



An NCIA White Paper

March 1, 2005

**Strengthening the
Capacity to Lead in
the Community College:**

**The Role of University-Based
Leadership Programs**

by

Stephen G. Katsinas
University of North Texas

and

Ken Kempner
Southern Oregon University

About the Authors

Steve Katsinas is Don A. Buchholz Chair of Higher Education and Director of the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education at the University of North Texas. His interests include access, finance, lay governance and state coordination, student financial aid, minority access,

and rural higher education and economic development. He has personally visited more than 300 institutions of higher education in 35 states, and served on advisory committees of the Ford and W. K. Kellogg Foundations dealing with rural higher education issues. His presentations include the

National Conference of State Legislatures, the State Higher Education Executive Officers, the Association of Community College Trustees and the American Association of Community Colleges.

Ken Kempner is Professor of Education and International Studies and former Dean of Social Sciences at Southern Oregon University. He previously served as Coordinator of the Higher Education graduate program at the University of Oregon. His current research addresses the role of higher education in social and economic

development, most recently in Brazil, Mexico, and Japan. His work is also focused on cultural leadership issues in higher education, specifically in community colleges. He is published in a variety of international journals and is invited to lecture on educational development and organizational theory in a number of other countries, including

Chile, China, Taiwan, and Thailand. He is senior editor of the *Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Reader on Comparative Education* and co-editor of the *Social Role of Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives*.

About NCIA

The National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA) is a private, non-profit, professional organization, and the largest council affiliated with the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Committed to leadership, innovation, advocacy, and development to improve teaching and learning, NCIA serves as the national voice for administrators of instructional programs in two-year colleges. The leadership of AACC and other national organizations consults with NCIA on important matters affecting institutional programs. The NCIA National Office is located within the College of Education at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX. The office telephone number is 1-800-782-9698; the e-mail address is ncia.educ@ttu.edu

The Scope of Today's Challenge

We are in the midst of an unprecedented wave of retirements within the ranks of community college presidents, vice presidents and deans, and faculty. A survey of presidents by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in 2001 revealed 45 percent of presidents (n = 249) plan to retire in 6 years, and another 34 percent between 7 and 10 years (Shults, 2001). Weisman and Vaughan (2002) report that 79 percent of presidents surveyed (n = 661) in 2001 planned to retire within the next ten years. Many of the administrators who would be expected to fill presidential vacancies are also nearing retirement age. Shults (2001) found that the average age of presidents was 56 years; for chief academic officers and chief student affairs officers, the average age was 54 and 52, respectively. There are also predictions that a high rate of full-time faculty retirements, coinciding with an increase in the size of the student population, will produce a serious instructional shortfall during the current decade (Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, & Haworth, 2002). Thirty-five percent of the presidents responding to the survey by Shults (2001) projected that 25-50% of their faculty would

retire between 2001 and 2006. Kelly (2002) indicated that, in California alone, 50% of the faculty will turn over by 2010.

There is a major issue with numbers. Presently, the U. S. Department of Education cannot provide an exact number of community colleges in America. This is because some districts have separately-accredited community college campuses, such as Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, and Maricopa (Phoenix), while others such as Miami-Dade, Portland, and Tarrant (Fort Worth) accredit all of their campuses as a single institution on a district-wide basis. Inexactness on the part of the U. S. Department of Education motivates many to use the AACC membership listing as a proxy for the number of community colleges. AACC's number is 1,171, and it is not uncommon to see the figure of 1,200 used as an estimate of the number of community colleges in America. The AACC figure includes some of the private, non-profit two-year colleges, some of the federally recognized Tribal Colleges (most of which offer the associate's degree as their highest-awarded degree), and some proprietary two-year colleges who are AACC members.

For the purposes of affixing the number of Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) needed, however, the 1,200 figure significantly understates the leadership challenge. In a soon-to-be-released work that analyzes data reported to IPEDS, Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy document the existence of 1,552 campuses within 860 discrete districts within the publicly controlled two-year colleges category alone.

For the purposes of affixing the number of Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) needed, however, the 1,200 figure significantly understates the leadership challenge. In a soon-to-be-released work that analyzes data reported to IPEDS, Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy document the existence of 1,552 campuses within 860 discrete districts within the publicly controlled two-year colleges category alone (2005, forthcoming). Added to this figure are the 114 campuses of two-year colleges under 36 separate four-year universities, a common administrative model in states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, which yields a total of 896 discrete "districts" operating 1,666 discrete "campuses." Added also to this figure are the 34 Tribal Colleges (American Indian Higher Education

Consortium, 2005), and the 211 private, non-profit colleges listed in the U. S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) database for the 2000-2001 academic year. The 614 two-year proprietary colleges listed in IPEDS in 2000-2001 further increases the number of two-year CEOs needed (Hardy, 2005).

In a January 2005 analysis of the websites of just the 860 publicly controlled districts and 1,552 campuses, Katsinas et al. found 1,351 individuals listed as district or campus CEOs. A total of 85 district or campus CEOs held titles of "chancellor," while 1,004 persons held the title of president, 99 held the title of provost/vice president, 94 held the title of dean/executive dean, and 69 held the title of campus director. There were 113 additional campuses for which either the college did not have an individual assigned to direct the campus, or it was impossible to ascertain the name of the campus CEO from the website. When the 114 two-year campuses under 36 four-year universities are added into the "missing data" in the public two-year category, a conservative estimate of 1,500 two-year public college CEOs is obtained.

In general, larger districts, mostly at multi-campus community college

districts in urban and suburban areas, typically had either a chancellor-president or president-provost organizational structure. Small multi-campus districts more commonly had a CEO with the title of president, and campus CEOs with titles of provost, dean, or director (the larger the enrollment, the more common were the titles of president-provost). Some multi-campus institutions had a district CEO who simultaneously served as the main campus CEO, while another individual served as campus CEO with the title of provost, dean, or director. It should be noted that the estimate of 1,500 CEOs does not include the 34 Tribal Colleges identified as members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, nor does it include the 211 CEOs of private, non-profit two-year colleges, or the 614 CEOs of two-year proprietary institutions identified in IPEDS. When all of these figures are added together, the number of CEOs for all types of two-year colleges approaches a total of 2,400—almost double the current estimate! In light of the growing permeability and career movement to and from public community colleges and proprietary institutions, even a conservative estimate yields a total of 1,800 two-year college CEOs, 50% above the 1,200 estimate commonly cited in the literature. Thus, there is high likelihood that the

extent of the leadership crisis will be much greater than previously estimated. With such large numbers of executive personnel approaching retirement, it is not surprising that issues related to faculty and leadership development have emerged as major concerns of instructional administrators, presidents, chancellors, and trustees at two-year colleges in America. A broad-based, comprehensive approach to leadership preparation and staff development has long been encouraged by every virtually writer on the subject (Boggs, 2003; Katsinas as cited in Evelyn, 2001; Piland and Wolf, 2003). Staff development includes pre-service and induction activities for new faculty and staff, and in-service activities for both full- and part-time faculty (Pierce, in Hammons, 1975). This includes formal induction programs for new faculty and staff, and continuing education programs to keep faculty and staff current on information-age technology based instruction and management systems. It can include paid leaves, paid internships and tuition reimbursement for graduate education courses (Pierce, in Hammons, 1975). It can also include institution-based programs, such as the innovative financial management program for mid-level administrative staff initiated at Collin County Community College District (TX).

Piland and Wolf (2003) argue strongly for institution-based programs of a similar nature.

“Obtaining credentials through traditional academic administration still appears to be important for promotion to chief academic officers”.

Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002

In their 2000 study comparing results obtained in 1985, Amey and VanDerLinden reported, “Obtaining credentials through traditional academic administration still appears to be important for promotion to chief academic officers” (2002, p. 3). They found that slightly more than 52% of CAOs were promoted from *within* their institutions,

typically rising from the ranks of the faculty after first having served as assistant or associate deans of instruction. And the position of chief instructional officer has long been the traditional stepping stone to the community college presidency (Vaughan, 1990). In the Amey and VanDerLinden study, 37% of all senior-level community college administrators listed the doctorate as the highest degree earned. Presidents and CAOs are most likely to hold the doctorate, at 87 and 74%, respectively. Among these individuals, approximately 80% of presidents and 71% of CAOs report holding an education-related doctorate. As the doctorate has become the common pathway to senior level administrative positions

(Townsend, 1996), it has also become increasingly preferred in the advertisements for the lower and mid-level instructional leadership positions of department chairs and deans.

As the doctorate has become the common pathway to senior level administrative positions, it has also become increasingly preferred in the advertisements for the lower and mid-level instructional leadership positions of department chairs and deans.

FOCUS: The Role of University-Based Leadership Programs

The primary focus of this research report is on university-based degree programs that prepare individuals for leadership positions in community colleges. Issues related to the preparation and development of faculty are also an important component of the personnel challenges facing community colleges. We will include the faculty dimension more thoroughly in our future work.

To bring greater focus to this discussion, the following definition of community college leadership development is offered: leadership development implies personal and professional growth, expanding the capacity to sustain,

grow, and transform organizations dedicated to teaching, learning, and community development. This is accomplished in three distinct ways: university-based degree programs, professional and continuing education, and personal self-development.

1 *University-based degree programs provide formal credentials, including master’s degrees and certificates, the education specialist degree, and the doctorate of education and doctorate of philosophy degrees. They encompass the study of education across the entire spectrum, K-22, and include the study of theory-practice relationships, the teaching*

of effective formal relationships, the teaching of effective formal communication skills (especially writing), and the study of the history of how things came to be.

2 *Professional and continuing education programs* include participation in the work of national organizations including the American Association of Community Colleges and the National Council of Instructional Administrators; participation in regional and professional accreditation; presentations at meetings; participation in leadership institutes that can be nationally, regionally, state, and institutionally based; and participation in non-education related institutes ranging from leadership programs sponsored by foundations, corporations, chambers of commerce, and other entities.

3 *Personal self-development programs* include reflective study of practice; a lifelong study of social, political, cultural, economic, and technological forces that impact education; continuous reading and scholarly writing; informal mentoring; and the promotion of a personal healthy lifestyle. Personal self-development programs are generally of a non-formal nature.

Argued here is that all constituencies of the community college have a vested interest in the success of each of these distinct means of developing leaders. To realize this success, partnerships must be formed between the community colleges and their colleagues in the independent sector, state and federal governments, and the universities themselves (Shapiro & Walters, 1992; Wendel, 1992; Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002). Such commitment is vital to maintain a steady pipeline of diverse people prepared to lead institutions that possess the most heterogeneous student bodies within American higher education, community colleges.

Currently, many of the programs responsible for doctoral education of community college leaders are in crisis. In her 1996 study, Marybelle C. Keim found 203 faculty in community college preparation programs, of whom 43 (21%) were women and 160 (79%) were men. Of the 33 universities offering 58 graduate programs included in the 1992 Director of Graduate Programs in Community College Education, 12 (36%) employed no female faculty. The most popular decade for these faculty to have earned their own doctorates was the 1970s (37%), which suggests significant turnover of university-based community college leadership preparation faculty may also be on the horizon. Keim further studied those faculty who spend 50% or more of their time in community college education, and found that there were 66 of them nationally of whom just 13, or about 20%, were women, and 53 or 80% were men (Keim, 1996). Keim concluded women were “vastly underrepresented” on the faculty in the leadership preparation programs, and urged the university programs to be more diligent in recruiting and retaining women faculty (Keim, 1996).

Decades of neglect and the lack of financial support have taken their toll. Housed in colleges of education that themselves have been undersupported, most programs are found at public institutions of higher education that have seen a 35.8 percent decline in state appropriations, adjusted for inflation, from fiscal year 1978 to 2004 (Mortensen, 2004). Unlike medical schools, higher education and community college doctoral programs lack access to dedicated sources of external federal funding, such as the National Science Foundation or National Institutes of Health. How can the capacity to formally develop the next generation of community college leaders be strengthened, and who will educate them? Attention is now turned to a brief history of higher education as a field of study, and how the community college crisis of the “baby boom” era was met, to provide context and possible policy directions for

strengthening the university-based higher education/
community college leadership programs of today.

Higher Education as a Field of Study

The field of higher education dates to the first two decades of the twentieth century, when Clark University President G. Stanley Hall urged leading universities to establish programs to provide broadly trained professional administrators for leadership roles in higher education (Goodchild, 1991). In describing Hall's role, Lester F. Goodchild writes:

On many occasions before various academic associations, Hall argued forcefully for the study of higher education. For example, he issued a national call for this study at research-oriented universities before the Association of American Universities in 1916: "Should not each institution with a department of education add to the work that now includes only grammar and higher school grades one or more courses on the history of science, of learned academies, universities, and colleges, their policy, and the higher pedagogy generally?" (p. 37)

Hall's personal commitment and advocacy was a clarion call for the establishment of higher education programs, which became more common during the 1920s in response to the growing demand for junior college administrators. Hall's

urgings, Goodchild writes, were answered, and by 1929, The Ohio State University; Teachers College, Columbia University; University of Chicago; University of Pittsburgh; the University of California at Berkeley; and the University of Michigan had established graduate coursework in higher education. In reviewing the curriculum of these early programs, Goodchild concludes:

Early higher education programs developed as institutions of higher learning became more specialized, which in turn gave rise to a need for greater numbers of professional administrators and faculty. The emergence of the junior/community college was the *raison d'être* for 5 out of the 7 early higher education courses and programs...As enrollments expanded between the world wars, this professional objective broadened to include student personnel and institutional research. (1991, p. 28)

The Second World War and the revolutionary GI Bill produced steady expansion for higher education/community college leadership programs, paralleling the establishment of the institutions,

as shown in Table 1, "Numbers of Public and Private Non-Profit Two-Year Colleges, 1915-1999." By 1945, 27 higher education programs existed; this number expanded to 87 by the 1962-63 academic year (Ewing & Stickler, 1964, in Young, 1996). By 1960, the dawn of the era of state community college establishment, nearly 100 doctoral and masters programs existed (Dibden, 1965, in Goodchild, 1991).

Most of the higher education/community college programs that exist today were either established or grew out of educational administration programs in the 1960s and 1970s. This coincided with the so-called "baby boom," when children of the World War II generation started entering higher education in large numbers. The federal Civil Rights Acts, affirmative action, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the landmark Higher Education Act of 1965, ushered in millions of new students at new and greatly expanded two- and four-year institutions. In 1960, 3.5 million students enrolled; this jumped to 7.5 million by 1970, and 11.5 million by 1980. As new

two-year institutions were created, and others expanded to meet demand both of an increasing college-age population and first-generation students, the need for administrators at all levels grew rapidly. While universities could draw sufficient numbers of administrators from faculty ranks, this was not possible for the brand-new community, junior, and technical colleges. New leaders

were needed for the new two-year institutions, and these individuals needed skills to meet the legislative and financial demands. At the university level, expanded professional development for their own rapidly expanding administrative and professional staffs, particularly in their new divisions of student affairs and institutional research, helped to

promote establishment and expansion of higher education/ community college programs. In order to meet this demand, the number of higher education/ community college leadership programs continued to grow. By 1991, Fife and Goodchild estimate 120 doctoral programs to prepare college administrators existed in the U. S.

Table 1
Numbers of Public and Private Non-Profit Two-Year Colleges, 1915-1999

Year	Total	Public		Private	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1915-16	74	19	26	55	74
1921-22	207	70	34	137	66
1929-30	325	136	42	189	58
1938-39	575	258	45	317	55
1947-48	650	328	50	322	50
1952-53	594	327	55	267	45
1956-57	652	377	58	275	42
1960-61	678	405	60	273	40
1972-73	1,141	910	80	231	20
1980-81	1,231	1,049	85	182	15
1998-99	1,244	1,075	86	169	14

Source: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory*, 1960, 1976, 1979, 1980; Palmer, 1987b; National Center for Education Statistics, 1993, 2003b, as cited in Cohen, A.M., and Brawer, F. B., *The American Community College*, 4th Edition, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003, p. 15.

The Vital Role of Foundations and the Federal Government to Expand Capacity

Foundations and the federal government provided further critical support in establishing and expanding higher education/ community college leadership programs. Much as George F. Zook had used his status in the Office of

Education to convene early junior colleges to a meeting in St. Louis in 1920 that resulted in the creation of the American Association of Junior Colleges (Pedersen, 1995), Grant Morrison of the U. S. Office of Education convened a meeting of uni-

versity-based professors and program directors interested in issues related to community college establishment. This group began informal meetings in 1957, and three years later, decided to formally organize. Thus began the Council of

Universities and Colleges, AACC's oldest affiliated council (Young, 2002), and an important conduit for interested private philanthropy and federal programming was now in place. Today, this organization is known as the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, AACC's smallest in terms of membership size, yet one of its most important affiliated councils.

The role of private philanthropy in establishing and expanding higher education/community college programs cannot be understated. According to Edmund J. Gleazer (2000), whose AACC presidency (1958-1981) coincided with the decades of college establishment and expansion, the initial announcement of the Kellogg Foundation grant competition anticipated proposals for pre- and in-service training programs for community college administrators.

Ten universities were invited to participate in the W. K. Kellogg Junior College Leadership Program: University of California, Los Angeles; University of California at Berkeley; Stanford University; University of Florida; Florida State University; University of Michigan; Michigan State University; Wayne State University; Teachers College, Columbia University; and the University of Texas at Austin. A

planning meeting was held with AAJC staff, Kellogg Foundation officials, and representatives of the 10 invited universities (Gleazer, 2000; Young, 2002). Reflecting upon the significance of this program in providing a cadre of well-prepared community college leaders, Gleazer would later write:

...The potential was almost beyond belief for those who had worked toward such a day. For at the dawn of the boom decade for community colleges, 500 new institutions to be established in that decade, this tremendous resource for leadership and for the development of leadership was ready for action. One could call it an educational miracle...(who) not only developing leadership, but shaping the identity of the evolving institution. (2000, p. 7)

In the 1960s and 1970s, both the W. K. Kellogg and Ford Foundations, and to a lesser but significant extent, the Sloan and U. S. Steel Foundations, became important players in the area of higher education/community college leadership development. As is still the case today, often a privately funded program leads to the establishment of publicly funded programs. In the 1960s, the programs supported by Kellogg and Ford included faculty development for new community college faculty, and extensive doctoral fellowships at many institutions. Such funding

provided powerful incentives for universities that had previously been closed to serving significant numbers of persons of color and female students. Strong programmatic leadership, program identity, the maintenance of program identity over time, and extant entrepreneurial creativity encouraged long-term commitments by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to North Carolina State University and the University of Texas at Austin. In turn, these commitments helped both programs attain a critical mass of faculty, programs and services. Over time, committed faculties in both of these programs developed highly enviable records of matriculating minority doctoral students.

It is highly likely that the initial Kellogg and Ford Foundation program grants of the early 1960s spurred efforts by the federal and state governments to support community college leadership development. The Ford Foundation, for example, invested significant funding into professional development programs for faculty at community colleges around the country in that decade. Private sector support spurred federal funding for development of community college leaders that included the federal Education Professions Development Act, which was part of the Title III

Strengthening Developing Institutions Program of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Table 2 provides a listing of selected federal programs that provided financial support for faculty development in various fields, and in some programs, for the training of administrators. Nearly all of these programs provided significant funding in the 1960s and early 1970s that, by the mid-1980s, had largely been eliminated (Boggs, 2003). It should also be noted that the curricular approaches developed by the Kellogg- and Ford Foundation-supported programs were very diverse, designed as the colleges were to best meet local needs.

for master plans for community colleges, and statewide plans for professional and staff development of community college faculty and staff for every state. While approved as Title X in the Education Amendments of 1972, funds were never appropriated (O'Banion, 1972). The National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, established NDEA fellowships, as did the acts creating the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Community college staff participated in these programs; however, funds were directed toward specific subjects rather than the broad-based understanding of the community college mission.

Institutions Program were doubled for FY1973 to \$100 million, of which 24 percent had to be set aside for community colleges. Clearly, Title III was an engine for the support of faculty and staff professional development at American community colleges. Unfortunately, the Education Amendments of 1972 cut the Education Development Professions Act funding from \$8 to \$2 million. Bender noted that these funding sources necessitated an emphasis upon grantsmanship efforts and did not reflect any systematic national understanding or commitment to the capital investment concept (O'Banion, 1972).

Table 2
Selected Major Federal Programs in Support of Professional Development for Community College Faculty and Administrators

National Defense Education Act of 1958 (created NDEA fellowships)	Higher Education Act of 1965
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963	Allied Health Professions Act of 1966
Vocational Education Act of 1963	Education Professions Development Act of 1968
Nursing Education Act of 1964	Education Amendments of 1972 (created the Pell Grant Program and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education)

Source: Millard, 1972, pp. 118-119.

Table 2 also summarizes key federal programs that supported professional development for community college faculty and administrators. Title III, the Education Professions Development Act, and the National Defense Education Act all provided significant

The interest of federal policymakers at this time was also significant. In 1969, New Jersey Senator Harrison Williams introduced a federal Comprehensive Community College Act. Using the 1202 provisions of the Higher Education Act, it called

Louis W. Bender (1974) stated that 18 of the 90 grants made by the new Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education in 1973 went to community colleges. Bender also noted that appropriations for the Title III Strengthening Developing

funding for full-time study, and reflected a national need and commitment to well-trained community college administrators. And the flagship and regional universities responded with programs. Auburn University

developed a program that prepared community college leaders in the late 1960s and 1970s with initial NDEA and Title III support. Funding supported full-time study and travel, and exposed persons thinking about careers at community colleges to meet leaders and visit institutions. One participant told the authors his NDEA doctoral fellowship in 1970 paid for his doctoral tuition, fees, and books, and provided a \$7,600

annual cash stipend. With inflation, this is nearly \$30,000 in today's money.

A 1975 report of the National Board on Graduate Education stated the obvious: nationally, federal funding may play the crucial role (Martorana, Toombs, & Breneman). The documented sharp decline in federal funding for doctoral education directly coincides with the reduction

and elimination of federal doctoral fellowship programs. Today, no such broad-based federally funded doctoral programs exist, even though community colleges prepare 85 percent of the nation's homeland security first responders (police, fire, emergency medical technicians, nurses, allied health professionals, etc.) (Boggs, 2004).

Higher education/community college programs today

Roughly one-half of the universities in Canada and the United States employ a full-time faculty member who possesses a research interest in some aspect of the community college. A small number of the higher education/community college programs serve students attending on a full-time basis, and typically have eight or more full-time faculty. The vast majority of the programs, however, have fewer than six full-time faculty, and often only one to three faculty serving a student body nearly totally comprised of part-time students.

In their 1991 study, *Administration as a Profession*, Jonathan Fife and Lester Goodchild estimated that approximately 120 doctoral programs in higher education/community college leadership existed. In 2003, the American Association of Community Colleges documented that nearly 140 universities offered some form of graduate coursework in the community college (Boggs, 2003). Roughly one-half of the universities in Canada and the United States employ a full-time faculty member who possesses a research interest in some aspect of the community college. A small number of the higher education/community college programs serve students attending on a full-time basis, and typically have eight or more full-time faculty. The vast majority of the programs, however, have fewer than six full-time faculty, and often only one to three faculty serving a student body nearly totally comprised of part-time students. Some programs have extended the range of their primary and secondary service areas through distance learning, weekend course delivery, and block scheduling on weekday evenings. Virtually all of the faculty involved in community college leadership preparation are members of the AACC-affiliated Council for the Study of Community Colleges. The truth today is that only a few of the nation's doctoral-level higher education/community college programs are in strong health.

The Challenge of Program Identity

A principal problem facing higher education/community college programs today is the decline of program identity. In their 1974 book, *Higher Education as a Field of Study*, Dressel and Mayhew project a formal Department of Higher Education or Center for the Study of Higher Education as the primary organizational structure. Today, with the exception of several selected

Today, with the exception of several selected universities, the higher education/community college leadership programs no longer possess identifiable departments within colleges of education where they are housed. The typical governance structure of most colleges of education has changed significantly in the past three decades, and with it, the level of independence and entrepreneurial freedom to innovate.

universities, the higher education/community college leadership programs no longer possess identifiable departments within colleges of education where they are housed. The typical governance structure of most colleges of

education has changed significantly in the past three decades, and with it, the level of independence and entrepreneurial freedom to innovate.

In a presentation before a recent meeting of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, Professor James O. Hammons of the University of Arkansas discussed his perspective on changes in College of Education organizational structures during his career. He observed that, three decades ago, Colleges of Education possessed flat organizational structures, with separate departments, independent budget lines, and separate department chairs to champion them. By the late 1990s, most had been

restructured hierarchically with super-departments or divisions that group two, three, or four formerly independent programs together. Most often, the department or division that houses higher education/community college programs also includes the programs in educational administration for K-12, and foundations of education. The community college specialization

Most often, the department or division that houses higher education/community college programs also includes the programs in educational administration for K-12, and foundations of education. The community college specialization often suffers an identity crisis, because faculty members in the expanded new super-departments are expected to be more generalists in higher education than specialists in community colleges.

often suffers an identity crisis, because faculty members in the expanded new super-departments are expected to be more generalists in higher education than specialists in community colleges.

In many instances, the super-department at flagship universities leads to the curious “one is enough” phenomenon. Few programs employ more than one full-time faculty member with an interest in the community college. Even in large programs that have been able to maintain their separate departmental status, such as the University of California, Los Angeles, or the University of Michigan, it is unusual to find more than one full-time community college specialist. Unlike regional universities, which rely heavily upon transfer students to bolster their baccalaureate degree completion rates, many flagship universities have few functional ties with community colleges. Many are located away from larger urban areas, and do not need strong relationships with community colleges to survive or even thrive. Still,

it is tragic to see distinguished nationally recognized senior scholars such as Arthur M. Cohen and Richard Alfred work all or most of their careers as the sole tenured faculty members of their departments and colleges with a research interest in the community college. The one is enough phenomenon makes the mentoring of new faculty with a specialization in the community college problematic.

Today, university faculty who specialize in research related to community colleges often find themselves isolated within their own institutions. Since the reward structure in many universities favors theoretical research, scholars whose work is focused on practical administrative and faculty issues at community colleges are less valued than those who study policy at the university level. Because community colleges are

teaching institutions that serve the needs of those students who are marginalized from higher levels of education, community college scholars find themselves also marginalized in the relevance and topics of their research. Faculty with service interests related to community colleges also risk alienation by associating too closely with the actual practice of education. Whereas higher education/community college programs at all but the largest institutions are devoted to training practitioners, university faculty members are rarely rewarded for practical service to the community colleges they study. Rewards at the university are for publishing in peer-reviewed or refereed journals; there is little prestige attached to providing service to the institutions and administrators that faculty with an interest in the community college study and teach.

Different Approaches, Difficult Comparisons

Differences in the role and approaches of university-based leadership development programs make it difficult to compare doctoral degree programs. This is in part because of the great diversity of program approach that exists. That diversity can be curricular, as demonstrated by the programs at George Mason University (GMU), the University of Texas at Austin, and the Mid-South Partnership for Rural Community Colleges, operated by Alcorn and Mississippi State Universities. The Doctorate of Arts in Community College Education at GMU is an interdisciplinary program

aimed directly at preparing undergraduate level instructional leaders (George Mason University, 2004). The Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas at Austin uses a cohort-based approach that admits 14 students per year. Its curriculum is anchored in a 12-hour community college “block of time” core taken in the fall term, followed by additional coursework and a semester-long internship under an experienced community college president. Students perform a self-assessment of their own leadership skills and competencies, and what they would

need to become effective community college leaders. Individual plans are developed and appropriate mentoring follows, reinforced by extensive field visits to community colleges. The program is capped by the required semester-long student internship under an experienced president (University of Texas at Austin, 2004). Mississippi State University (MSU) offers a doctoral Community College Leadership Program featuring an interdisciplinary curriculum designed to meet the leadership training needs of community college professionals in a rural context. Instructional delivery includes intensive weekend, compressed video, and Internet courses, with special emphasis on the role of the rural community

college in economic and community development (MSU, 2004).

The various factors that distinguish higher education/community college programs are based on the usual indicators of national institutional prominence: number of full-time faculty, publication productivity, research dollars generated, quality of students, and placement of students as scholars in other universities or as institutional CEOs. Most university-based doctoral programs in fields ranging from history to mathematics are established for the purpose of training future professors and researchers, not practitioners. Even doctoral programs in other professional fields are training their students primarily to be scholars, not practitioners and certainly not administrators. The students attend on a full-time basis, and typically enter advanced degree programs immediately upon completion of the bachelors or masters degree. Higher education/community college students are typically older, already hold full-time jobs, and the vast majority cannot quit their jobs to attend school full-time, living on a \$10,000-15,000 graduate student assistantship stipend.

The prestige hierarchy of university programs affects disciplinary pride and allocation of resources as well. Whereas administrator programs at

the K-12 level are authorized to provide state-required certification for their students, higher education/community colleges programs do not have this legislated mandate for the training of university administrators. Given these legal certification requirements, and the lack of comparable requirements at the university level, resources are allocated to K-12 programs first, to meet their professional and state-level programmatic accreditation criteria. Higher education/community college programs have no such leverage for the maintenance or development of their programs. How, then, are they to survive in this era of declining state funding for education? A major feature in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Unequal Cuts", documented how access-oriented two- and four-year institutions took the brunt of state budget cuts (Hebel, 2003). Higher education/community college programs are often at the lowest level of the institutional hierarchy in colleges of education and, consequently, have been among the easiest to reduce or discontinue in times of budget cuts.

There is the lack of a professional guild to accredit higher education/community college programs, to bring about a more consistent approach across the curriculum of all programs. Certification of

community college faculty and administrators exists in only a few states. Unlike the professions of law, dentistry, and medicine, that produce first professional degrees, or disciplines such as chemistry, physics, and engineering, there is no formal guild that accredits the higher education/community college programs. These professional associations influence curriculum in three ways: through the direct accreditation of the university-based programs, through the administration of an entry test to enter the profession, or through both. At any American Bar Association-accredited law school, for example, a constitutional law course will be found in the introductory year of study. This reflects a consensus or sense of consensus among professionals in the field, who through their professional associations have developed a set of guidelines that places the teaching of constitutional law as a high priority to gain professional program accreditation, in order to be eligible to take the test to become a lawyer. In nearly every state, one must pass the program of an accredited law school to sit for the bar exam. One does not need to be the graduate of an accredited program to become a community college president, however. Given the lack of a guild to exercise control over entry into the profession, it is highly likely that the

aims, purposes, programs, services, curricular approaches, and delivery methods of the university-based higher education/community college leadership preparation programs will

remain diverse. Further, in a nation as large as the United States, a diversity of program aims and objectives is desirable. For example, tailoring a program to address the

specific needs of rural community colleges makes great sense in Mississippi; such an approach may not be appropriate in southern California.

The Challenge of Producing Diverse Leaders

Given the very tough budgetary realities of recent years, there is a constant burden on higher education/community college programs to demonstrate their relevance and justify their contribution to the colleges of education in which they are housed. Currently, the challenge of producing diverse leaders that reflect the population of the community colleges they serve is an example of a contribution expected from higher education/community college leadership programs. Promoting diversity at the doctoral level is not a new problem. In 1974, Alfredo de los Santos noted that 75 percent of Chicanos in U. S. higher education were enrolled at community colleges. He also lamented the low number of Chicanos who graduated from community college leadership programs during the 1960s. Only one Chicano received a doctorate from UCLA's program in the decade 1961-1970, only 2 had graduated between 1950 and 1970 from the University of Texas at Austin, and New Mexico State University graduated its first Chicano in the summer of 1973.

While enrollments and degrees awarded to persons of color have increased since de los Santos wrote in 1974, much more remains to be done. Then as now, the problem is with the pipeline, as Tables 3 and 4 show. The pipeline problem will persist until it is fixed. The low overall pool of persons of color with doctorates explains a practical reality found at many urban community colleges—something best described as

stealing each other's administrators and faculty members. Increasing the number of minority doctoral graduates can help eradicate this practice.

The challenge of serving America's fast growing minority populations is also not a new problem. It can be predicted that community colleges located in areas of the nation with burgeoning Hispanic populations will see heightened pressure from their trustees and their communities to hire minority candidates. Given the great shift in population, the challenge community colleges face in employing administrative staff and faculty that are roughly proportional to the populations they serve will be a daunting task. With such a small available pool, can community colleges realistically expect to be competitive in their searches for qualified minority executive candidates? The answer is no, unless much greater emphasis is placed upon pipeline issues at all levels of the continuum in American education.

Table 3
Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded to African-Americans
by Major Field Group, 1977-1996.

Year	Engineering	Physical Sciences	Math & Computer Sciences	Life Sciences	Psychology	Social Sciences	Humanities	Education	Total
1977									
Number	23	45	11	77	105	123	74	685	1,143
% of all AA doctorates	(2.0)	(3.9)	(1.0)	(6.7)	(9.2)	(10.8)	(6.5)	(59.9)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[0.9]	[1.4]	[1.1]	[1.6]	[3.8]	[3.1]	[2.5]	[8.6]	
1987									
Number	29	25	11	95	90	97	47	457	851
% of all AA doctorates	(3.4)	(2.9)	(1.3)	(11.1)	(10.6)	(11.4)	(5.5)	(57.3)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[0.8]	[0.7]	[1.0]	[1.7]	[2.8]	[3.2]	[2.3]	[6.6]	
1996									
Number	69	53	17	152	152	136	69	545	1,193
% of all AA doctorates	(5.8)	(4.4)	(1.4)	(12.7)	(12.7)	(11.4)	(5.8)	(45.7)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[1.1]	[1.2]	[0.8]	[1.9]	[4.0]	[3.5]	[2.3]	[8.2]	
CHANGE, in numbers... 1977 to 1996	+46	+8	+6	+75	+47	+13	-5	-140	+50

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) via Webcaspar, as cited by Gray, William E. Increasing Minority Opportunities and Achievement in Doctoral Programs, In Leadership Summit on Diversity in Doctoral Education, Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by the US Department of Education, June 2-3, 1999.

Table 4
Number of Doctoral Degrees Awarded to Hispanic-Americans
by Major Field Group, 1977-1996.

Year	Engineering	Physical Sciences	Math & Computer Sciences	Life Sciences	Psychology	Social Sciences	Humanities	Education	Total
1977									
Number	25	42	18	52	56	63	77	164	497
% of all Hisp doctorates	(5.0)	(8.5)	(3.6)	(10.5)	(11.3)	(12.7)	(15.5)	(33.0)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[1.0]	[1.3]	[1.7]	[1.1]	[2.0]	[1.6]	[2.6]	[2.1]	
1987									
Number	67	64	15	88	227	67	81	204	813
% of all Hisp doctorates	(8.2)	(7.9)	(1.9)	(10.8)	(27.9)	(8.2)	(10.0)	(25.1)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[1.8]	[1.7]	[1.4]	[1.6]	[7.1]	[2.1]	[3.9]	[3.0]	
1996									
Number	84	70	17	163	191	93	99	222	939
% of all Hisp doctorates	(9.0)	(7.5)	(1.8)	(17.4)	(20.3)	(9.9)	(10.5)	(23.6)	(100.0)
% of Total doctorates	[1.3]	[1.5]	[0.8]	[2.1]	[5.1]	[2.4]	[3.3]	[3.3]	
CHANGE, in numbers... 1977 to 1996	+59	+28	-1	+111	+135	+30	+22	+58	+442

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) via Webcaspar, as cited by Gray, William E. Increasing Minority Opportunities and Achievement in Doctoral Programs, In Leadership Summit on Diversity in Doctoral Education, Proceedings of a Conference Sponsored by the US Department of Education, June 2-3, 1999.

In 1977, African-Americans and Hispanics received a total of 1,143 and 497 doctoral degrees, respectively. In 1996, they received 1,193 and 939, respectively. In 1977, doctorates awarded to African-Americans and Hispanics represented 3.8 and 1.6 percent, respectively, of the total, or 5.4 percent for America's two largest minority groups combined. Two decades later, a total of 330 universities awarded 3.6 percent of all doctorates to African-Americans, and 2.1 percent to Hispanics, for a combined total of almost 6 percent (Gray, 1999). As U. S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley noted in a 1999 speech to a conference on diversity in graduate education:

We have come a long way in terms of increasing diversity in graduate education. (but) even as the percentages of these minority students have gone up significantly, the overall numbers are still too low. The percentage increase is built on a very small base number. (Riley, 1999)

These low numbers mask even more serious problems for the nation's community colleges. By major field of study, the number of doctoral degrees awarded to African-Americans in Education actually *declined*, from 685 in 1977 to only 545 in 1996. The decline of 140 doctoral degrees awarded nationally over the past twenty years by definition means that more institutions will be chasing fewer academically well-qualified African-American graduates. For Hispanics, a total of 164 doctorates in Education were awarded in 1977; this number increased to 222 in 1996, an increase of 58 degree candidates over a period of two decades (Riley, 1999). The failure of the pipeline to produce a pool of well qualified minority doctoral graduates is well understood by the small number of minority administrators themselves. Qualitative interviews of career paths of Latino administrators participating in the 2001 Summer Leadership Conference of the National Community College Hispanic Council indicated entry

via student services and not through the traditional faculty ranks (Gutierrez, Castaneda, & Katsinas, 2002). The small pipeline will challenge community colleges in the next decade to recruit and retain talented minority administrators. In 1980, many predicted America's Hispanic population would exceed America's African-American population by 2025. By the mid-1990s, experts predicted that this would occur in 2010 (Rendon & Hope, 1996). Bureau of the Census data released in March of 2001 indicate that the number of Hispanics already exceeds the number of African-Americans nationally (U. S. Census Bureau, 2001).

The challenge of serving America's fast growing minority populations is also not a new problem. It can be predicted that community colleges located in areas of the nation with burgeoning Hispanic populations will see heightened pressure from their trustees and their communities to hire minority candidates. Given the great shift in population, the challenge community colleges face in employing administrative staff and faculty that are roughly proportional to the populations they serve will be a daunting task. With such a small available pool, can community colleges realistically expect to be competitive in their searches for qualified minority executive candidates? The answer is no, unless much greater emphasis is placed upon pipeline issues at all levels of the continuum in American education.

An inhibiting factor in serving larger numbers of minority students at the graduate level in our public universities is the instability of state funding. It takes a consistent long-term monetary investment at the program level to produce significant change in the numbers of masters and doctoral graduates. For example, the Mellon Foundation invested \$22 million between 1988 and 1999 to work with 39 privately controlled Historically Black Colleges and Universities (all United Negro College Fund members), and 27 other colleges and universities to

assist minority undergraduate students in preparing for Ph.D. programs in the arts, sciences, and the humanities. The \$22 million has provided stipends so that students can focus on academics instead of work while in their undergraduate years; the stipends are loans that are forgiven when students demonstrate progress toward advanced degrees. According to UNCF President William Gray III, of the 594 assisted students, 195

entered graduate school and 71 have completed masters degrees, 68 are at the candidacy stage in their doctoral programs, and 19 have finished doctorates. With such financial support, only 7 of the 594 students have ever dropped out. Financial aid in graduate school clearly makes a positive difference, particularly for persons of color and women, groups historically underrepresented at the upper echelons of administration.

Lessons Learned from the Establishment Era

A recurring theme is that many of the problems associated with expanding leadership development programs are not new. Creating different models of doctoral education tailored to the needs of a diverse population, providing funds for full-time study to significantly lower time-to-degree patterns and increase the pool, and funding to also assist minority doctoral attainment all were issues addressed in the 1960s.

The long-term interest of private foundations, that made decade long financial commitments, supported the development of “lighthouse programs.” The success of these initial programs in turn spurred federal legislation and, in particular, doctoral fellowship support, which then encouraged new players—regional universities—to establish and support doctoral programs in higher education/community college leadership.

A recurring theme is that many of the problems associated with expanding leadership development programs are not new. Creating different models of doctoral education tailored to the needs of a diverse population, providing funds for full-time study to significantly lower time-to-degree patterns and increase the pool, and funding to also assist minority doctoral attainment all were issues addressed in the 1960s.

A key lesson learned is that success required the active input of many actors—the professional associations, the Ford and W. K. Kellogg Foundations, and the universities. The colleges themselves were not yet well-established,

though key leaders played critically important roles. The requirements to access foundation funds included the requirement that the graduate school deans be involved if the institution was to participate, tying in the power structure of the universities, and giving status to the new higher education/community college program faculty. The interactions of AAJC President Edmund Gleazer with the leaders of organizations, including the Council of Graduate Schools, were important. Most important, there was sustained funding over an extended period of time, and the national challenge of providing new and appropriately prepared leadership for the new community colleges was created.

An Agenda for Building the Capacity of Doctoral-Level Leadership Opportunities

While this paper primarily focused on capacity building through the strengthening of the university-based leadership development programs, the authors recognize that strengthening leadership development opportunities for community college professionals must necessarily be a broad-based activity. For that reason, a comprehensive list of recommendations at the national, state, university, education college, and community college levels is offered. It is hoped that these ideas can spur individuals and organizations to further action on this critically important task of ensuring that America's community colleges are led well into a new century.

National Recommendations

1 *Strengthen relationships between community college leadership programs and national organizations.*

Examples of close relationships include the National Council for Student Development, housed at the University of Illinois, and the National Council of Instructional Administrators, housed at Texas Tech University. Other professional associations representing leadership in the community college do not have relationships that are as strong. In the past, the relationship of university-based programs was best represented by the fact that the Council for the Study of Community Colleges held a seat on the AACC Board. Returning that seat would provide for greater collaboration between the university-based programs and professional associations.

Providing support for professors and graduate students to hold membership in AACC and attend the national convention, and other community college conferences, would strengthen such relationships. To obtain funding from their universities, professors must often present research findings at these forums. Professional associations often do not have research agendas as part of their meetings, yet linkages at such events are important. Graduate students can use these opportunities to develop valuable networks and experiences that contribute to their professional development. Again, it is rare for a university to fund graduate student membership or attendance. Establishing realistic membership and conference fees for AACC and other community college professional associations can enhance the participation of professors and graduate students.

2 *Broaden the base of support for university-based leadership development programs.*

Proposed by George A. Baker III (February 2002), the convening of national associations and organizations to develop partnerships could address a number of issues presented in this paper. Representatives should include major national associations, including the Council of Graduate Schools, American Council on Education, the National Association of State Colleges and Land-Grant Universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the five entities whose members are most involved on a daily basis in the doctoral preparation of community college leaders—the Association for the Study of Higher Education, the American Education Research Association, the American College Personnel Association, the National

Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the Council for the Study of Community Colleges.

This partnership could work on financial objectives as well as the importance of developing a pipeline for the broader participation of minorities and women in doctoral programs and in positions of leadership. Goals of the partnership could include expanded federal fellowships for full-time doctoral study and expanded fellowships vital to creating more minority and women doctoral graduates. Such a partnership could also promote student loan forgiveness at the federal, state, and local levels for doctoral graduates who work at community colleges in inner cities and rural areas of the nation with high poverty rates.

3 *Foundation support is needed to create “lighthouse” programs that will precede federal investment in community college leadership development.*

The highly successful Kellogg model of the late 1950s and 1960s should be replicated again today.

Foundation support is especially needed for the following critical agenda items:

- a. Start up grants for new faculty. A modest grant of \$75,000 to the Council for

the Study of Community Colleges could create a series of start-up research funds for new untenured faculty with a research specialization in the community college. No such federal grants exist. CSCC’s research committee would review proposals, and award funding of between 7 and 10 research projects. The use of existing intermediaries such as the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, AACC’s oldest affiliated council which dates its founding to 1960, as a program and funding intermediary may make administrative sense for larger foundations.

- b. Create a Mentoring Program that pairs veteran university-based community college educators with groups of junior faculty. A number of foundations, including the Spencer Foundation, fund invitational summer workshops for faculty interested in law and finance issues. Similar programs are needed to help expand the base of university-based faculty, and to convene and mentor

junior level scholars, with an interest in the community college. Such a program would cost little and produce significant dividends.

- c. Foundation support for a major in-depth national study of the pipeline provided by the nation’s higher education programs, with special emphasis on those that prepare community college leaders, is needed. Such a study would build upon the study of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation-sponsored programs currently undertaken by AACC, as part of AACC’s Leading Forward initiative. The goal would be to have an in-depth book-length treatment of the subject, along the lines of the Dressel and Mayhew study of the early 1970s.

- d. A major study of the potential impact of Titles III and V related to leadership development is needed. There are few studies guiding policymakers on this subject. The opportunity programs served as a major source of funding for community college leadership development

during the “baby boom” establishment era, and can do so again today.

e. Foundations should recognize the need for programs aimed at the specific needs of community colleges when developing their program. The new American Council on Education Fellows program supported by the Lumina Foundation is an excellent example of a program that is more appropriately oriented to the type of non-traditional student who is either in a faculty role or mid-level management role, preparing to transition to senior administration. The program is structured to maximize the participation of working professionals; such an exemplary approach should be emulated in other

programs developed in the future. The straight-jacket of full-time only program participation will need to be lifted if maximum progress is to occur.

Revive the provisions contained in the Title X Community College Act in a future reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act.

A separate Community College Act can permanently fund and place the Office of Community College Liaison within the Secretary’s Office. A separate Act can provide funds for FIPSE-style research and demonstration projects oriented toward the special needs of community colleges. A separate Act can provide a major infusion of federal funds specifically for a wide variety of graduate programs, similar to what the federal government does in its McNair, GAANN, and other

federal fellowship programs. Such an externally driven strategy builds upon what has worked in the past, and is justified if the doctoral programs are to assist the community colleges in building an expanded leadership capacity.

Success will not be achieved if community college leadership needs continue to be separated and subsumed by a myriad of programs within the Office of Postsecondary Education. The argument fought in the late 1960s and early 1970s makes eminently good sense today. The Education Professions Development Act should be re-examined, and a model appropriate to the new millennium inserted into federal law. Such legislation is justified by the primary role community colleges play in training an estimated 85 percent of the nation’s first responder emergency services (police, fire, EMT, nursing and allied health professionals).

State Recommendations

State community college associations and agencies should work with university-based doctoral programs to strengthen formal training for community college professionals.

Every state should have at least one doctoral program in higher

education/community college leadership, as per the suggestion of George A. Baker III (2002). Each program should have at least 6.0 FTE faculty, of whom two should have a research interest in the community college. Larger states such as Texas, California, New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Florida should

have several strong programs. State associations should be encouraged to convene meetings of community college CEOs and university presidents to share with them concerns regarding the strengthening of investments in leadership development.

2 *State community college associations should make available free or at-cost memberships in their associations for professors of higher education/community college leadership.*

If professors are to share current cutting-edge issues with their doctoral students, as community college CEOs consistently encourage them to do, then they must provide the persons who would educate their leaders with this specific type of information. Many state community

college associations do not currently allow associate membership for professors in higher education/community college leadership, creating a subtle but important and real barrier between theory and practice.

Recommendations for Universities and Colleges of Education

1 *Recognize the importance of and the differences inherent in a higher education/community college leadership program.*

A critical mass of full-time students is important to support the program and augment the educational experience of the working professionals who attend part-time. One way to develop a critical mass is to provide a select number of fellowships or half-time employment that provides more than the standard graduate assistantship support. Program identity can be supported by understanding the differences inherent in working with community colleges. Funds to support professional service and applied or action research

would go far in indicating understanding of the entrepreneurial attitude necessary to forge mutually beneficial relationships.

2 *Ensure that university-based higher education/community college leadership programs maintain their own identity.*

This can be accomplished by having an appropriate minimum number of full-time faculty, a budget dedicated to support the activities of such a program, and an individual directing or coordinating program activities drawn from the higher education/community college faculty.

Recommendations for University-Based Programs and Community Colleges

1 *Strengthen relationships between University-Based Programs and Community Colleges.*

Universities should always have an advisory committee for their higher education/community college leadership program. The committee should approve and periodically review the curricula, degree

requirements, and program effectiveness and delivery methods. The president of the university and the dean of the college of education should sit on the advisory committee, which should meet at least two times per year. Any disconnect between the university-based leadership programs and the needs of community colleges in the field must

be addressed (Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). As Piland and Wolf observe, “Current community college leaders should take an active role in advisory committees for university programs. If no advisory committee exists, community college leaders must begin to raise questions as to why not” (2003, p. 97).

2 *Community college presidents and other senior administrators should personally invest their time in support of the higher education/community college programs in their state and local region.*

This means volunteer service on advisory committees, actually

making the meetings, and providing financial support for paid internships and other experiences. It means making themselves available to serve as guest lecturers, facilitators, and panelists for doctoral-level classes. It means welcoming doctoral students interested in studying the community college with open arms to their board meetings and other

events. It also means that universities hire community college presidents and other senior administrators as part-time faculty and that plans to support professional development at the doctoral level should be part and parcel of a comprehensive, thoughtful, and deliberative approach of community colleges.

Bibliography

- American Indian Higher Education Consortium. (2005). *Current roster of the tribal colleges*. Retrieved January 3, 2005, from <http://www.aihec.org/CollegeRoster.html>
- Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *Career paths for community college leaders*. Leadership Series Research Brief No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Baker, G. A., III. (2002). American higher education at the Rubicon: A partnership for progress. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(7-8), 629-644.
- Bender, L. W. (1974). Governmental actions affecting staff development. In R. Yarrington (Ed.), *New staff for new students: Educational opportunity for all*. Report of the 1973 Assembly. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Boggs, G. R. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boggs, G. R. (2004, March). *The future of community colleges: national and local perspectives*. Unpublished speech to the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education Lecture Series, Plano, TX.
- Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review*, 30(1), 45-73.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American Community College* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- De los Santos, A. G. (1974). Staffing to meet the needs of Spanish-speaking students. In R. Yarrington (Ed.), *New staff for new students: Educational opportunity for all*. Report of the 1973 Assembly. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Dressel, P. L., & Mayhew, L. B. (1974). *Higher education as a field of study: The emergence of a profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evelyn, J. (2001, December 14). Getting on the fast track to run community colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A27-28.
- Fife, J. D., & Goodchild, L. F. (1991). Conclusion (Administration as a profession). *New directions in higher education* 19(4), 115-117. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- George Mason University. (2004). *Doctorate of arts in community college education*. Retrieved March 29, 2004, from <http://dacce.gmu.edu/mission/index.html>
- Gibson-Harman, K., Rodriguez, S., & Haworth, J. G. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: the human resource challenge. In T. H. Bers & H. D. Calhoun (Eds.), *Next steps for the community college* (pp. 77-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (2000). Reflections on values, vision, and vitality: Perspectives for the 21st century. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24(1), pp. 7-18.
- Goodchild, L. F. (1991). Higher education as a field of study: Its origins, programs, and purposes, 1893-1960. In J. D. Fife and L. F. Goodchild (Eds.), *New directions in higher education* 19(4), 15-32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Gray, W. E., III. (1999, June 2-3). Increasing minority opportunities and achievement in doctoral programs. In *Leadership summit on diversity in doctoral education*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education.
- Gutierrez, M., Castaneda, C., & Katsinas, S. (2002). Latino leadership in community colleges: Issues and challenges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(4), 297-314.
- Hammons, J. O. (1975). (Ed). *Proceedings: The conference on questions and issues in planning community college staff development programs*. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED111462).
- Hardy, D. E. (2005). *A two-year college typology for the 21st century: Updating and utilizing the Katsinas-Lacey classification system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Hebel, S. (2003, May 30). Unequal impact: Community colleges face disproportionate cuts in state budgets. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A21.
- Katsinas, S. G., Lacey, V. A., & Hardy, D. E. (forthcoming). *A classification of two-year colleges in the United States*.
- Keim, M. C. (1996). Faculty in graduate programs in community college education. *Community College Review*, 24(1), 29-38.
- Kelly, E. (2002, May 27). The changing of the guard. *Community College Week*, pp. 6-9.
- Martorana, S. V., Toombs, W., & Breneman, D. W. (1975). *Graduate education and community colleges: Cooperative approaches to community college staff development*. Washington, D. C.: National Board on Graduate Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED111479).
- Millard, R. (Ed.). (1972). *Planning and management practices in higher education: Promise or dilemma?* Denver: Education Commission of the States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED065103).
- Mississippi State University. (2004). *Community college leadership doctoral degree program*. Retrieved March 29, 2004, from <http://www.educ.msstate.edu/EdLead/programs.html#commcol>
- Mortensen, T. G. (2004). *State and local tax fund appropriations for higher education per \$1000 of state personal income FY1961 to FY2004*. Retrieved January 11, 2004, from <http://www.postsecondary.org/archives/Reports/Spreadsheets/TaxFundApprop04.htm>
- O'Banion, T. (1972). *Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Palmer, J. (1987). *Community, technical, and junior colleges: A summary of selected national data*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED292507).
- Pedersen, Robert T. (1995). The St. Louis conference: The junior college movement reborn. *Community College Journal*, 65(5), 26-31.
- Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing colleges squarely in the middle. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 93-99). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rendon, L. I., & Hope, R. O. (1996). *Educating a new majority: Transforming America's educational system for diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Riley, R. W. (1999). *Leadership summit on diversity in doctoral education*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Walters, D. L. (1992). In F. C. Wendel (Ed.), *Applications of reflective practice*, (pp. 27-51). University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration.
- Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. Washington, D. C.: Community College Press.
- Townsend, B. (1996). The role of the professoriate in influencing future community college leadership. In J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: What it means today*, (pp. 59-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- University of Texas at Austin. (2004). *Community college leadership program: About the CCLP*. Retrieved March 29, 2004, from <http://www.utexas.edu/academic/cclp/about/index.html>
- U. S. Census Bureau (2001). *Census 2000 brief*. Washington, D. C.: GPO.
- Vaughan, G. B. (1990). *Pathway to the presidency: Community college deans of instruction*. Washington, D. C.: Community College Press.
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency 2001*. AACC/Leadership Series Research Brief no. 3. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Wendel, F. C. (Ed.). (1992). *Applications of Reflective Practice*. University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED366085).
- Young, R. J. (1996). Legacy of the post-WWII growth years for community college leadership programs. In J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: What it means today* (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, R. J. (2002). From persuasion to accommodation in public two-year college development. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(7-8), 559-572.