7) | -- | -- | 5(3.7) | 4.64 | .557 |
| Presentations were interesting | 74(54.8) | 55(40.7) | 1(.7) | 1(.7) | -- | 4(3.0) | 4.54 | .558 |
| Topics were complete and comprehensive | 72(53.3) | 54(40.0) | 4(3.0) | 1(.7) | -- | 4(3.0) | 4.50 | .600 |
| Presentations were valuable | 68(50.4) | 58(43.0) | 3(2.2) | 1(.7) | -- | 5(3.7) | 4.48 | .587 |
| Campus visits were valuable | 74(54.8) | 40(29.6) | 10(7.4) | 1(.7) | 1(.7) | 9(6.7) | 4.47 | .745 |
| Before experience, had not attended a IACCT meeting | 71(52.6) | 39(28.9) | 4(3.0) | 3(2.2) | 4(3.0) | 14(10.4) | 4.40 | .927 |
| Before experience, had not attended a IACCP meeting | 76(56.3) | 37(27.4) | 2(1.5) | 4(3.0) | 4(3.0) | 12(8.9) | 4.44 | .933 |
| Social time is important | 57(42.2) | 59(43.7) | 7(5.2) | 4(3.0) | 1(.7) | 7(5.2) | 4.30 | .779 |
| Networking skills improved | 64(47.4) | 47(34.8) | 12(8.9) | 7(5.2) | -- | 5(3.7) | 4.29 | .849 |
| Time for campus issues is sufficient | 49(36.3) | 57(42.2) | 17(12.6) | 8(5.9) | -- | 4(3.0) | 4.12 | .860 |
| Improved management skills | 31(23.0) | 66(48.9) | 25(18.5) | 2(1.5) | 4(3.0) | 7(5.2) | 3.92 | .884 |
| Improved communication skills | 31(23.0) | 64(47.4) | 23(17.0) | 7(5.2) | 5(3.7) | 5(3.7) | 3.84 | .979 |
| Before experience, had little contact with trustees | 38(28.1) | 41(30.4) | 7(5.2) | 23(17.0) | 19(14.1) | 7(5.2) | 3.44 | 1.451 |
| Trustees now know me | 20(14.8) | 35(25.9) | 36(26.7) | 18(13.3) | 8(5.9) | 18(13.3) | 3.35 | 1.140 |
| President is accessible | 17(14.1) | 30(22.2) | 30(2202) | 23(17.0) | 14(10.4) | 19(14.1) | 3.15 | 1.260 |
| Before experience, had little contact with president | 14(10.4) | 23(17.0) | 13(9.6) | 41(30.4) | 33(24.4) | 11(8.1) | 2.55 | 1.358 |

Ranked by mean

( ) = Percentages

NR= No Response

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

NS = Not Sure

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

**Items 26-42 Perceptions about the CLIC Program**

| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall experience was positive | 64(70.3) | 22(24.2) | 1(1.1) | -- | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.72 | .475 |
| Campus visits were valuable | 56(61.5) | 22(24.2) | 8(8.8) | -- | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.56 | .662 |
| Program is effectively administered | 52(57.1) | 32(35.2) | 2(2.2) | 1(1.1) | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.55 | .605 |
| Social time is important | 47(51.6) | 34(37.4) | 6(6.6) | -- | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.47 | .626 |
| Presentations were interesting | 40(44.0) | 45(49.5) | 2(2.2) | -- | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.44 | .543 |
| Presentations were valuable | 41(45.1) | 40(44.0) | 4(4.4) | -- | -- | 6(6.6) | 4.44 | .586 |
| Networking skills improved | 41(45.1) | 30(33.0) | 15(16.5) | 1(1.1) | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.28 | .788 |
| Topics were complete and comprehensive | 29(31.9) | 50(54.9) | 7(7.7) | 1(1.1) | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.23 | .642 |
| Time for campus issues is sufficient | 25(27.5) | 43(47.3) | 15(16.5) | 4(4.4) | -- | 4(4.4) | 4.02 | .807 |
| Before experience, had not attended a IACCP meeting | 23(25.3) | 34(37.4) | -- | 8(8.8) | 5(5.5) | 21(23.1) | 3.89 | 1.198 |
| Before experience, had not attended a IACCT meeting | 22(24.2) | 32(35.2) | 2(2.2) | 7(7.7) | 10(11.0) | 18(19.8) | 3.67 | 1.365 |
| Improved communication skills | 9(9.9) | 45(49.5) | 23(25.3) | 7(7.7) | 2(2.2) | 5(5.5) | 3.60 | .871 |
| Improved management skills | 7(7.7) | 44(48.4) | 23(25.3) | 10(11.0) | 3(3.3) | 4(4.4) | 3.48 | .926 |
| Trustees now know me | 12(13.2) | 22(24.2) | 13(14.3) | 17(18.7) | 7(7.7) | 20(22.0) | 3.21 | 1.160 |
| President is accessible | 11(12.1) | 17(18.7) | 16(17.6) | 16(17.6) | 17(18.7) | 14(15.4) | 2.86 | 1.374 |
| Before experience, had little contact with Trustees | 11(12.1) | 16(17.6) | 8(8.8) | 31(34.1) | 13(14.3) | 12(13.2) | 2.76 | 1.332 |
| Before experience, had little contact with president | 4(4.4) | 8(8.8) | 3(3.3) | 29(31.9) | 37(40.7) | 10(11.0) | 1.98 | 1.160 |

Ranked by mean

( ) = Percentages

NR= No Response

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

NS = Not Sure

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

**LINC Program- questions 43-82--- Gained a Better Understanding of—**

|  | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State governance of community colleges | 69(51.1) | 51(37.8) | 4(3.0) | 4(3.0) | -- | 7(5.2) | 4.45 | .708 |
| History of the community college system | 69(51.1) | 52(38.5) | 3(2.2) | 4(3.0) | -- | 7(5.2) | 4.45 | .697 |
| Varying leadership styles | 69(51.1) | 49(36.3) | 5(3.7) | 3(2.2) | 1(.7) | 8(5.9) | 4.43 | .752 |
| Vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges | 67(49.6) | 53(39.3) | 4(3.3) | 4(3.0) | -- | 7(5.2) | 4.43 | .706 |
| The role of leadership in the community college | 66(48.9) | 51(37.8) | 5(3.7) | 4(3.0) | -- | 9(6.7) | 4.42 | .719 |
| State and local funding of community colleges | 60(44.4) | 57(42.2) | 4(3.0) | 5(3.7) | -- | 9(6.7) | 4.37 | .733 |
| Local governance of community colleges | 64(47.4) | 51(37.8) | 5(3.7) | 7(5.2) | -- | 8(5.9) | 4.35 | .802 |
| My own leadership style | 65(48.1) | 45(33.3) | 9(6.7) | 5(3.7) | 1(.7) | 10(7.4) | 4.34 | .843 |
| The role of the board of directors of community colleges | 61(45.2) | 53(39.3) | 4(3.3) | 5(3.7) | 2(1.5) | 10(7.4) | 4.32 | .850 |
| Legislative and public policy issues for community colleges | 52(39.3) | 61(45.2) | 3(2.2) | 7(5.2) | 1(.7) | 10(7.4) | 4.26 | .824 |
| The Iowa Association of Community College Presidents | 49(36.3) | 66(48.9) | 5(3.7) | 4(3.0) | 1(.7) | 10(7.4) | 4.26 | .753 |

|  | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Networking | 54(40.0) | 54(40.0) | 13(9.6) | 5(3.7) | -- | 9(6.7) | 4.25 | .797 |
| Developing leadership styles | 55(40.7) | 54(40.0) | 14(10.4) | 6(4.4) | -- | 6(4.4) | 4.22 | .822 |
| The interaction of college leaders with external constituencies | 51(37.8) | 60(44.4) | 7(5.2) | 8(5.9) | -- | 9(6.7) | 4.22 | .819 |
| The interaction of college leaders with internal constituencies | 50(37.0) | 60(44.4) | 7(5.2) | 8(5.9) | -- | 10(7.4) | 4.22 | .819 |
| Decision making roles | 46(34.1) | 68(50.4) | 9(6.7) | 5(3.7) | -- | 7(5.2) | 4.21 | .739 |
| The Iowa Association of Community College Trustees | 45(33.3) | 66(48.9) | 7(5.2) | 3(2.2) | 2(1.5) | 12(8.9) | 4.21 | .792 |
| Legislative and public policy decision-making processes | 51(37.6) | 58(43.0) | 9(6.7) | 7(5.2) | 1(.7) | 9(6.7) | 4.20 | .858 |
| Organizational cultures | 47(34.8) | 66(48.9) | 10(7.4) | 6(4.4) | -- | 6(4.4) | 4.19 | .771 |
| Campus Issues | 44(32.6) | 60(44.4) | 14(10.4) | 5(3.7) | -- | 12(8.9) | 4.16 | .783 |
| Formal and informal organizational structures | 41(30.4) | 67(49.6) | 11(8.1) | 5(3.7) | -- | 11(8.1) | 4.16 | .748 |
| Institutional and personal ethics | 47(34.8) | 60(44.4) | 14(10.4) | 4(3.0) | 1(.7) | 8(5.9) | 4.15 | .855 |
| Assessing individual strengths | 43(31.9) | 57(42.2) | 17(12.6) | 6(4.4) | 1(.7) | 11(8.1) | 4.09 | .865 |
| How to work in a changing environment | 42(31.1) | 61(45.2) | 19(14.1) | 7(5.2) | -- | 6(4.4) | 4.07 | .831 |

| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Developing teams | 35(25.9) | 67(49.6) | 21(15.6) | 5(3.7) | -- | 7(5.2) | 4.03 | .773 |
| The importance of diversity to a college Campus | 42(31.1) | 57(42.2) | 19(14.1) | 7(5.2) | 2(1.5) | 8(5.9) | 4.02 | .921 |
| Communication skills | 38(28.1) | 62(45.9) | 20(14.8) | 7(5.2) | 1(.7) | 7(5.2) | 4.01 | .865 |
| Capital resource allocation | 29(21.5) | 67(49.6) | 25(18.5) | 8(5.9) | -- | 6(4.4) | 3.91 | .814 |
| Fiscal resource allocation | 29(21.5) | 66(48.9) | 24(17.8) | 8(5.9) | -- | 8(5.9) | 3.91 | .817 |
| Strategic planning | 35(25.9) | 56(41.5) | 27(20.0) | 10(7.4) | 1(.7) | 6(4.4) | 3.88 | .924 |
| Human resource allocation | 28(20.7) | 67(49.6) | 23(17.0) | 10(7.4) | -- | 7(5.2) | 3.88 | .838 |
| Conflict resolution | 33(24.4) | 54(40.0) | 23(17.0) | 11(8.1) | 1(.7) | 13(9.6) | 3.88 | .941 |
| The role of fund raising | 32(23.7) | 56(41.5) | 27(20.0) | 11(8.1) | 1(.7) | 8(5.9) | 3.84 | .929 |
| How to develop a campus climate | 28(20.7) | 59(43.7) | 33(24.4) | 8(5.9) | 1(.7) | 6(4.4) | 3.81 | .873 |
| How to develop priorities | 28(20.7) | 64(47.4) | 22(16.3) | 12(8.9) | 2(1.5) | 7(5.2) | 3.81 | .937 |
| How to balance multiple tasks/priorities | 28(20.7) | 55(40.7) | 27(20.0) | 17(12.6) | 1(.7) | 7(5.2) | 3.72 | .980 |
| Collective bargaining | 28(20.7) | 46(34.1) | 31(23.0) | 14(10.4) | 3(2.2) | 13(9.6) | 3.67 | 1.032 |
| Negotiation skills | 21(15.6) | 49(36.3) | 34(25.2) | 18(13.3) | 2(1.5) | 11(8.1) | 3.56 | .990 |
| Resume writing | 21(15.6) | 52(38.5) | 25(18.5) | 20(14.8) | 7(5.2) | 10(7.4) | 3.48 | 1.119 |
| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
| Interview techniques | 18(13.3) | 47(34.8) | 35(25.9) | 18(13.3) | 7(5.2) | 10(7.4) | 3.41 | 1.078 |

Ranked by mean

( ) = Percentages

NR= No Response

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

NS = Not Sure

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

**Items 43-82 for CLIC Participants- Gained a Better Understanding of:**

| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The role of leadership in the community college | 36(39.6) | 43(47.3) | 3(3.3) | 3(3.3) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 4.28 | .792 |
| Vision, philosophy, mission, goals, ideals of community colleges | 31(34.1) | 49(53.8) | 3(3.3) | 1(1.1) | 1(1.1) | 6(6.6) | 4.27 | .697 |
| State governance of community colleges | 31(34.1) | 47(51.6) | 2(2.2) | 4(4.4) | -- | 7(7.7) | 4.25 | .726 |
| History of the community college system | 36(39.6) | 38(41.8) | 5(5.5) | 6(6.6) | -- | 6(6.6) | 4.22 | .850 |
| The role of the board of directors of community colleges | 28(30.8) | 50(54.9) | 6(6.6) | 2(2.2) | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.21 | .671 |
| Varying leadership styles | 32(35.2) | 43(47.3) | 6(6.6) | 5(5.5) | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.19 | .805 |
| State and local funding of community colleges | 28(30.8) | 49(53.8) | 6(6.6) | 3(3.3) | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.19 | .711 |
| Organizational cultures | 25(27.5) | 53(58.2) | 6(6.6) | 2(2.2) | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.17 | .654 |
| Legislative and public policy issues for community colleges | 28(30.8) | 48(52.7) | 7(7.7) | 2(2.2) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 4.16 | .765 |
| The interaction of college leaders with external constituencies | 29(31.9) | 44(48.4) | 10(11.0) | 2(2.2) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 4.14 | .799 |
| Local governance of community colleges | 27(29.7) | 45(49.5) | 5(5.5) | 7(7.7) | -- | 7(7.7) | 4.10 | .845 |

| | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Legislative and public policy decision-making processes | 27(29.7) | 45(49.5) | 8(8.8) | 4(4.4) | 1(1.1) | 6(6.6) | 4.09 | .840 |
| Decision making roles | 17(18.7) | 60(65.9) | 6(6.6) | 3(3.3) | -- | 5(5.5) | 4.06 | .639 |
| Campus Issues | 25(27.5) | 44(48.4) | 11(12.1) | 4(4.4) | 1(1.1) | 6(6.6) | 4.04 | .851 |
| The interaction of college leaders with internal constituencies | 23(25.3) | 48(52.7) | 9(9.9) | 5(5.5) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 4.01 | .847 |
| My own leadership style | 21(23.1) | 52(57.1) | 4(4.4) | 9(9.9) | -- | 5(5.5) | 3.99 | .847 |
| Formal and informal organizational structures | 18(19.8) | 53(58.2) | 11(12.1) | 4(4.4) | -- | 5(5.5) | 3.99 | .728 |
| Institutional and personal ethics | 22(24.2) | 45(49.5) | 13(14.3) | 6(6.6) | -- | 5(5.5) | 3.97 | .832 |
| Networking | 27(29.7) | 40(44.0) | 11(12.1) | 5(5.5) | 3(3.3) | 5(5.5) | 3.97 | .999 |
| Developing leadership styles | 20(22.2) | 47(51.6) | 13(14.3) | 6(6.6) | -- | 5(5.5) | 3.94 | .817 |
| How to work in a changing environment | 19(20.9) | 48(52.7) | 9(9.9) | 9(9.9) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 3.87 | .918 |
| Communication skills | 17(18.7) | 48(52.7) | 12(13.2) | 8(8.8) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5 | 3.84 | .893 |
| Developing teams | 17(18.7) | 48(52.7) | 11(112.1) | 10(11.0) | -- | 5(5.5) | 3.84 | .879 |
| The importance of diversity to a college campus | 18(19.8) | 43(47.3) | 19(20.9) | 4(4.4) | 2(2.2) | 5(5.5) | 3.83 | .897 |

|  | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Iowa Association of Community College Presidents | 16(17.6) | 48(52.7) | 10(11.0) | 7(7.7) | 4(4.4) | 6(6.6) | 3.76 | 1.008 |
| The Iowa Association of Community College Trustees | 15(16.5) | 50(54.9) | 9(9.9) | 7(7.7) | 4(4.4) | 6(6.6) | 3.76 | .996 |
| The role of fund raising | 16(17.6) | 42(46.2) | 17(18.7) | 6(6.6) | 3(3.3) | 7(7.7) | 3.74 | .971 |
| How to develop a campus climate | 16(17.6) | 38(41.8) | 23(25.3) | 8(8.8) | -- | 6(6.6) | 3.73 | .878 |
| Assessing individual strengths | 17(18.7) | 42(46.2) | 12(13.2) | 13(14.3) | 2(2.2) | 5(5.5) | 3.69 | 1.032 |
| Fiscal resource allocation | 13(14.3) | 44(48.4) | 18(19.8) | 9(9.9) | 2(2.2) | 5(5.5) | 3.66 | .941 |
| Capital resource allocation | 14(15.4) | 35(38.5) | 23(25.3) | 11(12.1) | 2(2.2) | 6(6.6) | 3.56 | .993 |
| Human resource allocation | 7(7.7) | 44(48.4) | 21(23.1) | 10(11.0) | 2(2.2) | 7(7.7) | 3.52 | .898 |
| How to balance multiple tasks/priorities | 10(11.0) | 41(45.1) | 19(20.9) | 15(16.5) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 3.51 | .955 |
| Strategic planning | 9(9.9) | 44(48.4) | 16(17.6) | 15(16.5) | 2(2.2) | 5(5.5) | 3.50 | .979 |
| How to develop priorities | 10(11.0) | 37(40.7) | 25(27.5) | 13(14.3) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.5) | 3.49 | .930 |
| Conflict resolution | 11(12.1) | 35(38.5) | 23(25.3) | 13(14.3) | 4(4.4) | 5(5.5) | 3.42 | 1.046 |
| Collective bargaining | 9(9.9) | 30(33.0) | 20(22.0) | 21(23.1) | 4(4.4) | 7(7.7) | 3.23 | 1.090 |
| Negotiation skills | 9(9.9) | 30(33.3) | 23(25.3) | 17(18.7) | 6(6.6) | 6(6.6) | 3.22 | 1.106 |
|  | SA | A | NS | D | SD | NR | Mean | St Dev |
| Interview techniques | 6(6.6) | 16(17.6) | 21(23.1) | 20(22.0) | 4(15.4) | 14(15.4) | 2.74 | 1.207 |
| Resume writing | 5(5.5) | 16(17.6) | 23(25.3) | 21(23.1) | 14(15.4) | 12(13.2) | 2.71 | 1.167 |

Ranked by mean

( ) = Percentages

NR = No Response

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Agree

NS = Not Sure

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

**Item 165- Completion of objectives**

| | LINC | | | CLIC | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Yes** | **No** | **NR** | **Yes** | **No** | **NR** |
| I was able to network with others working in community colleges | 121(89.6) | 5(3.7) | 9(6.7) | 81(89.0) | 2(2.2) | 8(8.8) |
| I now better understand the community college system and the challenges faced by the system | 123(91.1) | 3(2.2) | 9(6.7) | 81(89.0) | 2(2.2) | 8(8.8) |
| I have a better understanding of the state and local funding for the colleges and the state governance for the colleges | 119(88.1) | 7(5.2) | 9(6.7) | 79(86.8) | 4(4.4) | 8(8.8) |
| I have a better understanding of the role of the presidents and other leaders within the community colleges | 120(88.9) | 6(4.4) | 9(6.7) | 79(86.8) | 4(4.4) | 8(8.8) |
| I have developed and/or improved my own leadership style | 119(88.1) | 7(5.2) | 9(6.7) | 69(75.8) | 14(15.4) | 8(8.8) |

( )= Percentages

NR = No response

**Item 20- Degree program participation was instrumental in advancement**

| | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Very | 10(7.4) | 3(3.3) |
| Moderately | 23(17.0) | 6(6.6) |
| Somewhat | 9(6.7) | 9(9.9) |
| Minimally | 10(7.4) | 6(6.6) |
| Not at all | 2(1.5) | 1(1.1) |
| Don't Know | 2(1.1) | 1(1.1) |
| NR | 79(58.5) | 65(71.4) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 96 (100.0) |

NR = No Response

( ) = Percentages

**Demographics of Program Participants**
**Ethnic Background of Participants:**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| White/Caucasian | 127 (94.1) | 88 (96.7) |
| Black/African American | 3 (2.2) | 1 (1.1) |
| Native American | 1 (0.7) | 0 (0.0) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 2 (1.5) | 0 (0.0) |
| Asian | 2 (1.5) | 1 (1.1) |
| Asian/white |  | 1 (1.1) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 91 (100.0) |

**Gender of Participants**

|  | LINC | CLIC |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 10 (7.4) | 61 (67.0) |
| Female | 125 (92.6) | 30 (33.0) |
| Total | 135 (100.0) | 90 (100.0) |

( ) = Percentages

Leadership Programs LINC Participants have participated in:

58 have not participated in any other Leadership Development Program

Other Programs:
- College Sponsored Programs- 7
- Chair Academy- 6
- Workshops/Seminars- 4
- Tomorrows Leaders Today- 1
- Local Leadership Development Programs- 15
- Phi Theta Kappa- 2
- NILD- 4
- Drake University- 1
- Leadership Iowa- 3
- Women's Leadership Institute- 1
- CLIC- 2
- League of Innovation Leadership Academy- 4
- AACC- 3
- CQIN Summer Institute- 1
- Graduate Course Work- 7

Leadership Programs CLIC Participants have participated in:

35 have not participated in any other Leadership Development Programs
Other Programs:
- League of Innovation- 2
- AACC- 1
- Local Programs- 4
- NILD- 1
- Workshops- 4
- LINC- 1
- Chair Academy- 8
- Leadership Iowa- 3
- Tomorrow's Leaders Today- 1
- College Programs- 8
- Professional Groups- 6
- Graduate Work- 5
- Harvard University Executive Leadership Program- 1
- Community College Leadership Program- 1

# REFERENCES

*AACC leadership summit of grow your own leadership development programs*. (2004). Retrieved January 4, 2004, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://ccleadership.org/pdfs/GYO/leading

AACC membership directory. (2005). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

A leading forward report: Growing your own leaders: Community colleges step up. (2006). A profile of community college presidents. (2006, October 27). *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 29, 2006, from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/10/10b01601.htm

Agresti, A., & Funlay, B. (1997). *Statistical methods for the social sciences*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Aiming to close a leadership gap. (2002, January 7). *Community College Times, 14*(25), p. 9.

American Association of Community Colleges, Washington, DC.

*The American College President*. (2007). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Anderson, J. A. (1997, Spring). Leadership training initiatives for community college administrators: A focused synthesis of the literature. *Community College Review*, *24*(4). Retrieved January 26, 2003, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Amey, M. (2004). Learning leadership in today's community colleges. *Community College Journal, 76*(4), 6-9.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *Career paths for community colleges Leaders.* (Research Brief Leadership Series, No. 2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. F. (2002, August). Perspectives of community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(7/8), 573-589.

Bagnato, K. (2004, August 2). Brave new leadership. *Community College Week, 16*(26), 6-8.

Barwick, J. T. (2002). Pathways to the presidency: Same trail, new vistas. *Community College Journal, 73*(1), 6-11.

Bennis, W. (1991). Learning some basic truisms about leadership. *National Forum, 71*(1). Retrieved July 21, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Boggs, G. R. (2002). Forward. In D. Campbell (Ed.), *The leadership gap: Model strategies for leadership development* (p. vii-viii). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Boggs, G. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *New Directions for Community Colleges,* No. 123*, Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boggs, G. R., & Kent, E. L. (2002). Presidents academy: An evolution of leadership development. In G. Watts (Ed.), *New Directions for Community Colleges*, No 120, *Enhancing community colleges through professional development* (pp. 51-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review, 30*(1). Retrieved March 1, 2003, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

*Building leadership capacity for the 21st century*. (1999). Retrieved January 15, 2005, from W. K. Kellogg Foundation Website: http://www.wkkf.org

Burke, J. M., Rodenhouse, M. P., & Healy Torregrosa, C. (Eds.). (2006). *2006 Higher education directory.* Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc.

Burnham, P.F. (2002). Defining the elements of community college leadership. *Journal for Community and Technical College Leaders, 9.1.1,* 16-18.

Campbell, D. F. (2006, February/March). The new leadership gap: Shortages in administrative positions. *Community College Journal, 76*(4), 11-14.

Campbell, D., & Kacluk, C. (2002). Leadership profile research and consortium. In Campbell, D. (Ed.), *The leadership gap: Model strategies for leadership development.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Campbell, D. F., & Leverty, L. H. (1997). Developing and selecting leaders for the 21st century. *Community College Journal, 67*(4), 34-36.

Carreon, J. J. (2005, March 28). Life changing leadership. *Community College Week, 17*(17), pp. 4-5.

Carroll, C. M., & Romero, M. G. (2003). Leadership development:  A collaborative approach. In W. Piland & D. Wolf (Eds.), *New directions for community colleges*, No. 123, *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 83-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carter, P., Terwilliger, K., Alfred, R. L., Hartleb, D., & Simone, B. (2002). Developing strategic leaders. *Community College Journal, 73*, (1), 22-25.

Chieffo, A. M. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. *Community College Review, 19*(2). Retrieved November 3, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Clark, D. J. (1998). Senior leaders reveal team truths. *Journal for Quality and Participation, 21*(3). Retrieved November 11, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

*Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium*. (2007). Retrieved April 1, 2007, from Iowa State University Website: http://www.edu.iastate.edu/elps/hged/clicdes

Community Colleges Past to Present. (2007). Retrieved April 14, 2007, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://www.aacc.nche.edu

Competencies for community college leaders, (n.d.). [Brochure]. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

*Condition of Iowa Community Colleges, 2006*. (2007). Retrieved February 2, 2007, from Iowa Department of Education Website: http://state.ia/us/educate/ccwp/cc/reports/cicc04/pdf

Cooper, J. E. & Pagotto, L. (2003, Fall). Developing community college faculty as leaders. In W. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *New directions for community colleges*, No. 123, Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century (pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crittenden, B. J. (1997). *Preparation factors common in outstanding community college presidents in the United Sates*. Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

Curtis, C. (2002, March 4). Leadership is an emotional craft. *Community College Week, 14*(15), 5.

Dembicki, M. (2006, November 26). Taskforce grapples with recruiting college leaders. *Community College Times, 18*(23), p. 1.

Directory of Iowa Community Colleges. (2007). Des Moines: Iowa Department of Education.

Duncan, A. H., & Harlacher, E. L. (1991, Spring). The twenty-first century executive leader. *Community College Review, 18*(4). Retrieved March 1, 2005 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Ebbers, L. H., Coyan, N., & Kelly, V. E. (1992, July). *LINCING: Creating a regional consortium for leadership development*. Paper presented at Leadership 2000, League of Innovation in Community Colleges and the Community College Leadership Program, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 089)

Ebbers, L. H., & McFarlin, C. H. (1998, Spring). Preparation factors common in outstanding community college presidents. *Michigan Community College Journal,* 33-45.

Ebbers, L. H., Gallisath, G., Rockel, V., & Coyan N. (2000, June). The leadership institute for a new century: Lincing women and minorities into tomorrow's community college leadership roles. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*(5), 375-384.

Ebbers, L. H., Wild, L., & Friedel, J. H. (2003, March). Determining community college workforce needs: Process suggestions and policy issues. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27*(3), 225-237.

Effective community college presidents. (n/d). Retrieved October 12, 2003, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/content/navigationmenu/resourceCenter/Leadership Program

*Effective community college presidents*. (2005). Retrieved January 23, 2005, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://www.ccleadership.org/leading_forward/characteristics.htm

*Effective community college presidents leadership 2020: Recruitment, preparation, and support*. (2001). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 766)

Evans, G. (1998, July 27). Cultivating a climate of satisfaction. *Community College Week, 10,*(26). Retrieved November 3, 2001 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Evans, G. A. (2001, September). The world on our backs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(8), 181-192.

Evelyn, J. (2001, April 6). Community colleges face a crisis of leadership. *Chronicle of Higher Education 47(30)*. Retrieved June 6, 2001, from http://chronicle.com.cgiz_bin/printable.cgi

Filan, G. L. (1999, Spring). The need for leadership training: The evolution of the chair academy. In R. Gillett-Kuram (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges*, *1999*(105), 47-55.

Filan, G. L. (2002). Growing our own leaders- A decade of development. *Journal for Community and Technical College Leaders, 9.1.1,* 3-6.

Fullins-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005, March). Community college leadership an art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(3), 233-250.

Gallisath, G. K. (1995). *Women's leadership development: A case study involving Iowa's community colleges and the leadership institute for a new century.* Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

Garavalia, B. J., & Miller, M. T. (1996). *Administrative perspectives on community college leadership.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 400 869)

Garmon, J. (2001, September 3). Advice and assent. *Community College Week, 14*(2), p. 6.

George, O. J. (2003). Harnessing leadership talent from within. *Community College Times, 15*(19), p. 8.

Gibson-Benninger, B. J., Ratcliff, J. L., & Rhoads, R. A. (1996). Diversity, discourse, and democracy: Needed attributes in the next generation of community college leadership programs. *New directions for community colleges, 95, 15*(3), 65-75.

Goff, D. G. (2002). *Community college presidency: What are the challenges to be encountered and traits to be successful?* Hillsborough Community College, Tampa, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 476 681)

Gonzales- Sullivan, L. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(4), 559-571.

Gonzales-Sullivan, L. (2004). Generations of leadership. *Community College Journal, 74*(4), 35-39.

Hahn, R. (1995). Getting serious about presidential leadership: Our collective responsibility. *Change, 27*(5). Retrieved May 30, 2001 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Hammons, J. O., & Keller, L. (1990). Competencies and personal characteristics of future community college presidents. *Community College Review, 18*(3). Retrieved May 30, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Hernandez, J. (2000, June). *Reflections on designing a partnership for community college leadership.* San Diego, CA: Claremont Graduate University, CA: Community College Leadership Development Initiatives. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 457 934)

Hines, M. (1992). Community college leadership. *Liberal Education, 78*(5). Retrieved November 3, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Hockaday, J., & Puyear, D. E. (2000). Community college leadership in the new millennium. In *New expeditions: Charting the second century of community colleges.* Leadership Abstract, Issues Paper No. 8. MI: Kellogg Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 439 741)

Jensen, R. (2000, December 11). Rules and truths of community college leadership. *Community College Week, 13*(9). Retrieved May 30, 2001 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College http://search.epnet.com/

Johnson, N. J. (1998). Study reveals surprising perceptions of community college leadership. *Community College Journal, 68*(5), 37-38.

Katzenbach, J. R. (1998). The irony of senior leadership teams. *Journal for Quality and Participation, 21*(3). Retrieved November 4, 2001 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College http://search.epnet.com/

Kelly, E. (2002, May 27). The changing of the guard. *Community College Week, 14*(21). Retrieved October 12, 2003 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College http://search.epnet.com/

Kelly, V. E. (1992). *The leadership for a new century: A three year descriptive study and evaluation.* Masters thesis, Iowa State University, Ames.

Kezar, A. J. (1998, Spring). Exploring new avenues for leading community colleges: The paradox of participatory models. *Community College Review, 25*(4). Retrieved November 4, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Kemppainen, J. P. (1999, April 19). Building the bridge to the 21st century. *Community College Week, 11*(19). Retrieved July 25, 2004, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Krathwahl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach.* New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Kubala, T. S. (1999). A national study on the community college presidency. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23*(2), 183-193.

Kubala, T., & Bailey, G. M. (2001). A new perspective on community college presidents: Results of a national study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(10), 793-805.

Lashway, L. (1995). *Facilitative leadership*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 851)

*Leadership 2020: Recruitment, preparation, and support*. (2002). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 687 799)

*Leading forward overview*. (2007). Retrieved on April 1, 2007 from Leading Forward Website: http://www.ccleadership.org/leading_forward/overview.html

*Leadership in a new century*. (2007). Retrieved April 1, 2007, from Iowa State University Website: http://edu.iastate.edu/elps/hged/linc

Leubsdorf, B. (2006, September 1). Boomers, retirement may create talent squeeze. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(02). Retrieved February 2, 2007, from http://chronical.com/cgl-bin/

*Logic model development guide*. (2001). Retrieved January 15, 2005, from W. K. Kellogg Foundation Website: http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/evaluation/Pub3669.pdf

Lorenzo, A. L. (1998). A framework for fundamental change: Context, criteria, and culture. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22*(4). Retrieved November 4, 2002, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Lorenzo, A. L., & DeMarte, D. T. (2002). Recruiting and developing leaders for the 21st century. In D. Campbell & Associates (Ed.), *The leadership gap: Model strategies for leadership development* (pp. 47-57). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Manzo, K. K. (2003, April 28). Cultivating the future. *Community College Week, 15*(19). Retrieved October 12, 2003 from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Web site: http://search.epnet.com/

McClenney, K. M. (2001). Converting crisis to opportunity: The AACC community college leadership summit. *Community College Journal, 71*(6), 24-27.

McFarlin, C.H., & Ebbers, L.H. (1997). *Preparation factors common in outstanding community college presidents.* (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 409 934).

McFarlin, C. H. (1999). Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents. *Community College Review, 27*(3). Retrieved June 6, 2002, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

McPhail, C. J. (2000). *Transforming community college leadership preparation: A cohort leadership learning model.* Baltimore, MD: Morgan State University. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 449 852)

189

*Meeting new leadership challenges in the community college*. (2001). San Diego, CA: Claremont Graduate University, Community College Leadership Development Initiatives. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 447 888)

Myran, G., Myran, S., & Galant, R. (2004). The spiritual dimension of leadership. *Community College Journal, 74*(4), 10-13.

Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (1998). Team leadership in practice. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 28* (2). Retrieved December 3, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

New AACC competencies aim to make better leaders. (2005, August 2). *Community College Times, 17*(15), pp. 1, 3.

Oglesby, V. D., & Windham, R. (1996). Career path characteristics of community college presidents. *College Student Journal, 30*(3). Retrieved June 9, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

O'Rourke, G. (1997). *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 929)

Ottenritter, N. (2006). Competencies for community college leaders: The next step. *Community College Journal, 76*(4), 15-18.

O'Banion, T. (2007). Crisis and calamity in the community college. *Community College Journal, 77*(3), 44-47.

Patton, M. (2003, November 25). AACC holds first leading forward summit. *Community College Times*. Retrieved April 8, 2003, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://ccleadership.org/resources_center/publications.html

Patton, M. (2004, January 20). Initiative seeks to inform and prepare new leaders. *Community College Times*. Retrieved April 8, 2004, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Template.cfm7section=Leadership

Patton, M. (2004, March 30). Leading forward brings grad programs together. *Community College Times*. Retrieved March 8, 2004, from American Association of Community Colleges Website: http://www.ccleadership.org/resource_center/publications.html

Patton, M. (2005, April 26). Kearns Goodwin identifies four useful leadership traits. *Community College Times, 17*(9), p. 11.

Pierce, D. R., & Pedersen, R. P. (1997). The community college presidency: Qualities for success. In I. Weisman (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges*, *1997, 98,* 13-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *New directions for community colleges,* No. 123, *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century*. pp.13-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

*Profiles for progress: Preparing community college leadership for a new era*. (2001). San Diego, CA: Claremont Graduate University, Community College Leadership Development Initiatives. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 457 934)

Roe, M., & Baker, G. (1989). The development of community college leaders: A challenge for our future. *Community College Review, 16*(4), 5-16.

Romero, M. (2004). Who will lead our community colleges. *Change, 34*(6), 30-34.

Roueche, J. (1996). Leadership challenges for 2000. *Community College Journal, 66*(5), 12-13.

Roueche, J. E. (2004, August 2). Extraordinary challenges, unique opportunities. *Community College Week, 16*(26), pp. 4-5.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A. III, & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Russ-Eft, D., & Preskill, H. (2001). *Evaluations in organizations:  A systematic approach to enhancing learning, performance, and change.* Lexington, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Sevier, R. A. (2004). Leading the change: The required qualities of today's exceptional leader. A Stamats White Paper. WP #13. Cedar Rapids, IA.

Shek, K. (2001, April 7). College president and faculty retirements loom. *Community College Times, 13*(8), p. 1.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. (Research Brief Leadership Series, No. 1). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Shults, C. (2002, September 16). Looming retirement presents challenge, diversity gains. *Community College Times 16*(8), p. 4.

Travis, J. E., & Travis, D. F. (1999). Survey of presidents reveals new trends in community college focus. *Community College Journal, 69*(4), 20-25.

Vaughan, G. B. (1998). No "new" leaders. *Community College Week, 11*(2). Retrieved April 8, 2004, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Vaughan, G. B. (2001). *Developing community college leaders for the future: Crisis or opportunity.* (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 457 873)

Vaughan, G. B. (2004, October 29). Diversify the presidency. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(10). Retrieved June 12, 2005, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Villadsen, A. (2002). Collective wisdom, clones, and new creations. *Community College Journal, 73*(1), 38-41.

Viniar, B. (2007, April/May). A step forward: The institute for community college development helps leaders achieve their goals. *Community College Journal*, pp. 64-67.

Wallin, D. L. (2002). Professional development for presidents: A study of community and technical college presidents in three states. *Community College Review, 30*(2). Retrieved March 1, 2003, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Leadership development for the next generation. In G. Watts (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges, 20,* pp. 59-66. San Francisco: JosseyBass.

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency 2001*. (Research Brief Leadership Series, No. 3). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Wharton, L. (1997). Observations on community college leadership. *Community College Review, 25*(1). Retrieved May 30, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2004). *Handbook of practical program evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Wolf, D. B., & Carroll, C. M. (2002). Shaking the leadership blues. *Community College Journal, 73*(1), 12-17.

Wright, S. W. (1997, April 7). A graying movement ponders how to cope with mass retirements. *Community College Week, 9*(18). Retrieved May 30, 2001, from Academic Search Elite, EBSCO, Clinton Community College Website: http://search.epnet.com/

Woodard, D. B., Love, P., & Komives, S. R. (2000). Leadership and management issues for a new century. In J. H. Schuh & E. J. Whitt (Eds.), *New directions for student services*, No. 92, *Leadership and management issues for a new century* (pp. 81-106). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My educational journey has been a long one that has included many people who have provided support and encouragement throughout this process.  I am indebted to these individuals and would like to express my appreciation to them.

A sincere note of appreciation to my major professor, Dr. Larry Ebbers.  His encouragement, patience, support, and guidance enabled me to complete this rigorous program of study.  Thanks also to my committee members who have offered their support and interest.  Drs. Bob Barak, Sharon Drake, Mack Shelley, and Dan Robinson have been a superb committee with whom to work.

There are many colleagues through my work at Eastern Iowa Community College District and particularly at Clinton Community College who have provided their encouragement support throughout this process.  Their interest and willingness to assist as needed has been most appreciated.

Many thanks to my editor, Pat Hahn, who has edited for me in challenging circumstances.  Her can-do attitude and willingness to work with me from 190 miles away has been greatly appreciated.

Last, yet most important, I am grateful to my family.  My husband Dave has always provided support and has picked up many pieces so my focus could be on my studies.  My daughters Emily and A.J. have always been a part of this process, and have been very generous in sharing their time and support.  There is no doubt this has been a family project!