IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

2011

The role of mentoring in community college presidential preparation

Jeffery Rabey
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

The role of mentoring in community college presidential preparation

by

Jeff Rabey

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leaderhip)

Program of Study Committee:
Larry H. Ebbers, Major Professor
Robert J. Barak
Frankie Santos Laanan
Daniel C. Robinson
Margaret C. Torrie

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2011

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

An impending leadership crisis looms for America's community colleges due to the large number of senior level administrators anticipating retirement in the near future. An estimated 80% of current community college presidents intend to retire within the next 10 years. Coupled with the lack of qualified, willing personnel to assume the leadership roles in the community college pipeline, a leadership crisis is inevitible for community colleges. With nearly half the students enrolling in undergraduate education choosing the community college (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2008), it is imperative that community colleges begin to identify and prepare midlevel administrators to fill the senior level positions that will be vacated by retirements. According to recent studies, mentoring can provide an effective means of developing future community college leaders.

The purpose of this study is to better understand how mentoring has assisted current community college presidents in preparation for their first community college presidency based on the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. Specifically, did current community college presidents who had mentors perceive that they were better prepared for their first presidency than those presidents who did not have mentors?

Four hundred fifteen current community college presidents responded to the survey used to conduct this study. Of the 415 respondents, 205 indicated they had a mentor, leaving 209 without a mentor. The study found few statistically significant results. It appears, however, that having a mentor helped prepare community college leaders for their first presidency more so than non-mentored presidents. Most female community college presidents indicated they had mentors prior to their first presidency. It appears having a mentor greatly increases females' chances of becoming community college presidents.

This study provided information on community college presidents' preparation for their first presidency and their preparation the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* Future consideration should be giving to the role mentoring plays in preparing female and minority community college leaders. Those in charge of professional development opportunities should consider incorporating mentoring into their offerings as a means to better prepare those in the community college leadership pipeline for their first presidency.

Chapter 1. Introduction

Since their inception in 1901, community colleges have been unique, diverse organizations. Cohen and Brawer (2008) have acclaimed community colleges as the people's college, a place to educate everyone, not just a select group of students with high academic credentials and financial means. The community college has long been associated with being all things to everyone with the variety of services they provide to students and the communities they serve (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Not only do community colleges provide academic beginnings for students, they also provide continuing education to community members and serve as economic development centers for the communities they serve. Because of the uniqueness of the community college and the broad purposes it serves, leadership at the community college takes a unique set of skills. In 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) recognized and identified skill sets successful community college leaders need to possess and developed *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. The document identified six competencies that community college leaders need to effectively lead community colleges into the future. The six competencies are organizational strategy, resources management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005). The complexity of community college leadership is compounded by the prediction of an impending leadership crisis in the community colleges.

A critical leadership shortage is looming for community colleges (Duree, 2007; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Many of the community college presidents, upper-level administrators, and faculty who began their careers in the 1960s and 1970s are nearing the end of their careers (Shults, 2001). According to Shults (2001), 45% of

community college presidents planned to retire by 2007. Weisman and Vaughan (2002) found that 79% of community college presidents surveyed planned to retire by 2012. In a recent update, 84% of community college presidents planned to retire by 2016 (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The amount of institutional and community college knowledge and expertise that will be lost with their retirement is immeasurable. This "graying" of community college upper-level leadership is compounded by the lack of future leaders in the community college leadership pipeline. In order to increase the pipeline of future community college leaders, it is imperative that current senior level administrators pass on their knowledge to the next generation of leaders. Senior level administrators could use mentoring as a means to help develop the next generation of leaders by passing on the knowledge gained through years of community college leadership (Duree, 2007).

The term "mentor" has its origins in Homer's *The Odyssey.* Odysseus entrusted his son to Mentor's care during his absence in war. Mentor gave Odysseus's son advice, cared for him, and protected him. Today, a mentoring relationship has come to mean a developmental, caring, sharing, and helping relationship where one person invests time, know-how, and effort in enhancing another person's growth, knowledge, and skills, and responds to critical needs in the life of that person in ways that prepare the individual for greater achievement in the future (McDade, 2005). Two principles used in the framework for the AACC's (2005) *Competencies for Community College Leaders* were that leadership can be learned and that many members of the community college can lead. This lends support to mentoring as an effective way to develop future leaders to fill the void of the impending crisis of retiring community college leaders.

Problem Statement

As stated earlier, an impending leadership crisis looms for America's community colleges due the large number of senior level administrators anticipating retirement in the next 10 years (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007) and the lack of qualified, willing personnel to assume the leadership roles in the community college pipeline (Shults, 2001). With almost half the students enrolling in undergraduate education choosing the community college (AACC, 2008), it is imperative that community colleges start to identify and prepare midlevel administrators to fill the senior level positions that will be vacated by retirements. Amey (2005) posited that leadership development in community college administrators is a continuous learning experience. According to Amey and VanDerLinden (2002), 56% of senior level community college administrators indicated they had a mentor at some point in their career. Perhaps mentoring, in the context of a learning relationship, could help cultivate the next generation of community college leaders. Many studies have been conducted on the community college presidency from traits to characteristics to career pathways; little has been written, however, on the role having a mentor has played in the preparation for the community college presidency.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to better understand how mentoring assisted current community college presidents in preparation for their first community college presidency based on the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. Specifically, did current community college presidents who had mentors perceive that they were better prepared for their first presidency than those presidents who did not have mentors? This study will build on Duree's (2007) study of community college presidents'

demographics, career pathways, and education preparation in relation to transformational leadership competencies; Stubbe's (2008) study on gender differences in demographics, career pathways, and education preparation for community college presidents; and Schmitz's (2008) study on demographics, competencies, and education preparation of academic versus non-academic career pathways to the community college presidency.

<div align="center">

Research Questions

</div>

1. What are the background characteristics of community college presidents who had mentors versus those community college presidents who did not have mentors?

2. To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

3. To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?

4. To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

5. To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?

6. To what extent do background characteristics, professional development, and ratings of preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* predict how mentored and non-mentored community college presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The framework for this study is Amey's (2005) conceptualization that leadership is an on-going process of learning. According to this theory, leaders move from an authoritative frame of perspective on leadership to a servant-like perspective on leadership as they cognitively develop as leaders through learning from their experiences and interactions with others (Amey, 2005). To take a learning approach to leadership, leaders need to move away from the top down approach and become more facilitative than administrative (Amey, 2005). Being an active learner of and within the college environment is key to leadership development (Amey, 2005). McDade (2005) compared mentoring to a teacher (mentor) and pupil (protégé) relationship that facilitates learning. At its core, mentoring is the passing of knowledge from a more experienced person to a usually younger, less experienced person. Essentially, mentoring facilitates learning in the traditional sense of education in the passing of knowledge from teacher/professor to student. McDade stated that perhaps the most important learning strategy of mentoring is to help protégés advance their own learning about leadership. To be successful, presidents must continue to learn about their leadership and grow in leadership cognitive complexity (McDade, 2005). McDade concluded from her study that mentors, as teachers, provide significant contributions to the leadership cognitive complexity of a next generation of presidents of community colleges. It appears that mentors create a learning relationship that evolves and matures over time, creating a rich learning environment for the protégé. Finally, Amey stated:

Conversing with a mentor is not just gathering information from one who is more experienced, but engaging in pointed discussions and critical dialogue about deep

issues and subconscious perspectives. Active reflections are seen not so much as a luxury, but a critical aspect of everyday leadership activity. Leadership development is never so much finished as it is an evolving process. (p. 8)

It seems fairly plausible that the concept of leadership as a constant learning process fits well with the mentoring aspect of community college presidential development. If the mentor/protégé relationship is a learning relationship, then it fits with the concept of leadership as a continuous learning process.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. First, if mentoring is found to have an impact on the preparation for the community college presidency, then institutions and graduate education programs need to consider including a mentoring component in their curriculum. Second, entities that provide leadership development programs for aspiring community college presidents, such as the American Association of Community Colleges and the League of Innovation in the Community College, would need to examine the role of mentoring within their programming. Third, institutions implementing Grow Your Own Leaders (GYOL) programs would need to consider making mentoring a part of the program. Finally, time is of the essence for current presidents and senior community college administrators to pass on their knowledge through mentoring as 84% plan to retire in the next 10 years. It is critical that the vast knowledge the current presidents have needs to be passed along to the next generation of leaders to ensure that community colleges continue to thrive.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study has several limitations. First, the results of the study depict currently serving presidents in 2007. This is a moment in time profile of community college presidents that returned the survey instrument. Second, the information collected from the presidents is self-reported, recall information. Therefore, the responses to survey items are subject to individual biases of each president's perception of leadership traits, skills, preparation, and competencies. Third, the survey instrument was administered electronically; therefore, there was limited control over the response rate. Fourth, data from the survey were limited to the aggregate results from the presidents that responded. Nearly 40% of community college presidents nationally responded to the survey. Those community college presidents that did not respond, however, may have had an affect on the outcomes of the study. Non-respondents were not analyzed. Finally, mentor was not defined in the survey, so it was up to the respondents to define for themselves what constitutes a mentoring relationship.

The study has three delimitations. First, community college presidents portrayed in the study were limited to two-year, not-for-profit schools in the United States. Second, survey items about competencies were framed in relationship to the AACC's (2005) *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* Finally, respondents had to answer the survey question(s) about mentor/mentoring to be included in the study.

Summary

This study will examine the role of mentoring in the preparation for the community college presidency—in overall preparation for the presidency, as well as the preparation in the six core competencies of leadership developed by the AACC. Implications for practice

and suggestions will be made regarding the role mentoring could play in the development of future community college leaders based on the results of the study.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used for this study:

Academic Administrator: Person with direct oversight of any division, department, or college unit within the instructional division of a community college. Examples of position titles would include, but not be limited to, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Academics, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Learning, Executive Dean of Academic Affairs, and Dean or Director of Academics.

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC): The AACC is considered the leading professional organization for two year colleges in the United States. The AACC has close to 95% membership from all accredited community, junior, and technical colleges and is committed to leadership, service, and legislative advocacy.

Chancellor: Administrator who has executive authority and serves a president over a multi-campus institution.

Community College: A two-year public, not-for-profit, institution with regional accreditation that most commonly awards associate degrees to students.

Competency: Fundamental knowledge, ability, or expertise in a specific area or skill set.

President: For this study, any person who has assumed the role of Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for a community college.

Senior Level Administrator: Administrative personnel at a community college who reports directly to the president or CEO of the institution.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

History of the Community College Presidency

In 2006, the nation's community colleges celebrated their 105th anniversary. With the founding of Joliet Junior College in 1901, a brand new entity in American higher education emerged. Rapid increases in comprehensive community college in the 1960s brought accessible, affordable, and quality education to the people of America in all 50 states. As a result of their open door mission, community colleges have been referred to as "the peoples college" and a place of "second chances" for students (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Currently, nearly half of all undergraduate students in the nation start at a community college (AACC, 2008).

During the decades of rapid growth, community college presidents were faced with unique circumstances and created, developed, and lived the community college mission. Secondary school principals and superintendents were most commonly the first junior college leaders (Piland & Wolf, 2003). When junior colleges became comprehensive community colleges during the 1960s and 1970s, however, they became complex institutions of higher education and became more like their university peers than the public schools from which they originated (Piland & Wolf, 2003). Sullivan (2001) characterized the first four decades of community college leaders into four generalized groups: (a) the founding fathers, (b) good managers, (c) collaborators, and (d) the millennium generation.

Generations of Leaders

According to Sullivan (2001), the first two generations of presidents had many of the same characteristics. They had traditional leadership styles that resembled American industry at the time—very hierarchical organizational structures. They were primarily white

men, married, in their 50s, and had served in either World War II or the Korean War. Most of them held doctorate degrees and ascended through the academic ranks to president. They adapted industrial concepts of collective bargaining as well university model faculty relations. Under these leaders, community colleges that started with virtually nothing grew into large bureaucracies with enviable physical plants, vast resources, and solid community support. The founding fathers and good managers created a form of higher education that was highly successful and uniquely American. By the early to mid-1990s, most community college presidents representing these two generations had retired.

The third group of community college presidents was labeled by Sullivan (2001) as the collaborators. Sullivan stated that the leaders of the collaborator generation currently are the majority in leadership roles at community colleges and have built on the strong foundation laid by their proceeding generation of leadership. They have endured recessions, pressures to be more accountable, public distrust, increasing numbers of underprepared students, and the rapid advancement of technology and the Internet. The background and style of this generation of leaders has prepared them for the challenges presented during this period of community college history. They have common characteristics including coming from middle class families that instilled the value of education as a means of moving upward in society, which has shaped their professional lives. Many were the first in their family to go to college and majored in education, social sciences, or the humanities. Most were shaped by some kind of activism before during, or after college including the civil rights movement, the antiwar movements, or the women's movements. As a result, social justice was an emphasis for this generation of leaders. While most are still white males, many more

women and minorities have attained leadership positions during this generation as opposed to the previous two generations of community college leaders.

The third generation of community college leaders prepared themselves for higher education leadership through their degree choices. Many have graduate degrees in higher education administration and leadership and also prepared themselves through professional development programs specific to community colleges. They are knowledgeable in organizational behavior, change process, and quality improvement, and they believe in the team building concept. They have considerable skill moving through different frames and styles of leadership. Unlike the previous two generations, they intentionally prepared themselves for the community college presidency.

The emerging fourth generation of community college presidents, according to Sullivan (2001), are demographically similar to the third generation. Most were born after the world wars and civil rights movements and have been greatly influenced by technology. Most are dependant on computers and the Internet to conduct daily business. They tend to want as many possibilities for a solution as possible and do not care for prescribed decision making that is common in the third generation through flow charting and policy making. They have a focus on workforce development rather than the social justice focus of the previous generation. They have trained intentionally for the presidency and appear to be more sophisticated and knowledgeable than their predecessors as they step into the presidency. Overall, the new generation of leadership at the community college appears to be well prepared to address the challenges facing community colleges in the new millennium (Sullivan, 2001).

Demographic Changes Over Time

Demographics of the community college president have changed over time as well. The average age of the community college president has gradually gotten higher over the last two decades. In 1984, the average age of presidents was 51 years old, 54 years old in 1996, 56 years old in 2001, and 58 years old in 2007 (Duree, 2007; Vaughan, 1986; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002, 2007). This trend makes sense as many scholars point to a mass retiring of our nation's community college leaders in the next 5 to 10 years (Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007)

In terms of gender, the percentage of female community college presidents has increased from around 3% in 1984–1985 to 11% in 1991 to 29% in 2006 (Moore, Martorana, & Twombly, 1985; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Duree (2007) found a slight increase of female community college presidents from 29% in 2006 to 32% in 2007. From 1991 to 2006, there was a 20% increase in the number of female community college presidents. Only a 4% increase in female presidents has occurred since 2001 when the percentage was 28% (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002) to the 2007 percentage of 32% (Duree, 2007).

In 1985, Moore et al. found that only 6.3% of community college presidents were minorities. In 1998, Vaughan and Weisman's report broke down the race/ethnicity backgrounds of community college presidents as 85.6% white, 5.2% African American, 4.9% Hispanic, 1.9% Native American, and 1.5% Asian American. In 2007, Duree's study showed a race/ethnicity break down of 80.7% white, 8.2% African American, 5.8% Hispanic, 2.2% Native American, and 1.9% Asian American. Clearly the number of

minority community college presidents has increased over the last 20 years, but that increase has slowed in recent years.

The number of community college presidents holding a doctorate has increased modestly over the last two decades. Vaughan (1986) found that in 1984 76% of community college presidents had earned a doctorate degree; in 1985 Moore et al. found that 79.3% of community college presidents had earned a doctorate degree. In 2007, Duree found that 87% of community college presidents had earned a doctorate. This is consistent with the 2006 survey conducted by Weisman and Vaughan (2007). Results from Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) also found 87% of community college presidents had doctoral degrees. Specific to the PhD, Moore et al. (1985) found that 39.5% of presidents had a PhD in 1985. Two decades later in 2007, Duree found that 43% of community college presidents had a PhD.

While the percentages of presidents holding doctorate degrees has been relatively stable, a recent trend worth noting is the rise in presidents with doctoral degrees with specific preparation in community college leadership. As recent as 2002, Amey and VanDerLinden found less than 2% of presidents specifying that their doctoral studies had an emphasis in community college leadership. Duree (2007) found that 38% of current community college presidents earned doctorates in higher education with a community college leadership emphasis.

Despite modest gains over the past 20 years in the number of women and minorities in community college presidencies, the preferred demographic of a community college president has not changed. McFarlin, Crittenden, and Ebbers (1999) identified the demographics of an outstanding community college president as a white male in his 50s

with a doctoral degree. Not much has changed over the last decade as Weisman and

Vaughan (2007) and Duree (2007) found that over 75% of the nations community college

presidents still share these common characteristics.

Challenges to Community College Leadership

According to many scholars, a critical leadership shortage is looming for community

colleges. Many of the community college presidents, upper-level administrators, and faculty

who began their careers in the 1960s and 1970s are close to retirement (Shults 2001).

According to Shults (2001), 45% of community college presidents planed to retire by 2007.

Weisman and Vaughan (2002) found that 79% of community college presidents surveyed

planned to retire by 2012. In a recent update, 84% of community college presidents planned

to retire by 2016 (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007).

The impending retirements are not limited to presidents. According to Shults (2001),

key upper administrators that are traditionally next in line for the presidencies or in the

"pipeline" in community colleges, such as chief student affairs officers, business and

financial officers, continuing education directors, and chief academic officers, are also aging

and ready for retirement. The average age of people in these positions is over 50 years old

(Shults, 2001). The average age of chief academic officers in 2001 was 54 years old (Shults,

2001). Vaughan and Weisman (1998) found that fewer than 30% of presidents ascended to

their first presidency after age 50. The aging of people in feeder positions to the presidency

suggests that more presidents will attain their first presidency after the age of 50 (Shults,

2001)

Shults (2001) also pointed out that faculty retirements loom as large as presidential

and administration retirements. As faculty begin a mass retirement, an important component

of the community college leadership pipeline will be lost. Faculty often fill roles of lower level administrators such as department chairs and deans and, in time, progress into upper level administrative roles such as chief academic officers and presidents (Shults, 2001). Finding qualified individuals to fill the leadership gap in America's community colleges is of national concern (AACC, 2001).

The document *Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community College,* produced by Claremont Graduate University's Community College Leadership Development Initiative (2000), had a bleak outlook on the future of community college leadership.

Leadership in the community college has suffered from benign neglect. Little conscious attention is paid to questions of from where community college leaders will come, how their talents will be developed, and how their experience will be valued. We destroy our leaders through burnout. They have not time to get trained. Faculty leaders are not identified. They are often discouraged. We have not had two candidates run for any faculty leadership position in years. Only those willing to be abused and overworked run for the positions.

A plethora of challenges and frustrations await community college presidents in the new millennium. Community colleges operate in an environment that is constantly being reshaped by advancing technology; globalization of education, business, state, and federal mandates;, and changing student demographics (Locke & Guglielmino, 2006). Vaughan (2000) stated that community college leaders must understand the inherent risks of being a president and must be prepared to handle the unexpected. Those unforeseen situations and

events can topple even the most prepared, stable presidency if not dealt with adequately (Vaughan, 2000).

In 2005, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* surveyed 764 community college presidents of which only 41% reported they were very well prepared for their first presidency, while 46% indicated they were moderately well prepared. The presidents indicated they were most unprepared for fund raising (18%), budgetary issues (11%), and relationship with legislators and other political officials (11%). The presidents' primary concern was balanced budgets. Second to budgetary worries was excellence of educational programs and quality faculty, both indicators of student learning. Overall, current community college presidents indicated they were unprepared for the presidency. This lack of perceived preparedness can make short work of a presidency (Vaughan, 2000).

In 2007, the American Council on Education (ACE) outlined in their report how today's college presidency combines at least two full time jobs, one on campus dealing with internal constituencies and the other but equal job of dealing with external challenges including legislative, government, community groups, media, and potential donors. While ACE included four year presidents, Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found similar results specific for community college presidents and differentiated community college issues as external and internal. Respondents in their study found the most pressing external issues to be state financial support for programs and teaching, linkages with business and industry, and meeting community needs. Internal issues were identified as student retention, creation of new programs and delivery systems, and student recruitment and marketing.

Hockaday and Puyear (2000) presented six major hurdles confronting community college presidents in the future. These challenges include relevance in a global economy,

distance education, competency-based programs, blurred mission boundaries, new funding

challenges, and new competition and the move toward privatization. Sullivan (2001)

described the environment in which community college leaders must function as

characterized by:

- A lack of resources

- Changing student and staff demographics

- A shift in emphasis from teaching to student learning and student learning
  outcomes assessment

- Technology advancements that are allocated an increasing portion of the
  operating budget, challenge to traditional instructional delivery, and require an
  aggressive professional development plan for faculty and staff

- Increasing mandates from external agencies

- Public skepticism about the effectiveness of public education institutions

- Increasing competition from private, for profit institutions

- Blurring service boundaries as a result of online learning and the proliferation of
  the Internet

- Alternative forms of skill credentialing instead of degree completions

- A never ending blitz of information

Along with the afore mentioned challenges, the future leaders of community colleges

will face reeducating much of America's workforce (Evans, 2001) Eighty-five percent of

the population will need the knowledge and skills for employment in the high-wage/

high-skill jobs of the Information Age economy.

Adapting to a rapidly changing workforce will require community college leaders to align the mission of the institution and adapt to be market responsive (Harmon & MacAllum, 2003). Harmon and MacAllum (2003) indentified market responsive characteristics as:

- Commitment to allocate resources to develop training programs and outreach to local businesses and other organizations

- Response mechanisms designed to quickly develop and deliver curriculum to meet demands of the workforce

- Partnerships with local business and industry that allow for the rapid development of training

- Close relationships with community stakeholders to better understand and respond to local workforce needs.

Community college leaders of the new century will be faced with the challenge of confronting nonstop change. Preparing their organization to quickly respond by developing and implementing effective strategies that meet the needs of stakeholders in their service areas will be imperative (Duree, 2007).

Not to be lost in the community college president's duties is the time and effort associated with fundraising. Glass and Jackson (1998) found that fundraising is a threat to many community college leaders, and success depends on the president's capacity for leadership in this area. In today's community college environment, fundraising is not an option, it is a necessity and vital to the current and future vitality of the college (Lanning, 2008).

Today's community college president requires a strong emphasis on external relations and leading internally, while at the same time must be leaders in their community (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). These factors, among others, might be contributing to the community college presidency being less attractive as a career choice. Entering into an administrative area that demands long hours, is high stress, and offers few rewards is not a bright prospect for future leaders (Zirkle & Cotton, 2001). According to Weisman and Vaughan's (2007) *Career and Lifestyle Survey*, the average community college president spends approximately 57 hours per week on work related activities including four evening or weekend activities. Presidents also reported they only used 60% of allotted annual leave, and 82% indicated they conducted college related work while on vacation, an indication of the all encompassing nature of the position (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). As Paneitz (2005) reflected during her second year of community college presidency, nothing could have prepared her for handling the stress of a 24/7 job and lack of privacy. Guthrie (2001), while reflecting on her four years as a community college president, stated the costs were substantial for her family and for her physical and psychological nerves. It is apparent that being an effective, dedicated community college president comes with its sacrifices.

Despite negative aspects presented in the literature surrounding the challenges involved with being a community college president, most indicated they would have chosen the same career path. The *Chronicle of Higher Education*'s 2005 survey of community college presidents indicated that 94% would do it all over again despite the challenges professionally and personally. Paneitz (2005) stated the community college presidency was the most exhilarating experience one can have. The vast majority of community college presidents have indicated the number one factor they have remained community college

presidents is the feeling that they could truly make a difference in people's lives and for the community they serve (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Kubala & Bailey, 2001).

Skills Needed by Community College Presidents

Great challenges face the new generation of community college leaders as they move their institutions forward in today's information age society. Each new generation of community college leaders brings potential for new ideas, strategic approaches, and methods to an organization. The leadership skills required for today's community college leaders are very different than those skills need a decade ago (Boggs, 2003; Sullivan, 2001). Without question, numerous challenges, opportunities, stresses, and rewards await current and future generations of community college leaders (Phelan, 2005). Is it possible for a leader to possess all the skills and traits necessary to lead community colleges into the next decade? Goff (2003) suggested that very few, if any, community college presidents have all the leadership traits and skills needed. Community college leaders will have to develop a wide array of skill and traits to be successful leaders (Phelan, 2005).

McFarlin et al. (1999) explored traits that had been developed by exemplary presidents. The authors found nine common factors possessed by exemplary community college presidents: earned doctorate degree, education preparation focused on community college leadership, had a mentor, were change agents, developed peer network, participation in leadership preparation activities, knowledge of technology, active personal research and publication agenda, and previous position in the community college.

Hockaday and Puyear (2000) identified nine traits of effective community college leaders including vision, integrity, confidence, courage, technical knowledge, ability to collaborate, persistence, good judgment, and the desire to lead. In 2001, the AACC formed

a Leadership Task Force in recognition of the potential leadership crisis for community

colleges. The task force produced a report describing the skills needed by community

college leaders to be successful. The recommended skill set included understanding the

mission of community colleges, effective advocacy and administrative skills, interpersonal

skills and knowledge of community and economic development (AACC, 2001). In the same

year, Shults (2001) found that skills essential for community college presidents included

mediation skills, a working knowledge of technology, being able to build coalitions, and an

ability to bring a college together through the governance processes.

Boggs (2003) claimed the importance of community college leaders presenting

themselves as honest models of integrity and having high ethical standards while serving as

the primary change agents. Miller and Pope (2003) found that current presidents indentified

eight important skills for community college leaders: stress tolerance, problem analysis,

organizational ability, personal motivation, written communication, oral communication,

educational values, and sound judgment. Miller and Pope also pointed out that community

colleges have become increasingly business practice centered. Community college

presidents have been forced to pay more attention to how the college operates revenue

centers such as bookstores, food service, fundraising raising with less emphasis on academic

leadership of the college (Miller & Pope, 2003).

In 2004, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* asked six community college experts to

point out the most challenging issues facing community colleges in the next five years. The

six experts identified: choosing among competing agendas, meeting the needs of a changing

society, staying focused on suitable missions, serving more students with less money, hiring

and motivating quality employees, fragmentation of programs, as well as isolation and

divisiveness among faculty and administration. Fulton-Calkins and Milling (2005) suggest

nine leadership traits as being crucial for future community college leaders:

- Learning from the past while embracing the future

- Values-based leading

- Vision to make connections

- Providing continuous leadership learning opportunities

- Keeping faculty in the loop

- Making connections to business and industry

- Enriching the inward journey

- Looking for talent from a broad pool

- Staying student centered while preparing the future workforce

Stanley (2008) offered common points for successful community college leaders

based on conversations with a variety of community college leaders. The common points

for successful community college leaders include demonstrate a willingness to take risks and

try something new, look beyond conventional sources of income and partners, look beyond

conventional instructional methods and program structure, seek and adapt to change, derive

from a desire to better serve their communities and students, enlarge and enhance their

institutions, and maintain financial stability. Some community college leaders offered

specific examples of approaches that have been successful including to exploit any and all

connections that can be helpful to students, the college, and the community; use data

aggressively and share it with others; rethink traditional higher education terminology

(specifically developmental education); offer incentives to enroll in your college; and streamline procedures to be more responsive to student, college, and community needs.

Clearly, there are many variations of research that suggest the skills sets needed to be an effective community college leader. It seems, however, there is no one specific skills set that is designed to guarantee success. Goff (2003) states, "It begs the question of how one individual can obtain and master all the traits and behaviors provided in the literature" (p. 17). The recommended skill sets needed is extensive. Since every institution is unique and has its own culture, it is critical that persons applying for upper level administration positions determine that the skills required for the position match the skill set acquired by the individual for the success of all involved (Goff, 2003)

Mentoring and Leadership Development

Defining Mentoring

The logical place to begin when discussing the role of mentoring in leadership development is to answer the question: What is a mentor or what is mentoring? Scholars studying mentoring agree that there is no widely accepted definition (Cohen, 1995; Hopkins, 2003; Jacobi, 1991; Merriam & Thomas, 1986). Definitions generally align in the field of which they occur and the perspective of the author (Hopkins, 2003). For example, authorities in business and education view mentoring differently. The business field views mentoring as a more practical, task driven process, while the field of education is apt to give more consideration to interpersonal aspects of mentoring than they do to career support functions of mentoring (Hopkins, 2003).

Definitions in the educational domain generally emphasize empowerment and self-direction through learning centered relationships. Cohen (1995) defined mentoring as a

one-to-one relationship that evolves through reasonable distinct phases between the mentor and the protégé. Mentoring is compromised of several interrelated behavioral functions that combine to assist the protégé including trust, advice, facilitate, challenge, motivate, and encourage initiative (Cohen, 1995).

Zachary (2000) defined mentoring as one on one facilitative relationship in which the mentor facilitates the learning relationship rather than directing the transfer of knowledge to the learner. The mentoring relationship is learner centered rather then teacher centered (Zachary, 2000). Jipson and Paley (2000) claim mentoring builds creative, democratic spaces for the formation of insights and understandings that help us search for and choose ourselves.

Definitions in the field of business generally look at mentoring from a skill building, career development lens. The following are few examples of definitions in business and how they differ from those in education. Wellington (2001) states a mentor is a person who can hook you up with the experiences and people you need to move ahead and tell you how to handle certain situations. Wellington goes on to say that mentors can show you the ropes and pull strings for the protégé. Daloz (1999) states in his definition of mentoring that the mentor clears the way, give some travel tips, smoothes the road, and assists the traveler to become competent for the journey. Finally, Kram (1985) added that mentors are people who provided protégés with support, direction, and feedback regarding their interpersonal development and career plans.

Regardless of the field where mentoring originates, in a mentoring relationship, the more experienced and powerful individual, the mentor, guides, advises, and assists in any number of ways to the career of the less experienced, often younger, upwardly mobile

protégé (VanDerLinden, 2005). Most professionals consider a mentor to be an experienced person who provides the mentee (a less experienced person) with support, encouragement, and knowledge (Shea, 1994). In return, the relationship fosters the mentor's professional activity and growth.

History of Mentoring

The term "mentor" has its origins in Homer's *The Odyssey*. The goddess wisdom, Athena, was the first mentor. She took over the body of a man named Mentor in order to give Odysseus advice. When Odysseus left for war, he entrusted his son, Telemachus, to Mentor's care during his absence. Mentor gave Odysseus's son advice, cared for him, and protected him. Mentor was the consummate teacher and educated Telemachus in the ways of the world and provided him with the knowledge needed to survive.

The first scholarly interest in the role of mentoring is often traced back to Levinson, Darrow, Levinson, Klein, and McKee's (1978) study of human development in adult men chronicled in the book *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. Levinson and colleagues focused on the developmental transitions and milestones adult men experienced throughout the first 20 years of adulthood. They discovered that relationships play a critical role in human development, specifically the relationship with mentors, who play a significant role in the learning and development of the men in their early adult years (Levinson et al., 1978).

Eby, Rhodes, and Allen (2007) summarized numerous studies in the 1970s and 1980s that continued research into mentoring. Vaillant (1977) studied some of the nation's most successful and influential men and found those who were most successful were mentored in young adulthood. In a highly publicized *Harvard Business Review* article, Roche (1979) reported that two-thirds of nearly 4,000 executives listed in *Who's News* of the

Wall Street Journal reported having a mentor. Perhaps one of the most influential works on mentoring in the 1980s was Kram's (1985) book *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life.* Kram's work is considered a seminal study on mentoring in business and increased interest in the study of mentoring across all disciplines and fields (Eby et al., 2007).

Mentoring in Higher Education

The vast majority of research on the benefits of mentoring has been conducted in the business sector with few empirical research studies on mentoring in academic settings and even fewer studies specific to the community college (McDade, 2005; Wunsch, 1994). Of the mentoring research in education, most has occurred in the high school or in four year colleges with little in the community college setting (Hopkins, 2003). Most of the research on mentoring in higher education is focused on faculty development as teachers and researchers (McDade, 2005). There is evidence that community colleges value mentoring programs on their campuses and that those who are mentored describe the relationship as valuable both socially and for their career (Hopkins, 2003). VanDerLinden (2005) claims mentoring has the potential to increase work-related knowledge and skills for community college personnel.

Research consistently supports the view that mentorship is a significant contributor to career development in higher education (Brown, 2002. The positive impact of mentorship on career development is further confirmed by the numerous studies on mentoring relationships across disciplines, such as business, education, and psychology (Wilson & Johnson, 2001). Mentoring often appears in discussions about the career and leadership development of college and university presidents (McDade, 2005). Most have positive

responses that the mentor aided the mentee's career development in some way. Mentors can help younger community college employees by planting seeds that would empower them to seek college presidencies. Brown (2005) suggested the importance of leaders developing other potential leaders through mentorship by arguing there is no success without a successor. Ragins and Cotton (1993) found that persons with prior experience in mentoring relationships, either as a mentor or mentee, are more willing to serve as mentors than those who lack such experience. Brown (2005) found that mentorship plays a critical role in advancing female college presidents up the administrative ladder.

In an early study specific to community colleges, Merriam and Thomas (1986) found the most active function the mentor performed was that of teaching. Not only did the mentors arrange situations that encouraged their mentees to learn, they actively passed on their accumulated wisdom through lessons designed to teach the protégé to handle situations not yet encountered (Merriam & Thomas, 1986). Merriam and Thomas concluded that mentoring was viewed by almost all presidents as the mechanism used to create the framework to function in the role of president. Mentees credit many traits learned to the individuals who served as their mentors including how to operate a college, understanding the politics of decision making, leadership styles, and the development of their philosophy, self esteem, and vision (Merriam & Thomas, 1986). The results of their study suggest mentoring is a key factor in the development of higher education leaders. At the very least, those who aspire to positions of leadership in higher education should seek out people who can provide mentor-like guidance.

In a more recent study of mentoring in the community college, VanDerLinden (2005) found that career related activities such as furthering one's education, participating in

professional development, and cultivating mentoring relationships impact the career advancement and leadership development of administrators. VanDerLinden goes on to say that it is believed that mentoring is the key ingredient that separates successful and unsuccessful administrators and that mentoring is related to organizational advancement, career development, and career satisfaction. Mentoring can have a significant impact on the career paths of those who aspire to advance in higher education administration (VanDerLinden, 2005). Mentors provided encouragement and opportunities, shared information, acted as role models, encouraged continued education, and taught the protégé how to be politically astute. VanDerLinden found that over 52% of those who indicated that they had a mentor also indicated that their mentor had assisted them to obtain their current position. She goes on to state that mentors provided encouragement and advice, provided specific help with aspects of one's career such as serving as a reference, provided exposure to certain activities including opportunities to take on additional responsibilities and other professional growth opportunities, specifically encouraged the mentee to participate in professional development or additional education, helped the mentee to develop professional networks, provided training on a specific skill or provided information/answers to a particular problem or issue, helped with political aspects of the job, and helped the mentee to see the "bigger picture." VanDerLinden suggested that mentors can assist in learning, provide encouragement and advice, and may help alleviate barriers for future administrators.

Summary

Research indicates mentoring as a potential leadership development tool for future community college leaders. Duree (2007) found that almost half of current community college presidents had a mentor prior to their first presidency. With 84% of presidents and

senior community college administrators planning to retire in the next 10 years (Weisman &
Vaughan, 2007), mentoring could provide a way to pass on valuable knowledge to the next
generation of community college leaders. It is important that the vast knowledge current
community college presidents have be passed along to the next generation of leaders to
ensure the community colleges continue to thrive.

Chapter 3. Methodology

The purpose of this quantitative study is to better understand how mentoring assisted current community college presidents in preparation for their first community college presidency. This mentoring study will be based on the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. The predominant question is: Do current community college presidents who had mentors perceive that they were better prepared for their first presidency than those presidents who did not have mentors?

Based on the purpose of this study, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. What are the background characteristics of those community college presidents who identified having mentors versus those community college presidents who did not have mentors?

2. To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

3. To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?

4. To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

5. To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?

6. To what extent do background characteristics, professional development, and ratings of preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* predict how current community college presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?

<div align="center">**Research Survey and Sample Design**</div>

In order to address the research questions, the researcher received permission to use a database created by Iowa State University's Office of Community College Research and Policy. The instrument used to survey the target population was composed of an electronic questionnaire and the survey known as *The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey*, which was conducted in 2007 by a group of researchers in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) and the Office of Community College Research and Policy at Iowa State University (ISU). The principal investigators were doctoral students working under the direction of Professor Larry Ebbers and Associate Professor Frankie Santos Laanan of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. The ISU Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM) was contracted to implement the data collection for the survey.

The principal investigators on the project consulted with the CSSM staff to finalize the design. The principal investigators designing the instrument decided to implement the project as a Web survey with both hard copy and e-mail notification. The sample consisted of current chief executive officers or presidents of all community colleges in the United States, to the extent possible. The sample for this study was limited to community colleges and community college presidents in public, not-for-profit two-year institutions located in the United States. The project was approved by the ISU Institutional Review Board.

Two leading external researchers in community college leadership reviewed drafts of the survey instrument and provided constructive comments. Seven community college presidents were administered the survey instrument in order to receive constructive comments about format and estimated time to complete the survey, and to ensure each survey item was understood by a representation of those in the field who would be completing the final survey. George Boggs, Chief Executive Officer of the American Association of Community Colleges, also endorsed the survey instrument and the process.

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) provided the population of community college presidents for this study. The information received by the CSSM contained 1,309 listings of which 197 were removed as ineligible. The 197 ineligible listings consisted of: (a) individuals from school districts, (b) department of education administrators, (c) individuals from four-year colleges and universities, and (d) duplicate listings. Schools with interim administrators were also classified as ineligible at the request of the principal investigators. The final sample consisted of 1,112 potentially eligible community college presidents currently serving in the 2006–2007 academic year.

Survey Instrument

Data were collected using *The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Survey*. The Office of Community College Research and Policy designed the survey instrument as a result of extensive review of past survey instruments used to study areas of the community college presidency. The types of inventories utilized to measure the items on the survey instrument were dichotomous responses (i.e., "yes" and "no"), numerical scales, and Likert-type rating scales (e.g., "not important" to "very important;" "not prepared" to "very prepared;" "not challenging" to "very challenging").

The 40-item survey instrument was organized in seven sections: (a) professional and personal information; (b) career pathways; (c) educational background; (d) leadership preparation; (e) faculty, staff, and public relations; (f) research and publications; and (g) competencies for community college leaders. The survey instrument concluded with four final questions. Two of those questions asked respondents to rate how well they were prepared for their first community college presidency and to indicate their current level of job satisfaction. The next survey item asked respondents to identify three outstanding community college leaders within the state where they currently hold a position. The final survey item was designed to allow survey respondents the opportunity to write open-ended answers that would provide narrative descriptions of what they wish they had done differently to prepare for community college leadership.

Data Collection Procedures

The survey questions were compiled by the principal investigators and were finalized in consultation with CSSM staff. The questions were programmed for Web application and tested by CSSM staff. The researchers also tested the Web survey instrument prior to implementation. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, unique usernames and passwords were assigned to each individual in the sample, and both the survey and the data were stored on a secure server.

On Friday, July 13, 2007, CSSM staff sent letters via postal mail to each of the 1,112 individuals in the sample to notify them of the study and invite them to participate. These letters were printed on ELPS letterhead with the signatures of Dr. Ebbers and Dr. Laanan. On Monday, July 16, e-mails containing identical information were sent to the 1,112 individuals in the sample. Both the letter and email contained complete instructions for

accessing the Web survey online, including the assigned username and password, and the e-mail contained a live link. A toll-free number was also provided in the letters and e-mails so that respondents could call with questions. Throughout the data collection period, questions or comments were received and addressed by CSSM staff via phone and e-mail. Three reminder e-mails were sent to non-respondents at spaced intervals over the next four weeks. Contact dates are listed below:

- July 13, 2007: Letter notification

- July 16, 2007: E-mail notification

- July 24, 2007: E-mail reminder 1

- August 2, 2007: E-mail reminder 2

- August 10, 2007: E-mail reminder 3 (Final)

Presidents were allowed to complete the survey instrument from July 16 to August 21, and 391 surveys were totally completed. Twenty-four partially completed surveys were included in the final data set at the request of the principal investigators, bringing the total to 415.

The data were compiled in an Excel file. A coding manual was developed that identified variable names and response codes for the survey. Open text responses were recorded in a separate Excel file. In addition, a file was created that identified the Case IDs of survey respondents who were identified as outstanding Community College Presidents in question 39 of the survey.

Survey Results

Of the 1,112 schools in the sample, 26 were classified as ineligible, bringing the eligible sample to 1,086. Seven of the ineligible schools indicated that they were not

community colleges, and the others were being directed by interim administrators. There

were eight cases in which the chief administrators were out of the office for an extended

portion of the summer and could not be reached. This was understandable given the

summer data collection period. Twelve cases contacted the CSSM to refuse participation,

and 635 cases did not respond. Sixteen cases were partially completed, but not enough

information was provided to justify including them in the data set. Twenty-four partially

completed cases and 391 totally completed cases did provide sufficient information to be

included, bringing the total number of acceptable completions to 415. Table 3.1 represents a

final response rate of 38.2% based on an eligible sample of 1,086.

Table 3.1

Eligible Sample and Response Rate for the Community College Presidency:

Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey

	Cases
Sample	1112
Not Eligible	26
Eligible Sample	1086
Unreachable	8
No Response/Refused	647
Partial – Not included	16
Completed Surveys	415
Response Rate	38.2 %

Source: Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology (2007).

Reported sample percentages are statistically valid within ± 4.9% at the 95%

confidence level. This means that if 50% of the respondents answer a certain question

affirmatively, the true percentage in the overall population has a 95% chance to be between

45.1% and 54.9%.

Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences® (SPSS) for Windows® was the computer software program used to execute the statistical analyses for this study. In order to address research question one, descriptive statistics were conducted to examine background characteristics for community college presidents with mentors and community college presidents without mentors prior to their first presidency.

For research questions 2 and 3, cross-tabulations and independent t-tests were conducted to determine the relationship between mentored and non-mentored presidents on their overall perceived preparation for their first presidency, as well as the respective group's preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.*

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the six subsets used to measure the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (organizational strategy, resources management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism) each of which has several variables. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the congruency of competency variable and as a means of data reduction to create composite variables to be used and constructs for further analyses. Determining the importance of a factor or sets of factors is assessed by the proportion of variance or covariance accounted for the factor or factors after rotation and interpreted by the underlying common theme uniting the group of variables loading on it (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Comrey and Lee (1992) have determined that factor loadings over 0.71 are excellent, factor loadings over 0.63 are very good, factor loadings over 0.55 are good, factor

loadings over 0.45 are fair, and factor loadings over, at, or below 0.32 are poor. In sum, the greater the loading factor, the more the variable or construct can be considered a strong measure of the factor. For this study, 0.55 was used as a cut off to identify and determine factors. All 45 factors originally identified by the AACC loaded at 0.55 or better. All factors were internally consistent and well defined by the variables (Table 3.2). Validity of the constructs was determined by completing Cronbach's test for reliability. The results of the exploratory factor analysis were consistent with a previous study by Duree (2007) using the same data base.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

To answer research questions 4 and 5, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. **An** ANOVA is used to test for differences among more than two comparative groups (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For this study, an ANOVA will be used to determine if there is a difference between community college presidents who were involved in formal mentoring relationships, informal mentoring relationships, and those presidents with no mentor relationship and their overall preparation for the presidency, as well as their preparation in the AACC core leadership competency constructs determined by the factor analysis.

An ANOVA procedure has three assumptions for the three independent variable groups: (a) they are independent of the population, (b) they have equal variances, and (c) they are evenly distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As *n* is not the same for each group, a Levene's test of homogeneity of variance was used to examine whether the three groups had equal variances. Finally, Tukey and Scheffe' post hoc tests was run to test for significant differences between the groups.

Table 3.2

AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders—Factor Analysis Results

Variable $N = 415$	Factor loading
Organizational Strategy (α = .732)	
Uses data-driven decision making practices to plan strategically	0.729
Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of student and the community	0.712
Maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and assets	0.662
Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with college master plan	0.635
Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.	0.617
Develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at your institution.	0.562
Resource Management (α = .882)	
Support operational decisions by managing information resources	0.818
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan	0.800
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff and facilities	0.763
Ensure accountability in reporting	0.742
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff	0.711
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization	0.708
Employ organizational, time management, planning and delegation skills.	0.706
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources	0.697

Table 3.2 (continued)

Variable *N* = 415	Factor Loading
Communication (α = .916)	
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage and act	0.860
Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully	0.843
Disseminate and support policies and strategies	0.843
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents	0.837
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities and expectations	0.835
Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences	0.819

Collaboration (α = .958)	
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships	0.927
Develop, enhance and sustain teamwork and cooperation	0.907
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good	0.907
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making	0.883
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society	0.876
Work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations	0.870
Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles	0.869
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college	0.817

Table 3.2 (continued)

Variable $N = 415$	Factor Loading

Community College Advocacy (α = .971)

Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college	0.953
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same	0.945
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education	0.945
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning-centered environment	0.935
Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence	0.914
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through teaching and learning	0.814

Professionalism (α = .975)

Regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation	0.991
Weigh short term and long term goals in decision making	0.991
Support lifelong learning for self and others	0.907
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others	0.900
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications	0.898
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge	0.895
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility and humor	0.894

Table 3.2 (continued)

Variable $N = 415$	Factor Loading
Professionalism (α = .975) (continued))	
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people	0.889
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college	0.888
Demonstrate transformational leadership	0.868

Multiple Regression

To answer research question 6, multiple regression was used. Multiple regression

analyses are statistical techniques that enable the researcher to examine the relationship

between a dependent variable (DV) and several independent variables (IVs), and can be

applied to a data set in which several IVs have been correlated with one another and with the

DV (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Of the three major analytical strategies in multiple

regression (i.e., standard multiple regression, sequential [hierarchal] regression, and

statistical [stepwise] regression), sequential multiple regression allows the researcher to

determine the order in which IVs enter the equation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

A sequential regression analysis was conducted on both the mentored and

non-mentored presidents to determine the extent to which differences in background

characteristics, professional development, and ratings of preparation in the AACC's

Competencies for Community College Leaders predict how current community college

presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency. The same predictor

variables were used on both groups to see differences in preparation variables for both

groups.

Predictor variables were entered into the hierarchal regression equation in three variable blocks with the significance level established at $p < .05$. The first block comprised variables related to presidents' background characteristics including gender, age, and race (which was recoded into white/non-white). Presidents' professional development characteristics comprised the second block. Professional development characteristics included major field of study in highest degree earned, participation in leadership development program outside of graduation studies, participation in a GYOL Program, and previous experience teaching at the community college. Teaching experience at the community college was recoded into yes or no and did not differentiate between full or part-time teaching experience. The third block referred to preparation in AACC competencies including predictors in organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect a mentor-protégé relationship had in the preparation for the community college presidency. The methodology and statistical analysis chosen for this study will greatly help to understand and determine how mentoring factors in the preparation for the community college presidency.

Chapter 4. Findings

This chapter provides a statistical overview of the findings from the research questions of this study. The purpose of the study was to find if there was a difference between mentored and non-mentored community college presidents in preparation for their first presidency and their preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. Of the 415 community college presidents in the sample, 49.6% ($n = 206$) responded they had a mentor prior to their first presidency, and 50.4% ($n = 209$) indicated they did not have a mentor prior to their first presidency.

Demographics of Community College Presidents

Through the analysis of data, I was able to answer each of the research questions I asked at the onset of my research.

1. **What are the background characteristics of community college presidents who had mentors versus those community college presidents who did not have mentors?**

The majority of the community college presidents (90%) in the sample were between the ages of 50 and 69 years old. Of the 415 president who responded to the survey, 46% were between 50–59 years old and 44% were between the ages of 60–69. The average age of the sample was 58 years old. Of the presidents that had a mentor prior to their first presidency, 51% were 50–59 compared to 42% of the non-mentored group. The mentored group had a slightly lower percentage in the 60–69 age group (41%) compared to the non-mentored group (47%). The non-mentored group had 2% over 70 years old compared to a half percent (0.5%) for the mentored group. The non-mentored group is slightly older than the mentored group as 49% of the non-mentored group is 60 years of age or older and

the mentored group has 41% of the respondents older than 60. Also, 59% of the mentored group is 59 or younger compared to the non-mentored group (51%).

In terms of gender, approximately two thirds of the 415 community college presidents were male (68%) while approximately one third were female (32%). Within the mentored group, 58% were male versus 42% female. In the non-mentored group, 79 % were male and 21% were female.

Of the 415 community college presidents responding to the study, 81.1% were White/Caucasian. Among other race/ethnicity groups for the total sample of presidents, 2.2% were Native American, 1.9% were Asian/Pacific Islander, 8.3% were Black/African America, and 5.8% were Hispanic/Latino. The mentored group tended to be more ethnically diverse with 20.5% being non-white compared to 12.5% non-white in the non-mentored group. Within the mentored group, 78.5% were White/Caucasian, 2.4% Native American, 1.5% Pacific Islander, 9.8% Black/African American and 6.8% Hispanic/Latino. In the non-mentored group, 83.6% were White/Caucasian, 1.9% Native American, 2.4% Pacific Islander, 3.4% Black/African American, and 4.8% Hispanic/Latino.

In regards to marital status, the majority of the sample (85%) are married or living as married, 8% are divorced/separated, 4% are single, and 2% are widowed. In the mentored group, 83% are married or living as married, 9% are divorced/separated, 6% are single and 1% are widowed. In the non-mentored group, 87% are married or living as married, 7% are divorced/separated, 3% are single, and 2% are widowed.

Table 4.1

Demographics of Community College Presidents (N=415)

Variable	Percent		
	Mentor	No Mentor	Total Sample
Current Age			
39 and Under	1.0	1.0	1.0
40 – 49	7.4	7.8	7.6
50 – 59	50.5	42.2	46.4
60 – 69	40.6	47.1	43.8
70 and Over	0.5	1.9	1.2
Gender			
Male	57.6	78.6	68.1
Female	42.4	21.4	31.9
Race/Ethnicity			
Native American	2.4	1.9	2.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5	2.4	1.9
Black/African American	9.8	3.4	8.3
Hispanic/Latino	6.8	4.8	5.8
White/Caucasian	78.5	83.6	81.1
Other	1.0	0.5	0.7
Marital Status			
Single	5.7	3.4	4.4
Married or Living as Married	83.4	87.4	85.4
Divorced/Separated	9.3	6.8	8.0
Widowed	1.2	2.4	2.2
Educational Background			
PhD	42.9	42.3	42.4
EdD	44.9	42.8	43.6
Other	12.7	14.9	14.0
Major Field of Study in Highest Degree Earned			
Higher Education–Comm. College Leadership	46.8	29.2	37.9
Higher Education – Other Emphasis	23.4	28.2	25.8
K – 12 Administration	0.5	4.8	2.7
Other Educational Field	16.1	17.7	16.9
Other Field of Study	13.2	20.1	16.7

Results show that the majority of the 415 community college presidents in the survey sample have earned a doctorate (86%). Little difference existed between those presidents who earned a PhD (42%) and those who earned a EdD (44%). The mentored group results had 43% earning a PhD while 45% had earned an EdD. The non-mentored group had 42% of the respondents earning a PhD while 43% earned an EdD. Of the total sample, 64% earned a degree in Higher Education with 38% pursuing a program in higher education with a community college emphasis. About one-third (34%) of the sample earned a degree outside of higher education, and only 3% earned a degree in K–12 administration. Within the mentored group, 70% earned their degree in higher education with about half (47%) having their highest degree earned in higher education with a community college emphasis. In the non-mentored group, 57% earned their degree in higher education with only 29% having an emphasis in community college leadership. The non-mentored group had 38% of respondents receiving a degree other than higher education compared to 29% for the mentored group. The non-mentored group had 5% earn their degree in K–12 administration compared to 0.5% in the mentored group. See Table 4.1 for detailed results.

To examine the profession background of current community college presidents, the survey respondents were asked to report information regarding their current position, number of presidencies held, number of years in present position, and age when assuming their first presidency. The results are shown in Table 4.2.

Among the total sample, 9 out of 10 (90%) respondents indicated they had the title of "President" while 7% had the title of "Chancellor." As noted in the definition of terms, "President" and "Chancellor" are generally consider the same, with "Chancellor" having executive authority over multiple campuses through a district versus just one campus. In the

Table 4.2

Number of Years and Positions in the Community College Presidency (N=415)

	Percent		
Variable	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total
Current Positions			
President	88.3	91.0	89.8
Chancellor	7.8	6.2	7.0
Vice Chancellor	0	0.5	0.2
Other	3.9	1.9	2.9
Number of Presidencies Held Including Current Position			
One	63.9	63.6	63.6
Two	24.9	27.8	26.3
Three	6.8	5.7	6.3
Four	3.4	1.4	2.4
Five or More	1.0	1.0	1.0
Number of Years in Present Position			
1 to 2	25.9	23.6	24.7
3 to 5	27.8	28.2	28.1
6 to 10	24.4	26.3	25.4
More than 10	22.0	21.5	21.8
Total Number of Years as a College President/Chancellor			
1 – 2	16.7	16.7	16.7
3 – 5	21.1	23.0	22.0
6 – 10	24.0	26.3	25.2
More than 10	38.2	34.0	36.1
Age When Beginning First Presidency			
29 and Under	0.5	1.4	1.0
30 – 39	12.9	8.7	10.8
40 – 49	39.8	39.9	40.6
50 – 59	43.3	42.8	41.3
60 – 69	3.5	5.8	4.6

mentored group, 88% were "President" while 8% were "Chancellor." The non-mentored group had 91% being called "President" with 6% being "Chancellor." Approximately 90% had held one or two presidencies with 64% being in their first presidency and 26% in their second presidency. The results are fairly consistent with the mentored versus non-mentored group. The mentored group had 63.9% holding their first presidency, 24.9% holding two presidencies, and 11.2% holding three or more presidencies. The non-mentored group had 63.6% holding their first presidency, 27.8% holding two presidencies, and 8.1% holding three or more presidencies. The number of years the total sample of community college presidents held in their current position is distributed fairly evenly. Those respondents in the first or second year of a presidency comprised 24.7%, while 28.1% have been in the position three to five years, 25.4% have been in the position six to 10 years, and 21.8% have been in the position more than 10 years. The mentored and non-mentored groups fell closely in the range of the total sample.

Of the 415 community college presidents who responded to the survey, 85% had taught either full time or part-time at a community college at some point in their career. More community college presidents who were mentored had taught at a community college either full or part-time (89%) than non-mentored (81%). Of the total sample, 57% had participated in a leadership program prior to their first presidency, while 43% had not. Among the mentored group, 67.5% had participated in a leadership program prior to their first presidency compared to 47.1% of the non-mentored group. More respondents from the mentored group (18.3%) had participated in a GYOL program prior to the first presidency than the non-mentored group (7.2%). The total sample had 12.7% participate in a GYOL prior to their first presidency. See Table 4.3 for detailed results.

Table 4.3

Leadership Development and Preparation (N=415)

	Percent		
Variable	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total
Have You Ever Taught in a Community College			
Yes, Full-time	28.6	30.3	29.4
Yes, Part-time	40.4	32.2	36.3
Yes, both Full and Part-time	20.2	18.3	19.3
No	10.8	19.2	15.0
Participated in Leadership Program Prior to 1st Presidency			
Yes	67.5	47.1	57.3
No	32.5	52.9	42.7
Participated in Grow Your Own Leadership Program in Your Preparation for Your Presidency?			
Yes	18.3	7.2	12.7
No	81.7	92.8	87.3

The results for the importance of peer networks in assisting the 415 community college presidents in the study in preparing for and assuming their first presidency are summarized in Table 4.4. Neither the mentored group, non-mentored group, nor the total sample indicated that their graduate program cohort aided in their preparation or helped in assuming their first presidency. All three groups, however, did find that previous co-workers at community colleges were important in preparing for and assuming their first presidency. Overall, the presidents who had mentor-protégé relationships found all peer networks to be more important than the presidents who did not participate in mentor-protégé relationships. Those presidents who did not participate in mentor-protégé relationships found all peer networks less important than the total sample as well.

Table 4.4

Importance of Peer Networks in Preparing for and Assuming First Presidency (Summarized by Important or Very Important) (N=415)

	Percent		
Variable	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total
Graduate Program Cohort	28.6	24.3	26.4
Graduate Program Faculty	43.0	37.6	40.3
Previous Co-workers at Community Colleges	83.4	71.5	77.1
Social Networks	61.0	49.0	54.8
Business Networks	60.3	48.5	54.2

As reported at the beginning of this chapter, the presidents in this survey were evenly split between those who had a mentor-protégé relationship and those who did not. See Table 4.5 for detailed results. Of the 415 community college presidents in the sample, 49.6% (*n*=206) responded they had a mentor-protégé relationship prior to their first presidency, and 50.4% (*n*=209) indicated they did not have a mentor-protégé relationship prior to their first presidency.

Of the nearly 50% of respondents to the survey who did have a mentor-protégé relationship prior to their first presidency, the most likely time for this relationship to occur was during their graduate studies (29.5%), followed closely by during the first five years of their career (25.1%). The vast majority of the mentor-protégé relationships were informal (84.3%), while only 15.7% of the mentor-protégé relationships were formal. Mentors were approached by a protégé 42.4% of the time while protégés approached the mentor 52% of the time according to the survey results. The majority of the mentor-protégé relationships

Table 4.5

Mentor–Protégé Relationships (N=415)

Variable	Percent
Participated in a Mentor-Protégé Relationship as a Protégé	
Yes	49.4
No	50.4
Periods in Career Participating in Mentor-Protégé Relationship	
During Undergraduate Studies	3.9
During Graduate Studies	14.5
During First Five Years of Career	8.0
During Second Five Years of Career	12.3
Other	10.4
Did Not Participate as a Protégé	50.4
Mentor-Protégé Experience – Formal or Informal	
Formal	7.7
Informal	41.4
Did Not Participate as a Protégé	50.4
Mentor-Protégé Experience – Who Established Relationship	
Mentor Approached by Protégé	21.2
Protégé Approached by Mentor	26.0
Did Not Participate as a Protégé	50.4
Setting of Mentor-Protégé Experience	
During Gradate Program	4.6
During Community College Employment	30.1
Both	8.9
Somewhere Else	5.5
Did Not Participate as a Protégé	50.4
Participated in More Than One Mentor-Protégé Relationship as Protégé	
Yes	30.1
No	18.6
Did Not Participate as a Protégé	50.4
Participating in Mentor-Protégé Relationship as a Mentor	
Yes, Informally Mentoring	66.0
Yes, Formally Mentoring	19.3
No	13.5

took place in the community college setting. Over 60% of the respondents have participated in more than one mentor-protégé relationship as a protégé, and 85% have taken on a role as a mentor.

<p align="center">**Overall Preparation for the First Presidency**</p>

2. **To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency*?***

This section shows the results of how the 415 presidents surveyed felt they were prepared overall for their first presidency as well as how prepared they were in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* when they assumed their first presidency. Table 4.6 shows the results for overall preparedness for the first presidency. Of the total sample, approximately 9 out of 10 (89%) felt they were well prepared, with 41% feeling they were very well prepared, and 48% feeling they were moderately well prepared. Approximately 1 out of 10 (11%) felt they were somewhat prepared or unprepared. Of the mentored group, 42.3% felt they were very well prepared for their first presidency, 49.5% moderately well prepared, 8.2% somewhat prepared, and none thought they were unprepared. Of the non-mentored group, 39.4% felt they were very well prepared for their first presidency, 47.0% moderately well prepared, 11.1% somewhat prepared, and 2.5% unprepared. Based on the results of an independent samples *t*-test, no statistically significant difference was found between overall preparation for the first presidency between the mentored and non-mentored groups (*t* = -0.951, p=0.342, two tailed). See Table 4.7 for findings from the independent *t* tests.

Table 4.6

Preparation for the Community College Presidency (N=415)

	Percent		
Variable	Mentor	No Mentor	Total
Perception of Overall Preparation for the 1st Presidency			
Very Well Prepared	42.3	39.4	40.8
Moderately Well Prepared	49.5	47.0	48.2
Somewhat Prepared	8.2	11.1	9.7
Unprepared	0.0	2.5	1.3

Table 4.7

Independent Samples t-test for Overall Preparation for the First Presidency between

Mentored and Non-mentored Presidents (N=415)

			t-test for Equality of Means		
			Sig.	Difference	
Variable	*t*	df	(2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Perception of Overall Preparation for the 1st Presidency	-0.951	413	0.342	-0.076	0.080

Preparation in AACC's Competencies

3. **To what extent do mentored versus non-mentored presidents rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?**

Table 4.8 shows the results of how the 415 community college presidents in the study who participated in a mentor-protégé relationship and those who did not participate in a mentor-protégé relationship differed in their perception of their preparation to practice the leadership skills embedded in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* Results are based on presidents' responses to the AACC's endorsed six competency

domains: organizational strategy, resource management, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism.

Organizational Strategy

Over the total sample, approximately four out of five presidents indicated they were prepared or well prepared in the organizational strategy domain. Almost 85% rated themselves prepared or well prepared in the develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at their institution. The mentoring and non-mentoring groups rated themselves at 86.3% and 82.8% respectively in this category. In regards to using data driven decisions to plan strategically, the overall sample rated themselves 79.6% prepared in this category, the mentored group rated themselves 82.9% prepared, and the non-mentored group rated themselves 76.6% prepared.

In rating themselves prepared to use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of student and the community, the overall sample was 73.3% prepared, the mentored group was 76.6% prepared, and the non-mentored group was 69.9% prepared. When looking at preparation in developing a positive environment that supports innovation, team work, and successful outcomes, the overall sample rated themselves as 90.4% prepared, the mentored group rated themselves as 91.2% prepared and the non-mentored group rated themselves as 89.4% prepared.

When rating themselves as prepared or well prepared in the ability to maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and assets, the total sample was 77.8% prepared, the mentored group was 75.1% prepared, and the non-mentored group was 80.9% prepared.

Table 4.8

Perceptions of Preparation for First President in AACC Competencies for Community

College Leaders (N=415)

Variable	Percent Prepared/Well-Prepared		
	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total (for both)
Organizational Strategy			
Develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at your institution.	86.3	82.8	84.6
Use data-driven decision making practices to plan strategically.	82.9	76.6	79.6
Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community.	76.6	69.9	73.3
Develop a positive environment that support innovation, team work, and successful outcomes.	91.2	89.4	90.4
Maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and assets.	75.1	80.9	77.8
Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.	79.5	80.9	80.2
Resource Management			
Ensure accountability in reporting.	78.0	82.3	80.3
Support operational decisions by managing information resources.	67.8	75.1	71.4
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan.	79.5	78.9	79.3
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.	59.5	63.6	61.4
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.	77.6	77.5	77.4

Table 4.8 (continued)

Variable	Percent Prepared/Well-Prepared		
	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total (for both)
Resource Management (continued)			
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.	71.7	77.5	74.4
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	82.4	83.3	82.9
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.	84.9	82.3	83.6
Communication			
Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences.	87.8	84.2	86.0
Disseminate and support policies and strategies.	80.1	85.4	82.8
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.	91.5	91.7	91.6
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents.	89.5	92.2	90.8
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage and act.	87.3	89.5	88.4
Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.	89.5	89.8	89.6
Collaboration			
Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas and communication styles.	80.9	84.6	82.8
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society	72.8	66.3	69.5
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.	86.6	85.6	86.1

Table 4.8 (continued)

Variable	Percent Prepared/Well-Prepared		
	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total (for both)
Collaboration (continued)			
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college.	81.7	81.5	81.6
Work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations.	63.4	74.3	70.0
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.	84.6	89.1	86.9
Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.	90.8	91.5	91.1
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making.	87.7	85.2	88.4
Community College Advocacy			
Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.	86.2	84.1	85.2
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through teaching and learning.	85.6	85.6	85.6
Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college.	93.7	90.7	92.2
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.	92.6	89.2	90.9
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning centered environment.	91.1	88.6	89.8
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education.	89.5	88.7	89.1

Table 4.8 (continued)

Variable	Percent Prepared/Well-Prepared		
	Mentor N=205	No Mentor N=209	Total (for both)
Professionalism			
Demonstrate transformational leadership.	77.1	73.7	75.4
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.	88.4	84.1	86.2
Regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.	83.1	83.7	83.4
Support lifelong learning for self and others.	88.3	91.3	89.8
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.	64.6	73.5	69.1
Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.	88.3	89.2	88.7
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.	81.4	75.4	78.3
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.	94.1	95.4	94.8
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.	88.7	87.1	87.9
Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.	85.1	90.8	88.0
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications.	70.2	70.9	70.6

The mentored and non-mentored groups were fairly equal with the sample when assessing their preparedness for the ability to align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan at 80.2% (sample), 79.5% (mentored), and 80.9% (non-mentored), respectively.

Resource Management

Of the 415 community college presidents who responded to the survey, three out of four responded as prepared or well prepared overall in the resource management domain. This is consistent with the mentored and non-mentored groups as well, with both resulting in about 75% being prepared or well prepared in this domain. The lowest perception of preparation in this domain for all groups was the ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources at 61.4% (sample), 59.5% (mentored), and 63.6% (non-mentored). More than four out of five presidents in all three groups felt prepared to employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills along with the ability to manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long term viability of the organization. The presidents in all three groups were consistent in their perception of their preparation to implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities at 77%.

Four out of five (80.3%) of the overall sample perceived they were prepared to ensure accountability in reporting while the mentored group was 78% prepared and the non-mentored group was 82.3% prepared. For the ability to support operational decisions by managing information resources, the overall sample was 71.4% prepared while the mentored group was 67.8% prepared, and the non-mentored group was 75.1% prepared. All three groups were consistent at around 79% in being prepared or well prepared to develop

and manage resources consistent with the college master plan while implementing a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff. The preparedness of the groups at 74.4% for the overall sample, 71.7% for the mentored group, and 77.5% for the non-mentored group.

Communication

Communication was one of the higher rated domains in the study. The overall sample rated their preparedness to articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences at 86%, with the mentored group at 87.8% and the non-mentored group at 84.2%. In rating themselves prepared or well prepared to disseminate and support policies and strategies, the sample rated themselves 82.8% prepared, the mentored group 80.1% prepared, and the non-mentored group 85.4% prepared.

The overall sample rated themselves as 90.8% prepared or well prepared to effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents while the mentored group preparedness was 89.5%, and the non-mentored group preparedness was 92.2%. Almost 85% of the sample presidents rated themselves prepared or well prepared to listen actively to understand, analyze, engage, and act. The mentored and non-mentored groups rated themselves at 87.3% and 89.5%, respectively, in this category. In their perceived preparation in the ability to project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully, the sample responded consistently at almost 90%, as well as reporting consistent results for create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations at almost 92%.

Collaboration

Of the 415 community college presidents who responded to the survey, four out of five responded as prepared or well-prepared overall in the collaboration domain. This is consistent with the mentored and non-mentored groups as well with both resulting in about 80% being prepared or well prepared in this domain. There were two categories in this domain where all groups were low in preparation compared to the other categories in the domain. The first was demonstrate cultural competence in a global society at 69.5% for the total sample, 72.8% for the mentored group, and 66.3% for the non-mentored group. The second relatively low category was work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations; the total sample registered at 70.0%, the mentored group at 63.4%, and the non-mentored group at 74.3%. Categories where all three groups were similar in preparation were involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good at 86%; establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college at 82%; and develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation at 91%. For embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles, 82.8% of the total sample were prepared or well prepared, 80.9% of the mentored group and 84.6% of the non-mentored group were prepared or well prepared. In regards to manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationship, 86.9% of the total sample felt they were prepared or well prepared in this area while 84.6% of the mentored group and 89.1% of the non-mentored group felt the same. In the mentored group, 87.7% felt they were prepared or well prepared for facilitating shared problem solving and decision making,

while in the non-mentored group, 85.2% felt prepared, and 88.4% of the total sample felt prepared in this area.

Community College Advocacy

Community college advocacy was a highly rated domain by the respondents to the survey. Approximately 9 out of 10 (89%) felt prepared or well prepared in this domain. The total sample, mentored group, and non-mentored group had similar scores on preparedness for the categories of: demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through teaching and learning at 85.6% and represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education at 89%. For value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence, 85.2% of the total sample felt they were prepared or well prepared, while 86.2% of the mentored group and 84.1% of the non-mentored group were prepared or well prepared in this area. The total sample, as well as the mentored and non-mentored groups, felt prepared or well prepared in the ability to promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college at 92.2%, 93.7% and 90.7%, respectively. The mentored group led the way in preparedness for advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same at 92.6%, while 89.2% of the non-mentored group felt prepared or well prepared in this area, and 90.9% of the total sample felt prepared or well prepared. About 90% of the total sample felt prepared or well prepared in the area of advance lifelong learning and support a learning centered environment. In the mentored group, 91.1% felt prepared or well prepared while 88.6% of the non-mentored group felt they were prepared in this area.

Professionalism

Overall, four out of five of current community college presidents in the sample were prepared or well prepared in the professionalism domain. The total sample, mentored group, and non-mentored group shared similar results in the following areas: regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation at 83%; demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility at approximately 89%; promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people at approximately 95%; use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge at 88%; and contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications at approximately 71%. The lowest rated area by the total sample was manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor at 69.1%. The mentor group rated themselves lower than the sample at 64.6%; the non-mentored group, however, rated themselves higher than the total sample, and the mentored group in this area rated themselves at 73.5%. In rating their preparedness in the ability to demonstrate transformational leadership, 75.4% of the total sample felt prepared or well prepared in this area while 77.1% of the mentored group and 73.7% of the non-mentored group felt the same. When it came to the area of demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college, 88.4% of the mentored group felt prepared or well prepared as did 84.1% of the non-mentored group and 86.2% of the total sample.

The non-mentored group rated themselves the highest in support lifelong learning for self and others at 91.3% followed by the total sample at 89.8% and the mentored group at

88.3% prepared or well prepared. For the area of understanding the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others, 81.4% of the mentored group felt prepared or well prepared in this area, while75.4% of the non-mentored group felt prepared and 78.3% of the total sample felt prepared. When it came to weighing short-term and long-term goals in decision-making, 88.0% of the total sample felt prepared or well prepared, while 85.1% of the mentored group and 90.8% of the non-mentored group felt the same.

Independent samples *t*-tests were preformed on the mentored and non-mentored groups to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in preparedness for the first presidency within any of the areas in the six domains in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* Based on the results of independent samples *t*-tests, there was only one statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level found between the groups in all the areas of the six domains. The mentored group was more prepared to use a systems perspective to assess and respond to needs of the students and the community than was the non-mentored group with a statistically significant score of *t* = 2.018, p=0.044. See Table 4.9 for a summary of the results for all areas in the six domains of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.*

Preparation for the First Presidency by Mentor Relationship

4.   **To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?**

In order to determine if the type of mentoring relationship community college presidents participated in or did not participate in influenced how they rated their overall

Table 4.9

Independent Samples t-test for Perceptions of Preparation for First Presidency in AACC

Competencies for Community College Leaders between Mentored and Non-Mentored

Presidents (N=415)

Variable			*t*-test for Equality of Means		
			Sig.	Difference	
	t	df	(2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Organizational Strategy					
Develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at your institution.	-0.410	412	0.682	-0.034	0.082
Use data-driven decision making practices to plan strategically.	0.388	412	0.699	0.033	0.085
Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community.	2.018	412	0.044*	0.189	0.094
Develop a positive environment that support innovation, team work, and successful outcomes.	-0.501	412	0.616	-0.035	0.069
Maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and assets.	-1.829	412	0.068	-0.148	0.081
Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.	1.239	411	0.216	0.110	0.089
Resource Management					
Ensure accountability in reporting.	-1.700	412	0.090	-0.160	0.094
Support operational decisions by managing information resources.	-0.429	412	0.668	-0.039	0.092

*$p<.05$

Table 4.9 (continued)

| Variable | | | *t*-test for Equality of Means | | |
| | | | | Difference | |
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Resource Management (continued)					
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan.	-0.654	412	0.514	-0.064	0.097
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources	0.311	412	0.756	0.036	0.115
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.	-0.177	412	0.859	-0.017	0.094
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.	-0.951	412	0.342	-0.090	0.094
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	-0.454	412	0.650	-0.040	0.088
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.	0.000	412	1.00	0.000	0.088
Communication					
Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences	-0.007	412	0.995	0.000	0.102
Disseminate and support policies and strategies	-0.500	412	0.617	-0.053	0.105
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations	0.106	412	0.916	0.011	0.103

Table 4.9 (continued)

| Variable | | | *t*-test for Equality of Means | | |
| | | | | Difference | |
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Communication (continued)					
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents.	-0.040	412	0.968	-0.004	0.106
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage and act.	0.014	412	0.989	0.001	0.098
Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.	-0.070	412	0.945	-0.007	0.105
Collaboration					
Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas and communication styles.	1.194	412	0.233	0.169	0.142
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society.	1.150	412	0.251	0.174	0.151
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.	1.616	412	0.107	0.222	0.138
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college.	1.133	412	0.258	0.170	0.150
Work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations.	-0.457	412	0.648	-0.068	0.149
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.	0.078	412	0.938	0.010	0.131
Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.	0.278	412	0.781	0.037	0.133
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making.	0.347	412	0.729	0.046	0.134

Table 4.9 (continued)

| Variable | | | *t*-test for Equality of Means | | |
| | | | | Difference | |
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Community College Advocacy					
Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.	0.919	412	0.359	0.149	0.163
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through teaching and learning.	0.750	412	0.453	0.122	0.162
Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college.	0.606	412	0.545	0.094	0.155
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.	0.327	412	0.744	0.051	0.155
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning centered environment.	0.309	412	0.757	0.050	0.160
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education.	0.539	412	0.590	0.085	0.157
Professionalism					
Demonstrate transformational leadership.	0.825	412	0.410	0.145	0.176
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.	1.091	412	0.276	0.175	0.160
Regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.	0.560	412	0.576	0.089	0.160

Table 4.9 (continued)

| Variable | | | *t*-test for Equality of Means | | |
| | | | | Difference | |
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error
Professionalism (continued)					
Regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.	0.560	412	0.576	0.089	0.160
Support lifelong learning for self and others.	0.323	412	0.747	0.050	0.153
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.	-0.880	412	0.379	-0.153	0.174
Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.	0.644	412	0.520	0.100	0.155
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.	1.007	412	0.314	0.173	0.172
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.	1.008	412	0.314	0.152	0.151
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.	0.780	412	0.436	0.131	0.168
Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.	0.298	412	0.766	0.048	0.162
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications.	0.957	412	0.339	0.167	0.174

preparation for their first presidency, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used to test for differences among more than two comparative groups (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For this study, an ANOVA will be used to determine if there is a difference between community college presidents that were involved in formal mentoring relationships, informal mentoring relationships, and those presidents with no mentor relationship compared to their overall preparation for the presidency. A p-value of $< .05$ was established for statistical significance. Results between the groups showed a sum of squares (SS) = 1.199, degrees of freedom (df) = 3, the mean square (MS) = 0.600, f-ration (F) = 0892, and the significance (p) = 0.411 (see Table 4.10). Because the p value was greater than .05, no statistical significance was found between community college presidents who were formally mentored, informally mentored, or had no mentor relationship when it came to their perception of overall preparation for their first presidency.

Table 4.10

One-Way ANOVA of Dependent Variable Overall Perception of Preparedness for First Presidency by Mentor Relationship (Formal, Informal, or No Mentor) (N=415)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Overall Prepared for First Presidency	Between	1.199	2	0.600	0.892	0.411
	Within	276.960	412	0.672		
	Total	278.159	414			

Type of Mentoring Relationship

5. **To what extent do formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and presidents with no mentors rate themselves as prepared in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*?**

In order to determine if the type of mentoring relationship community college presidents participated in or did not participate in influenced how they rated their preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the six domains of the AACC's competencies: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism combined as construct variables as well as on the individual statements under each construct. An ANOVA was used to determine if there was a difference between community college presidents who were involved in formal mentoring relationships, informal mentoring relationships, or no mentor relationships and their overall preparation for the presidency. Again, a *p*-value of $< .05$ was established for statistical significance.

Organizational Strategy

Within the organization strategy domain of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders,* no statistically significant results were found. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

Resource Management

Within the resource management domain of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders,* no statistically significant results were found. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

Table 4.11

One-Way ANOVA of Dependent Variable Perception of Preparedness in AACC

Competencies as Constructs by Mentor Relationship (Formal, Informal, or No Mentor)

(N=415)

Dependent Variable	Groups	SS	df	MS	F	p
Organization Strategy	Between	10.983	2	5.491	0.493	0.611
	Within	4579.290	411	11.142		
	Total	4590.273	413			
Resource Management	Between	26.415	2	13.207	0.395	0.674
	Within	13733.279	411	27.551		
	Total		413			
Communication	Between	170.038	2	85.019	3.086	0.047*
	Within	11323.489	411	27.551		
	Total	11493.527	413			
Collaboration	Between	905.906	2	452.953	4.525	0.011*
	Within	41142.519	411	100.103		
	Total	42048.425	413			
Community College Advocacy	Between	162.069	2	81.034	0.990	0.372
	Within	33624.639	411	81.812		
	Total	33786.708	413			
Professionalism	Between	994.282	2	497.141	1.849	0.159
	Within	110524.745	411	81.812		
	Total	111519.027	413			

*p<.05

Communication

The communication construct variable was found to be significant at the *p*-value of <.05. The *p* value for the communication construct was *p*=0.047. Between the groups, results are as follows: the sum of squares (SS) = 170.038, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 85.019, f-ratio = 3.086, and the significance (*p*) = 0.047

In the specific competencies with in the communication construct, statistical significance at the *p*-value of < .05 was found in the following area: dissemination and support policies and strategies. Results between the groups are: sum of squares (SS) = 10.450, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 5.225, f-ratio (F) = 4.662, and the significance of (*p*) = 0.010. Post Hoc Scheffe and Tukey test found that formally mentored group rated themselves significantly more prepared than the informally mentored group and the non-mentored group. The rest of the areas under the communication domain were not found to be statistically significant. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

Collaboration

The collaboration construct variable was found to be significant at the *p*-value of <.05. The *p* value for the collaboration construct was *p*=0.011. Results between groups showed: sum of squares (SS) = 905.906, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 452.953, f-ratio = 4.525, and the significance (*p*) = 0.011. Formally mentored presidents rated themselves significantly more prepared than informally mentored and non-mentored presidents.

In the specific competencies within the collaboration construct, statistical significance at the *p*-value of < .05 was found in the following area: demonstrate cultural competence in a global society. Results between the groups were: sum of squares (SS) =

17.623, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 8.811, f-ration (F) = 3.790, and the significance (p) = 0.023. Formally mentored presidents rated themselves more prepared than informally mentored and non-mentored presidents.

Statistical significance at the p-value of < .01 was found in the following area: involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good. Results showed that between the groups, the sum of squares (SS) = 23.523, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 11.761, f-ration (F) = 6.135, and the significance (p) = 0.002. Formally mentored presidents rated themselves more prepared than informally mentored and non-mentored presidents.

Statistical significance was also found at the p-value of < .001 in the following area: establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college. Results between the groups showed: sum of squares (SS) = 37.568, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 18.784, f-ration (F) = 9.330, and the significance (p) = 0.000. Again, formally mentored presidents rated themselves more prepared than informally mentored presidents and non-mentored presidents.

A fourth statistically significant area in the collaboration domain at the p-value of < .05 was: facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making. Results between the groups showed the following: sum of squares (SS) = 15.506, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = 7.753, f-ration (F) = 4.261, and the significance (p) = 0.015. Formally mentored presidents rated themselves more prepared than informally mentored presidents and non-mentored presidents

The remaining areas under the collaboration domain were not found to be statistically significant. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

Community College Advocacy

Within the community college advocacy domain of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders,* no statistically significant results were found. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

Professionalism

With in the professionalism domain of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders,* no statistically significant results were found. See Table 4.11 for detailed results.

It should be noted that the sample size for the formally mentored presidents was very small at 32 respondents compared to 172 for the informally mentored presidents group and 211 for the non-mentored group. With such a small group included in this test, caution should be used when drawing conclusions from these results.

<div align="center">

Regression Analysis

</div>

6. **To what extent do background characteristics, professional development, and ratings of preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* predict how mentored and non-mentored community college presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency?**

Multiple regression analysis was conducted on both the mentored and non-mentored community college presidents to predict overall perceptions of being prepared for their first presidency from certain background characteristics, professional development, and self ratings of preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* A regression analysis was run separately on each group, mentored and non-mentored, using the

Table 4.12

One-Way ANOVA of Dependent Variable Perception of Preparedness in AACC

Competencies by Mentor Relationship (Formal, Informal, or No Mentor)(N=415)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Organizational Strategy						
Develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at your institution.	Between	0.437	2	0.218	0.311	0.733
	Within	288.938	411	0.703		
	Total	289.374	413			
Use data-driven decision making practices to plan strategically.	Between	0.237	2	0.118	0.159	0.853
	Within	306.304	411	0.745		
	Total	306.541	413			
Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community.	Between	4.597	2	2.299	2.544	0.080
	Within	371.316	411	0.906		
	Total	375.913	413			
Develop a positive environment that support innovation, team work, and successful outcomes.	Between	0.921	2	0.461	0.938	0.392
	Within	201.960	411	0.491		
	Total	202.882	413			
Maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and assets.	Between	2.666	2	1.333	1.963	0.142
	Within	279.027	411	0.679		
	Total	281.693	413			
Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.	Between	1.556	2	0.778	0.960	0.384
	Within	333.101	411	0.679		
	Total	334.657	413			
Resource Management						
Ensure accountability in reporting	Between	3.429	2	1.714	1.865	0.156
	Within	377.866	411	0.919		
	Total	381.295	413			
Support operational decisions by managing information resources	Between	2.370	2	1.185	1.354	0.259
	Within	359.758	411	0.871		
	Total	362.128	413			

Table 4.12 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Resource Management (continued)						
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan	Between	2.720	2	1.360	1.395	0.249
	Within	400.828	411	0.875		
	Total	403.548	413			
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources	Between	0.708	2	0.354	0.256	0.774
	Within	567.884	411	1.382		
	Total	568.592	414			
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services,staff, and facilities.	Between	0.959	2	0.480	0.522	0.594
	Within	377.997	411	0.920		
	Total	378.957	413			
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff	Between	1.037	2	0.519	0.563	0.570
	Within	378.627	411	0.921		
	Total	379.664	413			
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	Between	0.602	2	0.301	0.379	0.685
	Within	326.702	411	0.795		
	Total	327.304	413			
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization	Between	0.594	2	0.297	0.367	0.693
	Within	332.781	411	0.795		
	Total	333.374	413			
Communication						
Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences	Between	2.526	2	1.263	1.179	0.309
	Within	4400.356	411	1.071		
	Total	442.882	413			
Disseminate and support policies and strategies	Between	10.450	2	5.225	4.662	0.010*
	Within	459.813	411	1.119		
	Total	471.576	413			
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations	Between	5.942	2	2.971	2.740	0.066
	Within	445.664	411	1.084		
	Total	451.606	413			

*p<.05

Table 4.12 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Communication (continued)						
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents	Between	2.409	2	1.204	1.034	0.356
	Within	478.683	411	1.165		
	Total	481.092	413			
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage and act	Between	3.568	2	1.784	1.825	0.162
	Within	401.758	411	0.978		
	Total	405.326	413			
Project confidence & respond responsibly and tactfully	Between	5.561	2	2.780	2.475	0.085
	Within	461.656	411	1.123		
	Total	467.217	413			
Collaboration						
Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas and communication styles.	Between	8.595	2	4.297	2.081	0.126
	Within	848.903	411	2.065		
	Total	857.498	413			
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society	Between	17.623	2	8.811	3.790	0.023*
	Within	955.578	411	2.325		
	Total	973.200	413			
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.	Between	23.523	2	11.761	6.135	0.002**
	Within	787.977	411	1.917		
	Total	811.500	413			
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college.	Between	37.568	2	18.784	8.330	.000***
	Within	926.762	411	2.255		
	Total	964.331	413			
Work effectively and board diplomatically with legislators, members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations.	Between	10.428	2	5.214	2.302	0.101
	Within	930.898	411	2.265		
	Total	941.326	413			

*** $p<.001$, **$p<.01$, *$p<.05$

Table 4.12 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Groups	SS	df	MS	F	p
Collaboration (continued)						
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships	Between	7.329	2	3.664	2.075	0.127
	Within	725.879	411	1.766		
	Total	733.208	413			
Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation	Between	8.823	2	4.411	2.451	0.088
	Within	739.834	411	1.800		
	Total	748.657	413			
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making	Between	15.506	2	7.753	4.261	0.015*
	Within	747.789	411	1.819		
	Total	763.295	413			
Community College Advocacy						
Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.	Between	4.718	2	2.359	0.863	0.423
	Within	1123.439	411	2.733		
	Total	1128.157	413			
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through teaching and learning.	Between	2.883	2	1.441	0.529	0.590
	Within	1119.477	411	2.724		
	Total	1122.360	413			
Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college.	Between	5.325	2	2.663	1.073	0.343
	Within	1019.827	411	2.481		
	Total	1025.152	413			
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.	Between	5.546	2	2.773	1.113	0.329
	Within	1023.654	411	2.491		
	Total	1029.200	413			
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning centered environment	Between	3.277	2	1.638	0.615	0.541
	Within	1094.136	411	2.662		
	Total	1097.413	413			

*$p<.05$

Table 4.12 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Community College Advocacy (continued)						
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education.	Between	7.355	2	3.677	1.443	0.237
	Within	1047.080	411	2.548		
	Total	1054.435	413			
Professionalism						
Demonstrate transformational leadership.	Between	12.828	2	6.414	2.021	0.134
	Within	1304.633	411	3.174		
	Total	1317.461	413			
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.	Between	4.558	2	2.279	0.859	0.424
	Within	1090.737	411	2.654		
	Total	1095.295	413			
Regularly self-assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.	Between	2.483	2	1.242	0.471	0.625
	Within	1083.217	411	2.636		
	Total	1085.700	413			
Support lifelong learning for self and others.	Between	8.299	2	4.149	1.716	0.181
	Within	993.750	411	2.418		
	Total	1002.048	413			
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.	Between	9.343	2	4.672	1.504	0.224
	Within	1276.872	411	3.107		
	Total	1286.215	413			
Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.	Between	9.637	2	4.818	1.953	0.143
	Within	1014.056	411	2.467		
	Total	1023.693	413			
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others	Between	14.954	2	7.477	2.476	0.085
	Within	1241.377	411	3.020		
	Total	1256.331	413			

*p<.05

Table 4.12 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Groups	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Professionalism (continued)						
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty,and respect for people	Between Within Total	10.126 965.567 975.693	2 411 413	5.063 2.349	2.155	0.117
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge	Between Within Total	9.548 1189.803 1202.328	2 411 414	4.774 2.895	1.646	0.194
Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making	Between Within Total	9.964 1113.836 1123.937	2 411 414	4.982 2.710	1.839	0.160
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications	Between Within Total	14.685 1286.138 1300.824	2 411 413	7.343 3.129	2.346	0.097

same independent variable blocks. Sample size for the mentored presidents regression

analysis was N=205, and the sample size for the non-mentored presidents was N=206. The

results of the three model regression analyses are presented in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14. In

Model 1, variables on age, gender and race/ethnicity recoded in to white/non-white. Model

2 added president's major field of study in highest degree earned, participation in leadership

development program outside of a graduate studies, participation in a Grow You Own

Leadership Program, and previous experience teaching at the community college.

Experience teaching at the community college was recoded into yes or no and therefore did

not differentiate between full or part-time teaching experience. The third model entered in

Table 4.13

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Mentored Community College

Presidents' Perception of Preparation for the First Presidency (N=205)

	Standardized regression coefficients (β)		
Variable Blocks	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographics			
Age	-0.106	-0.100	-0.074
Gender	-0.094	-0.151*	-0.129*
Race (white/non-white)	-0.104	-0.094	-0.108
Professional Development			
Major in highest degree earned		-0.174*	-0.160**
Participation in Leadership Development		0.236**	0.219***
Participation in GYOL		0.098	0.109
Taught at Community College (yes/no)		0.028	-0.002
Preparation in AACC Competencies			
Organizational Strategy			0.329***
Resources Management			0.061
Communication			-0.109
Collaboration			0.218*
Community College Advocacy			-0.113
Professionalism			-0.473**
R^2	0.018	0.074	0.365

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Community College presidents' perceived preparation in the AACC's leadership

competency constructs.

In the first block, there was one significant finding for the mentored community

college presidents and no significant findings for the non-mentored community college

presidents. For the mentored presidents, there was a statistically significant difference ($p =$

0.031) between gender and perception of overall preparedness for the first presidency.

Mentored presidents had negative standardized coefficients (β = -0.129) for gender

Table 4.14

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Non-Mentored Community

College Presidents' Perception of Preparation for the First Presidency (N=206)

	Standardized regression coefficients (β)		
Variable Blocks	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Demographics			
Age	0.075	0.087	0.025
Gender	0.056	0.047	0.041
Race (white/non-white)	0.024	0.010	-0.097
Professional Development			
Major in highest degree earned		-0.081	-0.071
Participation in Leadership Development		-0.071	-0.017
Participation in GYOL		-0.024	-0.026
Taught at Community College (yes/no)		0.057	0.016
Preparation in AACC Competencies			
Organizational Strategy			0.283***
Resources Management			0.260**
Communication			-0.014
Collaboration			-0.075
Community College Advocacy			0.090
Professionalism			-0.567***
R^2	-0.004	-0.010	0.374

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

indicating that male presidents felt more prepared overall for the first presidency than did

female presidents.

In the second block, the mentored community college presidents in this study had

two statistically significant findings, while the non-mentored community college presidents

had no significant findings. The mentored presidents group's significant finds were in the

areas of: major field of study in highest degree earned ($p = 0.007$) and in participation in a

formalized leadership program ($p = 0.000$). Major field of study in highest degree earned had a negative beta score ($\beta = -0.160$) indicating that those mentored presidents who majored in higher education with an emphasis in community college leadership felt better prepared overall when they assumed their first presidency. Participation in a formalized leadership program had a negative beta ($\beta = -0.219$) indicating that participation in a formalized leadership program better prepared them for the community college presidency.

In the third block, statistical significance was found in both the mentored and the non-mentored community college presidents in their perceived preparation in the AACC leadership competencies constructs. The mentored group had statistically significant findings in Organizational Strategy ($p = 0.000$), Collaboration ($p = 0.032$) and Professionalism ($p = 0.001$). Organizational Strategy ($\beta = 0.329$) and Collaboration ($\beta = 0.218$) had positive standardized coefficients indicating mentored presidents felt more prepared for their first presidency when they felt prepared in these areas as well. Professionalism, however, had a negative beta ($\beta = -0.473$) indicating that those mentored presidents rating themselves as prepared in the Professionalism construct thought themselves less prepared overall for the first presidency.

The non-mentored group, had statically significant findings for the AACC competency constructs of Organizational Strategy ($p = 0.000$), Resources Management ($p = 0.003$), and Professionalism ($p = 0.000$). Both Organizational Strategy ($\beta = 0.283$) and Resource Management ($\beta = 0.260$) had positive beta scores indicating that being prepared in these areas was beneficial in overall preparation for the community college presidency. As with the mentored group, the Professionalism construct had a negative beta score

(β = -0.567) indicating that being prepared in this area was not helpful in the overall preparation for the first presidency.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

In summary, for the first two blocks, the mentored presidents had statistically significant results for gender, majoring in a higher education program with an emphasis in community college leadership, and participating in a formalized leadership program, while the non-mentored presidents had no significant finds. The third block of AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* constructs found that both mentored and non-mentored presidents had statistically significant predictors. Both groups found preparation in Organizational Strategy construct to be a positive predictor of overall preparation. Both groups also found preparation in Professionalism to be a negative predictor of overall preparation for the community college presidency. Where the groups differed, mentored presidents had a positive association with being prepared in the Collaboration construct and their perceived preparation for first presidency, while non-mentored presidents had a positive association with the Resources Management construct and perceived preparation for the first community college presidency.

Chapter 5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter discusses the major findings, conclusions, relationships to other studies, implications for policy and practice, and implications for future research. The purpose of this quantitative study was to better understand how mentoring assisted current community college presidents in preparation for their first community college presidency. The study went further to examine the role of mentoring relationships in preparation for the first presidency based on the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* While the primary focus of this study was on leadership preparation and the role having a mentor played in that, conclusions about mentoring relationships intent was complimentary to the study.

The results of this study are intended to provide useful information to a wide range of people involved with leadership development of future community college leaders, including individuals engaged in university based community college leadership programs, individuals in charge of mentoring programs, and individuals in charge of professional development, leadership development, and GYOL programs at community colleges. Perspective presidents and current senior administrators at community colleges could benefit from this study by using the information to focus a potential mentoring relationship with a current or past community college president. Current community college presidents could use the results of this study as a foundation to cultivate future community college leaders through the use of mentoring programs and professional relationships. Governing boards of community colleges could use the results of this study to set up mentoring programs to enhance leadership succession planning and programming. In summary, the findings from this study should provide new insight about the skills needed to face the challenges of the

community college presidency in the future and how mentoring can help fill those skills needed by potential or future community college leaders.

Demographic Characteristics

The first research question was designed to establish a general demographic profile of mentored and non-mentored community college presidents, specifically, age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Age

The average age of community college presidents is increasing. This is not surprising with the anticipation of a large number of community college presidents retiring in the next 10 years (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The average age of both female and male community college presidents is 58, with the most common age reported (mode) as 60. Ages ranged from 29 to 73 with 90% of the respondents between 50 and 69 years of age. The greatest percentage of presidents is in the 50–59 age range. The majority of female presidents were in the 50–59 age range (58%), while the highest percentage (47.1%) of males fell in the 60–69 age range. The average age of Caucasian presidents responding to the survey was 57.5 years old, while the average age of minority presidents was 55 years old. Of the presidents who had a mentor prior to their first presidency, 51% were 50–59 years old compared to 42% of the non-mentored presidents in the same age group. The mentored group had a slightly lower percentage in the 60–69 age group (41%) compared to the non-mentored group (47%). The non-mentored group was slightly older than the mentored group as 49% of the non-mentored group was 60 years of age or older, and the mentored group had 41% of the respondents older than 60. Fifty-nine percent of the mentored group was 59 or younger compared to 51% of the non-mentored group.

These finding indicate that little has changed over the last decade as the figures from this study are remarkably similar to other studies of community college presidents (Duree, 2007; Vaughan & Weisman, 1998; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Differences are noted, however, when comparing the average age of community college presidents over the last two decades. The average age of community college presidents was 51 years old in 1984, 54 years old in 1996, and 56 years old in 2001 (Duree, 2007; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The number of presidents aged 50 to 69 years old in 2007 confirms that the shortage in community college leadership is real and will continue to need to be addressed.

Gender

This study further substantiates that nationally the number of female presidents continues to grow, but not as fast as in the 1990s. According to Weisman and Vaughan (2007), in 1991 11% of community college presidents were female compared to 29% in 2006. More than a 20% increase in the number of female presidents has occurred since 1991. The annual increase in the number of female presidents, however, has slowed since 2001 when the number of female presidents was reported at 28% (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Findings from this study showed a slight increase to 32% of community college presidents being female while approximately two-thirds (68%) of the community college presidents were male. Females are still underrepresented in the community college presidency when compared to the number of female students and faculty in community colleges (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; VanDerLinden, 2005). The percentage of female presidents does not reflect the percentage of female students enrolled in public two-year institutions. In 2009, 58% of the of students enrolled in community colleges were females (AACC, 2009).

Brown (2005) found that mentorship plays a critical role in advancing female college presidents up the administrative ladder. The current study found that a larger percentage of female presidents (42%) had mentors than those who didn't (21%). It appears that mentoring could be a way to increase the number of female presidents at community colleges. Socialization and the lack of female role models affect women's career development by limiting their exposure to nontraditional career opportunities (Townsend, 1995). If community colleges are to be true to their "open door" missions for students, the same should be true for administrative positions. Community college leaders should look to increase the number of female presidents in future decades by supporting professional development opportunities including mentoring of females in the community college administration pipeline.

Race/Ethnicity

Four out of five (81.1%) community college presidents responding to this survey were White/Caucasian. Among other race/ethnicity groups, 8.3% were Black/African American, 5.8% were Hispanic/Latino, 2.2% were Native American, and 1.9% were Asian/Pacific Islander. In the decade previous, Vaughan and Weisman (1998) reported the breakdown of race/ethnicity of community college president as 85.6% Caucasian, 5.2% African American, 4.9% Hispanic, 1.9% Native American, and 1.5% Asian American. From this study, community college presidents with mentors were slightly more diverse than those presidents without mentors, 78.5% White/Caucasian versus 83.6% White/Caucasian. Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino groups were more represented in the mentored presidents' group.

Over the last decade, the community college presidency has become slightly more diverse. The race/ethnicity breakdown, however, does not match the race/ethnicity makeup of the community college student. According to the AACC (2009), 36% of community college students are minorities, while 64% are Caucasian/White. The most underrepresented race/ethnicity group when comparing percentage of students to community college presidents is the Hispanic/Latino group. Hispanic/Latinos make up 16% of the community college enrollments, yet less than 6% of the nation's community college presidents are Hispanic. Mentored presidents had higher percentages of Hispanic (6.8%) and African/American (9.8%) presidents compared to the non-mentored presidents (4.8% Hispanic and 3.4% African/American). If community colleges are to embrace the diversity exhibited by their student demographics, additional efforts are required to increase the number of minorities in leadership positions that lead to the presidency as well as the number of presidents from minority groups, specifically in academic positions such as instructors, chairs, and deans as academics continues to be the pathway to the presidency (Duree, 2007). Much in the same way that Brown (2005) found that mentorship plays a critical role in advancing female college presidents up the administrative ladder, it appears mentoring can do the same for minority groups seeking the presidency. Further study is required in this area.

Despite modest gains over the past 20 years in the number of women and minorities in community college presidencies, the preferred demographics of a community college president have not changed. McFarlin et al. (1999) identified the demographics of an outstanding community college president as a white male with a doctoral degree in his 50s. Not much has changed over the last decade; this current study, along with Weisman and

Vaughan (2007) and Duree (2007), found that over three quarters of the nation's community college presidents still share these common characteristics.

Formal Education

A doctorate degree continues to be the key to obtaining a community college presidency. Results from this study reveal 86% of the total sample have earned a doctorate. This finding was consistent with previous studies as Weisman and Vaughan (2007) found 88% of community college presidents had their doctorate, while 87% of presidents had their doctorate in 2000 (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002). There was little difference between presidents who earned a PhD (42%) versus those who earned a EdD (44%). The mentored and non-mentored groups showed the same results as the total sample between presidents with PhDs and presidents with EdDs.

In 2000, Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found that only 2% of community college presidents reported their major field of study in their highest degree earned had an emphasis in community college leadership. This current study found that 38% of community college presidents had community college leadership as an emphasis in thier highest degree earned. This finding may suggest that the newer generation of community college leaders recognized an opportunity to replace the first wave of community college presidential retirees and are pursuing doctoral programs with a community college emphasis. This may also be an early indicator of success for recent university leadership development programs in community college leadership discussed in the *Breaking Traditions* report (Amey, 2006)

Within the mentored group, 47% of presidents indicated they had a degree with an emphasis in community college leadership compared to 29% of the non-mentored group. This may indicate that mentors were advising protégés to enter programs specific to

community college leadership in order to be better prepared to take a community college presidency. One other notable difference between the mentored and non-mentored groups was that less than 1% of mentored presidents had their highest degree earned in K–12 administration compared to 5% of the non-mentored group.

Leadership Development

When asked if they had participated in a leadership program outside their graduate program prior to their first presidency, mentored presidents had a 20% greater participation in such programs compared to non-mentored presidents (67.5% to 47.1%). These programs included a variety of institutes, academies, and seminars. Presidents indicated they had participated in programs from the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Council for Education, League for Innovation in the Community College, and numerous other university, state, and private sponsored opportunities. It appears the mentored groups were advised by their mentors to gather as much leadership training in community colleges as possible. Mentored presidents may have had a better understanding of the complexity of the community college presidency and the specific skill set required for community college presidents as a result of the mentor-protégé relationship. The mentored presidents were advised or realized through the mentoring relationship the need for training beyond the scope of what is covered through formalized education programs.

Grow Your Own Leadership (GYOL) Programs

One response to the impending leadership crisis is the rise of in-house staff development programs referred to as Grow You Own Leadership programs. These programs were endorsed as a method to address the community college leadership crises when the AACC provided recommendation for GYOL programs in their *Leading Forward*

initiative funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (O'Banion, 2007). In the mentored

group, 18% of the presidents participated in a GYOL compared to 7% in the non-mentored

group. Amey and VanDerLinden's (2002) research suggested that internal hiring continues

to be the most common means of appointing high ranking community college

administrators. This trend will likely continue as Weisman and Vaughan (2007) found that

43% of current presidents sponsor a GYOL program on their campuses. As GYOL

programs increase on college campuses, so will the opportunities for formal and informal

mentoring relationships to occur. The results of this study can help guide where the

mentoring relationship should focus its efforts to best prepare future leaders of community

colleges

Mentoring and Preparation for the Community College Presidency

The second and third research questions deal with the role of mentoring in the

overall preparation of community college presidents as well as their preparation in the

AACC six core competencies. Of the total sample of community college presidents, 89%

felt they were well or moderately prepared for their duties when they assumed their first

presidency. This is consistent with the results from the *Chronicle of Higher Education's*

2005 survey where 87% of the 764 community college presidents reported they were very

well prepared or moderately well prepared for their first presidency. The mentored group

felt they were slightly more prepared than the non-mentored group at 91.8% for the

mentored group compared to 86.4% for the non-mentored group. While there was no

significant difference between the preparation of mentored and non-mentored presidents in

this study as discovered through *t* tests, it is documented in previous studies that mentoring

does appear to have an effect on preparation for the community college presidency. In 1986,

Merriam and Thomas concluded that mentoring was viewed by almost all presidents as a framework by which they learned to function in the role of president. They learned from mentors key aspects of leadership development and the challenges of being a community college president. VanDerLinden (2005) stated that mentoring is believed to be the key ingredient that separates successful and unsuccessful administrators. Brown (2005) suggested the importance of leaders developing other potential leaders through mentorship by arguing there is no success without a successor.

Overall, both mentored and non-mentored presidents in this study indicated they were prepared for their first presidency position. When examining their perceived preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, however, findings revealed areas where mentored and non-mentored presidents felt better and less prepared in certain competencies. The competency sets in which they rated their preparation included six domains: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism. The following examination of the six domains presents a summary of the highlights and differences between mentored and non-mentored presidents. Those who have oversight of leadership preparation programs, specifically those in charge of mentoring programs and GYOL programs, could use these findings to develop future presidents to be successful institutional leaders.

Organizational Strategy

Community college presidents with mentors rated themselves better prepared or evenly prepared with non-mentored counterparts in all six competencies in organizational strategy except for the ability to maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources, and

assets. Non-mentored presidents indicated they felt better prepared in this competency (81%) compared to 75% of the mentored group feeling they were prepared in this area. Leadership development programs could provide programming that ensures future leaders develop a working knowledge of community college finances. Mentors of future leaders could seek opportunities to include protégés in finance issues and challenges. Those planning to aspire to the community college presidency should be aware of these finding and make community college finance a priority area in their overall leadership development planning.

Mentored presidents stated they were more prepared in using data driven decision making practices to plan strategically (83% to 77%) and in the ability to use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community (77% to 70%). Being prepared to use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community was significant at the $p<.05$ level. Mentoring seems to better prepare community college presidents for this part of the president's role. Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found that meeting the needs of the community was a challenge for community college presidents. Leadership development programs and mentors could further develop the skills of future community college presidents in this area as it is an essential component of any successful community college presidency.

Resource Management

Mentored presidents were evenly prepared or less prepared in all competencies in this area except to manage conflict and to change in ways that contribute to the long term viability of the organization (85% to 82%). Perhaps this is the case as mentored presidents were able to witness conflict resolution in action during their experience as protégés. Still, a

3% difference is not enough to indicate mentored presidents have an advantage over non-mentored presidents in this competency. Non-mentored presidents perceived themselves as more prepared to: (a) ensure accountability in reporting (82% to 78%), (b) support operational decisions by managing information resources (75% to 68%), and (c) implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff (78% to 72%). There were no significant differences between the mentored and non-mentored presidents in the resource management area. Leadership programs and mentors of future community college leaders, however, could take note of the results and emphasize competencies in resource management areas. Special note could be given to both mentored and non-mentored presidents' lack of perceived preparation in the area of entrepreneurship in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. Seeking alternative funding sources is going to become a larger aspect of the community college president's job as state and federal funds become more scarce. It is important to give attention to this area as a means to keep tuition at affordable levels for students if community colleges are to continue to carry out their mission. As state and federal resources become more scarce, community college presidents need to be mindful of tuition rates so as to not pass the financial burden on to the student. At least with the current presidents surveyed by this study, it appears mentoring relationships are not helping prepare the community college presidents in the resource management area of the AACC's *Core Competencies for Community College Leadership*.

Communication

Mentored and non-mentored presidents scored similarly on the majority of competencies in this area, rating themselves high in all competencies in the communication

area. Non-mentored presidents felt somewhat more prepared (85%) in the ability to disseminate and support policies and strategies when assuming their first presidency than did mentored presidents (80%). It is encouraging to see that presidents in this sample are strong communicators as good communication skills are essential to strong leadership. As Duree (2007) stated, "Communication competencies should continue to be considered as an area of importance in the development of potential community college leaders" (p. 131).

Collaboration

Mentored presidents were slightly more prepared than non-mentored presidents in the following competencies in the collaboration area: (a) embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles (85% to 81%); and (b) manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships (89% to 85%). Non-mentored presidents were far more prepared (74%) in working effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, and accreditation organizations than their mentored counterparts (63%). It should be noted, however, that this competency is essential to success of community college leaders. Leadership programs and mentors of future community college leaders could use these results to focus training and experiential learning opportunities around developing this skill set. The ability to work effectively with legislators, board members, and accrediting bodies is essential to a successful presidency. Mentored presidents perceived themselves as better prepared in the ability to demonstrate cultural competence in a global society (73% to 66%). What should be of concern is the relatively low scores in this area in today's global society. Again, there could be an urgency and extra emphasis in leadership development programs and mentoring relationships based on these results. As minorities comprised 36% of community college

enrollments in 2009, it is essential that future community college presidents increase their cultural competencies. An effective set of skills in collaboration must include being prepared to acknowledge the importance of cultural competence by embracing diversity and bringing individuals with different cultures, values, and ideas into the organization (Duree, 2007).

Community College Advocacy

Overall, mentored and non-mentored community college presidents in this study scored high and relatively even in their perceived preparation in community college advocacy. There were no significant differences between the groups in any of the competencies in this area. Mentored and non-mentored presidents inclusive rated themselves as well prepared in this area. The ratings are encouraging considering the community college mission of open access and the promotion of equality. Leadership development programs and mentors of potential community college leaders could continue to promote this skill set. Leaders may want to recognize the importance of this study's results as they develop their skill set and aspire to the presidency. Effectively leading an institution of higher education in a diverse, global society will require community college advocacy skills. Duree (2007) recommended that aspiring community college presidents develop a strong community college advocacy skill set prior to their first presidency.

Professionalism

In the final set, mentored versus non-mentored presidents in the study rated themselves close to even and relatively high in preparedness in the professionalism construct. Mentored presidents rated themselves more prepared to understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others (82% to 75%). Non-mentored

presidents rated themselves as more prepared (91%) than mentored presidents (85%) in the ability to weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision making. Both groups rated themselves lowest in this area in being prepared to manage stress through self care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor. The mentored presidents rated themselves lower than the non-mentored presidents at 65% to 73%. Leadership programs, both formal and informal, could take note of these results to incorporate or, at a minimum, acknowledge the need for future community college leaders to be able to handle the pressures, balance the responsibilities, and deal with the stress of being president. Mentors of future presidents should share with their protégés how they handle stress on daily basis as a part of the job. Clearly, being the leader of any organization can be and is stressful. According to Stubbe (2008), community college presidents need to know their strengths and not try to do everything at the college, know their values and maintain the best balance possible, know how to organize, know how to renew oneself, and know how to laugh. Smith (1996) stated that a leader of an organization can only perform well when the balancing act is successful.

Perceptions of Preparation by Type of Mentor Relationship

The fourth research question for this study intended to examine the extent that mentoring relationships have on overall preparedness for the first presidency. Through the survey, if presidents had a mentoring relationship prior to their first presidency, they were asked to indicate if the mentoring relationship was formal or informal. As a part of the *Leading Forward* initiatives sponsored by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the AACC contacted community college leaders from around the nation to establish a set of recommended competencies to be used as a framework for developing future leaders. Before conducting the ANOVA for this research question, an exploratory factor analysis

was conducted to assess how well the individual competencies loaded under the six major areas. Results showed that the nation's community college leaders who built the competency framework were accurate in their placement of the skill sets under the domains. These findings would indicate that the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* could serve as the foundation constructs for leadership development for years to come. Knowing the results of the factor analysis quantitatively validate the psychometrics of the competency constructs could serve as positive reinforcement for the community college leaders who originally worked on the *Leading Forward* project (Duree, 2007).

Therefore, three groups were examined in this research question against their overall preparation for their first presidency—presidents who were involved in formal mentoring relationships, presidents who were involved in informal mentoring relationships, and presidents with no mentoring relationships. Hopkins (2003) concluded informal mentoring relationships were more productive and effective than formal mentoring relationships. This research question attempted to determine if there is a difference in mentoring relationships in preparation for the community college presidency. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between the three groups.

Results from the ANOVA indicate there is no significant difference between the formally mentored presidents, informally mentored presidents, and non-mentored presidents in their overall perception of being prepared for their first presidency. This finding is in contrast to Hopkins (2005); it should be noted, however, that the sample size of the formally mentored presidents was very small (n=32) compared to sample size of the presidents who had informal mentor relationships (n=172), and the sample size of those presidents who had no mentor relationships (n=211). Because of the small sample size of the formally mentored

presidents, conclusions from these results should not be made or should be made with extreme caution.

For the fifth research question, the same three mentor relationships were compared against the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. There were statistically significant differences between the presidents with formal mentoring relationships, informal mentoring relationships, and no mentoring relationships. Those presidents who had formal mentoring relationships perceived themselves as better prepared in the communication and collaboration areas of the *AACC's Competencies for Community College Leaders*. Again, this is in conflict with previous studies where informal mentoring relationships were found to be more productive and effective than formal mentoring relationships (Hopkins, 2005). While results from this study should be used with caution due to the small sample size of formally mentored presidents, those involved with leadership development programs, including GYOL and mentoring programs, may want to take careful consideration when deciding to implement a formal or informal mentoring program.

Influences on Ratings of Overall Preparation for the First Presidency

The sixth research question in this study was to determine the extent to which certain background characteristics, various areas of professional development, and ratings of preparation in the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* predict how mentored and non-mentored community college presidents perceive their level of preparation for their first presidency. Regression analysis was conducted on both the mentored and non-mentored community college presidents who participated in this study. Results found that mentored presidents who majored in higher education leadership

programs with community college emphasis and participated in formalized leadership preparation programs were more prepared overall for their first presidency.

The male presidents who had mentor relationships felt more prepared for the first presidency than did female presidents. This could indicate that, more than likely, both male and female presidents in this study had males for mentors. Weisman and Vaughan (2007) found that in 1991 only 11% of community college presidents were female. It was not until the latter part of the 2000s that female presidents made up around 30% of the community college presidents. Based on the fact that in the early 1990s only 11% of community college presidents were female, which would be the time frame when many of the current community college presidents in this survey were in the leadership pipeline, it could be concluded that the majority of future female presidents who had mentoring relationships had male mentors. Perhaps having a male mentor did not prepare females for the unique challenges presented to a female president. Having been able to have discussions with and learn from a female community college president and her experiences might have made them more prepared for their role as community college presidents. Stubbe (2008) concluded that there are differences in females and males in preparation for the community college presidency. This is an area for extended future research. Perhaps the next generation of female community college leaders will have a different experience and perception of the role of mentoring in preparation for the presidency.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Previous recommendations have been developed based on the results of The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey completed by 415 community college presidents in 2007. Duree (2007) recommended that

aspiring community college presidents should be involved in leadership programs outside of formal education; complete a terminal degree before assuming the first presidency; participate in leadership programs, academies, conferences, and seminars specifically intended to prepare current and future leaders in the AACC competencies; and should approach institutional leaders to assist in developing in-house leadership opportunities that strengthen competencies in organizational strategy and resource management. Stubbe (2008) and Schmitz (2008) also recommended completing a terminal degree in higher education with an emphasis in community college leadership and strategically planning a career pathway with a multitude of experiences. Career pathways to the presidency continue to run through academics, and aspiring leaders must have a solid foundation in the mission and culture of community colleges. Duree (2007) and Schmitz (2008) also claimed validation to the importance of the AACC *Competencies for Community College Leaders* as community college presidents' ratings of importance were consistent across the competencies as essential skills for current and future community college presidents.

Results from this study contribute to previous studies originating from The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey. Recommendations to future community college leaders from this study include to foster a commitment to lifelong learn under the presumption that leadership can be learned and to seek professional development in areas of diversity, financial management, resource development, and how to work effectively with college board members and legislators. Future community college leaders should be more globally aware and culturally competent than the current community college presidents involved in this study. Community colleges' open door mission will continue to attract a board range of students especially as the number

of minorities living in the United States continues to rise and become students in community colleges.

Minorities make up 36% of community college enrollments, yet less than 20% of the community college presidents are minorities. Closing that gap should be a priority for community college leaders, leadership preparation programs, and community college governing boards. Likewise, females make up 58% of community college enrollments, yet only 32% of community college presidents are female. This is a large gap that needs to be addressed as well. Romano, Townsend and Mamiseishvili (2009) found over 60% of students enrolled in graduate programs emphasizing community college leadership were female. This is the exact opposite statistic of the current makeup of community college presidents with 64% being male. The number of females in higher education doctoral programs is encouraging and should be studied to determine if this has an influence on increasing the number of female presidents. The news, however, isn't as encouraging for minorities. Romano et al. (2009) found that the overwhelming majority (70%) of students enrolled in graduate programs emphasizing community college leadership were White/Caucasian. While the leadership pipeline looks encouraging for females, it is still lacking for minorities. Efforts to attract minorities into community college leadership programs should be emphasized and "ramped up" in an effort to get more minorities in the community college leadership pipeline. Community colleges could take great steps in the future to make community college leaders more representative of the population they serve. Based on the results of this study and previous studies, community college leaders and policy makers should strive to make the community college presidency more inclusive.

The results of this study indicate that mentoring can enhance leadership development and preparation for the first presidency. Participation in mentoring relationships makes a difference in overall leadership preparation. Mentoring could also be a way to cultivate young community college leaders in the pipeline into leadership positions and ultimately the presidency. While not having a mentor does not exclude one from the presidency, it appears experience gained by participating in a mentoring relationship lessens the feeling of being overwhelmed when new situations occur, and those who are most prepared for the presidency have been mentored by a president.

Results from this study also indicate that mentoring can enhance leadership opportunities and preparedness for the first presidency for females and minorities. Perhaps this is through being mentored by someone of the same gender or race that is currently in a leadership position. Currently, females and minorities are underrepresented in the community college presidency nationwide. Perhaps learning about the community college presidency from a person with a similar background can help breed success in underrepresented populations. Mentoring programs could also help future presidents be more globally aware and culturally competent when taking their first presidency than current community college presidents in this study were when they took their first presidency. Mentoring programs that focus on relationship building and resource development would prove most beneficial for future community college leaders. Those that have been in mentoring relationships also tend to become mentors themselves once they ascend to the community college presidency. This is not only beneficial to the mentor, but mentoring others can foster continued leadership development while in the presidency.

Future Research

The following section includes recommendations for future research based on the findings of this study. Further research into leadership preparation and development would be beneficial as community colleges have recently experienced tremendous growth with declining or stagnant resources. With the anticipation of need for future leaders in the community college due to the large number of expected retirements of current presidents, the community college presidency will continue to be a popular research subject.

Duree (2007) found the pathway to the presidency continues to be through academics. Research should be conducted on academic vice-presidents, academic deans, programs chairs, academic department heads, and faculty leaders to determine their preparation, or lack of preparation, in the AACC *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* Research on the prevalence and role of mentoring they had in their professional lives should be conducted as well. This would gain valuable insight into the importance of mentoring in preparation for their current positions as well as how they feel mentoring might help them prepare if they decided to pursue the presidency. Regardless, if this group decides to pursue the presidency or not, the leadership skills outlined by the AACC would be beneficial to anyone in a senior community college leadership position.

Similar research should be conducted on participants in leadership programs sponsored by the AACC, the League of Innovation in the Community College, as well as others to determine how well they are prepared in the AACC *Competencies for Community College Leaders.* These groups are important to study as they presumably want to take on a higher leadership position in the community college based on their participation in such programs. Participants in GYOL programs and mentoring programs at community colleges

should be studied to determine the effect these programs are having on preparing future community college leaders. Special attention should be given to women and minorities in future research to determine if leadership programs and mentoring programs are aiding their respective leadership careers.

A similar study to this one should be conducted on recent graduates of higher education programs that specialize in preparing community college leaders. In a recent study of doctoral students currently enrolled in programs with emphasis in community college leadership, 51.7% of the respondents said that they were not even aware of the AACC *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (Romano et al., 2009). Follow-up studies on graduates of these programs would help determine if the curricula of community college leadership doctoral programs are addressing the leadership needs of future community college leaders. Since the majority of students in graduate programs focused on community college leadership want to seek administrative positions, it is imperative that these programs teach the skills needed for the community college presidency (Romano et al., 2009).

If the community college presidency is to diversify in the future, research needs to continue on the role of career pathways, mentoring, and leadership development to ascertain how minorities and women can advance to the community college presidency in greater numbers. Romano et al. (2009) found that over 60% of students enrolled in graduate programs emphasizing community college leadership were female, and nearly 30% were minorities. While this is encouraging for the prospect of more females ascending to the community college presidency, the numbers are not as promising for minorities in the leadership pipeline. Even more discouraging is the fact that Hispanics make up 36% of

community college enrollments and only 9% of the students enrolled in graduate programs preparing the next generation of community college leaders. Further research should be conducted on why minorities, especially Hispanics, continue to be underrepresented in leadership opportunities in the community college. Matching the percentage of gender and minority enrollments to the percentage of community college presidents is going to take dedicated research leading to specific skill development.

Further research could be conducted on the leadership needs of those presidents who head single campus institutions and those who lead multi-campus entities, commonly known as chancellors. Research done on the specific skills and preparation needed to lead a multi-campus district versus a single campus district would be valuable to include in academic preparation, leadership development programs, as well as potential mentoring programs.

Research attention needs to be paid to looking at why some presidents view their perceived preparation in Professionalism as being negatively associated with overall preparation for the presidency. Researchers should take the statements that make up the Professionalism construct of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* and explore how higher education programs, leadership development programs, and mentoring programs are addressing preparation in this area.

Summary

Community colleges are and will continue to be unique institutions serving a wide variety of needs for the communities they serve. Community colleges are and will continue to be a first, second, third, and, in some cases, last or only opportunity for higher education for some students. These unique institutions need special leaders. For community colleges

to continue to serve the needs of the country and be viable institutions for years to come, they will need well trained leaders with a specific skill set. This study, and others to follow, will continue to hone in on skills needed for tomorrow's community college leaders to ensure they have that skill set that leads to a healthy network of community colleges.

Appendix A

American Association of Community Colleges:

Competencies for Community College Leaders (2005)

<u>Organizational Strategy</u>

- Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to improve the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.

- Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders to solve problems, make decisions, and plan strategically.

- Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization, to changing demographics, and to the economic, political, and public health needs of students and the community.

- Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.

- Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources.

- Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.

<u>Resource Management</u>

- Ensure accountability in reporting.

- Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of supporting systems and databases.

- Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies.

- Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

- Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.

- Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.

- Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegations skills.

- Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long term viability of the organization.

Communication

- Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences, appropriately matching message to audience.

- Disseminate and support policies and strategies.

- Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.

- Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies.

- Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, and act.

- Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.

Collaboration

- Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.

- Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.

- Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.

- Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance mission, vision, and goals of the community college.

- Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.

- Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.

- Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.

- Facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.

Community College Advocacy

- Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.

- Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.

- Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college, seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.

- Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.

- Advance lifelong learning and support a learner-centered environment.

- Represent the community college in the local community, in the broader educational community, at various levels of government, and as a model of higher education that can be replicated in international settings.

Professionalism

- Demonstrate transformational leadership through authenticity, creativity, and vision.

- Understand and endorse the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.

- Self-assess performance regularly using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation.

- Support lifelong learning for self and others.

- Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.

- Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.

- Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.

- Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.

- Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.

- Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision making.

- Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publication.

Appendix B

The Community College Presidency:

Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey

Iowa State University
Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey.

- Please use the User name and Password that appear in the letter and/or e-mail that you received from Iowa State University to enter the survey.

- Click on the **Continue** button at the end of each section to proceed. You may have to scroll down to see the continue button on some screens.

- Click on the **Final Submit** button at the end of the survey to submit your final answers.

After beginning the survey, you may exit and complete the remaining items later if you like, but you must use your assigned survey **user name and password each time to re-enter.**

Click on the Start button to start the survey. | Start |
_____

If you have any difficulties with this form, please contact Allison Tyler, atyler@iastate.edu, phone (toll-free): (877) 578-8848.

In each section, provide the information or check the spaces as appropriate. All responses will remain confidential. For this survey, *Community College President* is defined as the CEO of an institution or system with two-year associate degrees as its primary offering.

<u>Your Professional and Personal Information</u>

1. Current position/leadership title:

        O President
        O Chancellor
        O Vice Chancellor
        O Other
        If other, please explain below.

        |_____|

2. Including your current position, how many college president/chancellor/CEO positions
    have you held?

    ○ 1
    ○ 2
    ○ 3
    ○ 4
    ○ 5 or more

3. Number of years in your present position:

    ○ 1-2
    ○ 3-5
    ○ 6-10
    ○ More than 10

4. Total number of years as a college president/chancellor:

    ○ 1-2
    ○ 3-5
    ○ 6-10
    ○ More than 10

5a. Age at which you assumed your first college presidency: _____

5b. Current age: _____

6. Gender: ○ Male
               ○ Female

7. Race/Ethnicity:

    ○ American Indian/Native American
    ○ Asian/Pacific Islander
    ○ Black/African American
    ○ Hispanic/Latino
    ○ White/Caucasian
    ○ Other

8. Current marital status:

       ○ Single
       ○ Married or living as married
       ○ Divorced/Separated
       ○ Widowed

Your Career Pathways

9a. What was your last job (position) prior to your first presidency?

9b. Was this job in a community college setting?

       ○ Yes
       ○ No

10. How many years did you spend in each of the following career tracks prior to your first presidency?

Number of Years	
	Community College academics
	Other Community College positions
	Other positions in education (outside of Community College)
	Other positions outside of education

11. Have you ever taught in a community college?

       ○ Yes, Full-time
       ○ Yes, Part-time
       ○ Yes, Both Full- and Part-time
       ○ No

12. Are you currently teaching in any of the following settings? (Check all that apply)

       ☐ Community College
       ☐ Other higher education
       ☐ Not currently teaching
       ☐ Other
       If other, please explain below.

13. How important to you were the following reasons for becoming a president?

	Not Important			Very Important
Salary/Compensation	o	o	o	o
Personal satisfaction	o	o	o	o
Professional challenge	o	o	o	o
To make a difference	o	o	o	o
Mentor's encouragement	o	o	o	o
Other reasons	o	o	o	o

If other reasons, please explain below.

Your Educational Background

14. What degrees have you earned? (Check all that apply)

☐ Bachelor's
☐ Master's
☐ Ed. Specialist
☐ Ph.D.
☐ Ed.D.
☐ J.D.
☐ Other

If other, please explain below.

15. What was your major field of study in your highest degree?

O Higher education with emphasis on community college leadership
O Higher education with other emphasis
O K-12 administration
O Other educational field
O Other

If other educational or non-educational field, please explain below.

Leadership Preparation

16. Outside of your graduate program and **prior to** your first presidency, did you participate in any formalized leadership preparation programs (e.g. The League for Innovation in Community Colleges, AACC, state programs, etc.)?

       ○ Yes
       ○ No
       If yes, please list these formal leadership preparation programs below.

17. Have you participated in a "grow your own leadership" (GYOL) program in your preparation for your presidency?

       ○ Yes
       ○ No

18. How important were each of the following peer networks in assisting you in preparing for and assuming your first presidency?

	Not Important			Very Important
a. Graduate program cohort	○	○	○	○
b. Graduate program faculty	○	○	○	○
c. Previous co-workers at community colleges	○	○	○	○
d. Social networks	○	○	○	○
e. Business networks	○	○	○	○

19a. As you were developing leadership skills required of a community college leader, did you participate in a mentor-protégé relationship as a protégé?

       ○ Yes
       ○ No → If no, please scroll to the bottom of the page and click on
                 "Continue." (Go to Q20a)

19b. When did you participate in a mentor-protégé relationship? (Check all that apply)

       ☐ During undergraduate studies
       ☐ During graduate studies
       ☐ During first 5 years of career
       ☐ During second 5 years of career
       ☐ Other

19c. Was your mentor-protégé relationship formal or informal?

      ○ Formal
      ○ Informal

19d. Did you approach your mentor or did your mentor approach you to establish the mentor-protégé relationship?

      ○ Approached mentor
      ○ Was approached by mentor

19e. Was your mentor-protégé relationship developed within the academic setting of a graduate program or within the professional setting of community college employment?

      ○ During graduate program
      ○ During Community College employment
      ○ Both
      ○ Somewhere else

19f. Did you participate in more than one mentor-protégé relationship as a protégé?

      ○ Yes
      ○ No

19g. Please indicate the number of mentors you have had by gender.

      _____Female mentors
      _____Male mentors

20a. Have you or are you mentoring a potential community college leader?

      ○ Yes, informally mentoring
      ○ Yes, formally mentoring
      ○ No

20b. Please indicate the number of persons you have mentored by gender.

      _____Females mentored
      _____Males mentored

21. **After** assuming your first presidency, did you participate in any formalized leadership preparation programs?

      ○ Yes
      ○ No
      If yes, please list these formal leadership preparation programs below.

22a. Does your community college participate in a "grow your own leadership" (GYOL) program?

       ○ Yes
       ○ No → If no, please scroll to the bottom of the page and click on "Continue." (Go to Q23)

22b. If your community college sponsors or participates in a GYOL program, who are the targeted participants in the program? (Check all that apply):

       ☐ Top administration (vice presidents and deans)
       ☐ Mid-level academic managers (department chairs)
       ☐ Mid-level managers or directors
       ☐ Faculty

22c. What is your personal involvement in the GYOL program? (Check all that apply):

       ☐ Broad oversight
       ☐ Primary decision maker
       ☐ A presenter
       ☐ No personal involvement

Faculty, Staff, & Public Relations

23. How many of the following external boards do you currently serve on?

       ____ Corporate
       ____ College or university
       ____ Other nonprofit organizations

24. In your role as a community college leader, on average, how often do you meet with or have discussions with each of the following?

	Once per week or less	2 - 5 times per week	5+ times per week
Cabinet level administrators	○	○	○
Faculty	○	○	○
Other college staff	○	○	○
Students	○	○	○
College board members	○	○	○
Other community college presidents	○	○	○
Other education officials	○	○	○
Business/Industry officials	○	○	○
Local, state or national elected officials	○	○	○

25. In your role as a community college leader, please rate the level of challenge each of the following issues present.

	Not Challenging			Very Challenging
Faculty Relations	O	O	O	O
Board relations	O	O	O	O
Enrollment	O	O	O	O
Fundraising	O	O	O	O
Legislative Advocacy	O	O	O	O
Community Involvement	O	O	O	O
Economic & workforce development	O	O	O	O
Diversity	O	O	O	O

26. Select the top three constituent groups that present the greatest challenge to you as president.

- ☐ Administration and staff
- ☐ Community residents/leaders
- ☐ Donors/benefactors/fundraising
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Governing board
- ☐ Legislators and policy makers
- ☐ Media
- ☐ Students

27. Select the top three areas that have increased in their level of importance since you first became a college president.

- ☐ Academic issues
- ☐ Accountability
- ☐ Athletics
- ☐ Budget/financial management
- ☐ Crisis management
- ☐ Diversity
- ☐ Enrollment management
- ☐ Entrepreneurship
- ☐ Fund raising
- ☐ Governing board relations
- ☐ Personnel issues
- ☐ Public relations
- ☐ Strategic planning

28. Do you consider yourself a transformational leader?

      ○ Yes
      ○ No
      ○ Unsure

29. Do those who work with you consider you a transformational leader?

      ○ Yes
      ○ No
      ○ Unsure

Research and Publications

30a. Within the past 5 years, how many book reviews have you published in a professional/trade journal?

      [   ] Book reviews published

30b. Within the past 5 years, how many articles have you published in a professional/trade journal?

      [   ] Articles published

30c. Within the past 5 years, how many monographs or books have you published?

      [   ] Monographs or books published

30d. Within the past 5 years, how many chapters have you contributed to a published book?

      [   ] Chapters contributed

Competencies for Community College Leaders

The next questions address six competency domains for community college leaders that have been developed and endorsed by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). For each component listed, please rate how well prepared you were coming into your first presidency as well as how important each competency is to community college leadership.

31. **Organizational Strategy**

	Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
	Not Important		Very Important	

		1	2	3	4
Develop, implement, and evaluate strategies to improve the quality of education at your institution.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Use data-driven decision making practices to plan strategically.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the needs of students and the community.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Maintain and grow college personnel, fiscal resources and assets.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

32. **Resource Management**

		Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
		Not Important		Very Important	

		1	2	3	4
Ensure accountability in reporting.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Support operational decisions by managing information resources.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

33. **Comunication**

		Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
		Not Important		Very Important	

		1	2	3	4
Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Disseminate and support policies and strategies.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage, and act.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

34. **Collaboration**

	Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
	Not Important		Very Important	

		1	2	3	4
Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making.	**Preparation**	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

35. **Community College Advocacy**

		Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
		Not Important		Very Important	
Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning-centered environment.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

36. **Professionalism**

		Not Prepared		Well Prepared	
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
		Not Important		Very Important	

		1	2	3	4
Demonstrate transformational leadership.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Regularly self assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Support lifelong learning for self and others.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications.	Preparation	o	o	o	o
	Importance	o	o	o	o

37. Overall, how well prepared did you feel for your first presidency?

         O Very well prepared
         O Moderately well prepared
         O Somewhat prepared
         O Unprepared

38. How would you rate your current job satisfaction?

         O Very satisfied
         O Somewhat satisfied
         O Somewhat dissatisfied
         O Very dissatisfied

39. Please list the three community college presidents from within your state that you consider the best examples of outstanding/leading community college presidents. All information provided will be kept completely confidential.

Leader A: _____ Institution: _____

Leader B: _____ Institution: _____

Leader C: _____ Institution: _____

40. What do you wish you had done differently to prepare for community college leadership, knowing what you know now?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. YOUR RESPONSES HAVE BEEN RECORDED.

References

American Association of Community Colleges. (2001). *Leadership 2020: Recruitment, preparation, and support.* Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction NO. ED 468 766)

American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies for community college leaders*. [Brochure]. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2008). *American association of community colleges facts 2008*. Retrieved September 22, 2008, from http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/pdfs/factsheet08.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2009). *American association of community colleges facts 2009*. Retrieved March, 2010, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx

American Council on Education. (2007). *The American college president* (20th anniv.). Washington, DC: Author.

Amey, M. (2005). Leadership as learning: Conceptualizing the process. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*, 689–704.

Amey, M. J. (2006). *Breaking tradition: New community college leadership programs meet 21st century needs.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *The institutional context of community college administration.* Research Brief Leadership Series, No. 4, AACC-RB-02-3. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. F. (2002). Perspectives on community

college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of

Leadership and Practice, 26*, 573–589.

Boggs, G. R. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for

Community Colleges, Fall*(123*),* 15–25.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation:

Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Reveiw, 30*(1)

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

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, N. (1995). *Mentoring adult learners*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.

Community College Leadership Development Initiative. (2000). *Meeting new leadership

challenges in the community colleges.* Claremont Graduate University, CA. (ERIC

Document Reproduction No. ED 447 888).

Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). A first course in factor analysis (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ:

Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Daloz, L. A. (1999). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners*. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Duree, C. (2007). *The challenges of the community college presidency in the new

millennium: Pathways, preparation, competencies, and leadership programs needed

to survive.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames.

Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In

T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple

perspectives approach* (pp. 7–20). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing

Evans, G. A. (2001). The world on our backs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25,* 181–192.

Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*, 233–250.

Glass, J. C. Jr., & Jackson, K. L. (1998). A new role for community college presidents: Private fund raiser and development team leader. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22*(6), 575.

Goff, D. G. (2003). *What do we know about good community college leaders: A study in leadership trait theory and behavioral leadership theory*. (Report No. JC 030 281). Tampa, FL: Hillborough Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED476456)

Guthrie, J. (2001). Been there; done that: Life after the presidency. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25,* 243-250.

Harmon, R., & MacAllum, K. (2003). *Documented characteristics of labor market-responsive community colleges and a review of supporting literature*. U.S. Department of Education – Office of Vocational and Adult Education. Rockville, MD: Westat & Washington, DC: The Academy of Educational Development.

Hockaday, J., & Puyear, D. (2000). Community college leadership in the new millennium. *New Expeditions Issues Paper No. 8*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Hopkins, R. A. (2003). *A comparision of matching methods, choice and assignment, in formal adult mentoring relationships in the community college context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cornell University, Ithaca.

Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology. (2007). *A survey of community college presidents methodology report.*

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research,61*(4), 505-532.

Jipson, J., & Paley, N. (2000). Because no one gets there alone: Collaboration as co-mentoring. *Theory into Practice, 39*(1), 36–42.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.* Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Kubala, T. S., & Bailey, G. M. (2001). A new perspective on community college presidents: Results of a national study. Community *College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*, 793–804.

Lanning, P. (2008). Community colleges must step up their fund raising. *The Chronical of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 31, 2008, from http://choronicle.com/ weekly/v55/i10/10b02801.htm.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, D., Levinson, M., Klein, E. B., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.

Locke, M. G., & Guglielmino, L. (2006). The influence of subcultures on planned change in a community college. *Community College Review, 34*(2), 108–126.

McDade, S. A. (2005). Teacher-pupil: The challenging relationships of mentors and protégés. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(9–10), 759–781.

McFarlin, C. H., Crittenden, B. J., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents. *Community College Review, 27*(3), 19–31.

Merriam, S. B., & Thomas, T, K. (1986). The role of mentoring in the career development of community college presidents. *Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10,* 177-191.

Miller, M. T., & Pope, M. C. (2003). Faculty senate leadership as a presidential pathway: Clear passage or caught in the maze? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27,* 119–129.

Moore, K., Martorana, S., and Twombly, S. 1985. Today's Academic Leaders: A National Study of Administrators in Two-Year Colleges. University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education

O'Banion, T. (2007). Crisis and calamity in the community college. *Community College Journal, Dec-Jan.*, 44–47.

Paneitz, B. (2005). Observations from a new president: Year two. *League for Innovation Leadership Abstracts, 18*(9). Retrieved March 14, 2007, from www.league.org/publications/leadership

Phelan, D. J. (2005). Crossing the generations: Learning to lead across the leadership life cycle. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(4), 784–792.

Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. *New Directions for Community Colleges, Fall*(123), 93-99

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L. (1993). Gender and willingness to mentor in organizations. *Journal of Management. 19*(1), 97-111.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*, 14–28

Romano, R. M., Townsend, B., & Mamiseishvili, K. (2009). Leaders in the making: Profile and perceptions of students in community college doctoral programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(3), 309–320.

Schmitz, G. R. (2008). *Leadership preparation and career pathways of community college presidents.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames.

Shea, G. F. (1994). *Mentoring: Helping employees reach their full potential.* New York: American Management Association, Memberships Publications Division.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. American Association of Community Colleges, Washington, DC.

Smith, R. M. (1996, March). Community college presidents: The balancing act. *Leadership Abstracts*, *9*(3).

Stanley, P. (2008, October). Lessons from a 2 year college 'master class'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,55*(10), p. B23. Retrieved October 31, 2008, from http://choronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10b02301.htm

Stubbe, A. F. (2008). *The community college presidency in the new millennium: Gender differences in leadership preparation.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Sullivan, L. G. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(4), 559–571.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Townsend, B. K. (1995). Gender and power in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 89,* 1–4.

Vaillant, G. (1977). *Adaption to life.* Boston: Little, Brown, & Company.

VanDerLinden, K. E. (2005). Learning to play the game: Professional development and mentoring. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(9), 729–743.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). *The community college presidency.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (2000). *Balancing the presidential seesaw: Case studies in community college leadership.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Vaughan, G. B., & Weisman, I. M. (1998). *The community college presidency at the millennium.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Wellington, S. (2001). *Be your own mentor.* New York: Random House.

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency, 2001.* (Report No. AACC-RB-02-1; AACC Ser-3) American Association of Community Colleges, Washington, DC: Author.

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2007, October). A profile of community college presidents. [Special issue]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Oct 27, 2006, p. B16.

Wilson, P. F., Johnson, W. B. (2001). Core virtues for the practice of mentoring. *Journal of Psychology and Theology. 29*(2), 121-130.

Wunsch, M. A. (1994). *Mentoring revisited: Making an impact on individuals and institutions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zirkle, C., & Cotton, S. (2001). Where will future leadership come from? On the status of

career and technical education administration. *Technology Education. Dec.,* 15–18.