DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 363 JC 950 549

AUTHOR Johnson, Larry, Ed.
TITLE Leadership Abstracts, 1995.
INSTITUTION League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Leadership Abstracts; v8 n1-12 1995

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; *Community Colleges; Distance Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Opportunities; *Educational Technology; Endowment Funds; Learning Theories; Lifelong Learning; *Partnerships in Education; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The abstracts in this series provide two-page discussions of issues related to leadership, administration, and teaching in community colleges. The 12 abstracts for Volume 8, 1995, are: (1) "Redesigning the System To Meet the Workforce Training Needs of the Nation," by Larry Warford; (2) "The College President, the Board, and the Board Chair: A Primer on Effective Relationships," by Wayne Newton and Norm Nielsen; (3) "From Teaching to Learning: A New Reality for Community Colleges," by Robert B. Barr; (4) "Defining the Productivity of Community College Administrators," by Phillip N. Venditti; (5) "Will Educational Opportunity Survive?" by Patrick Callan; (6) "Mission Possible: Teaching the Disenfranchised," by J. William Wenrich; (7) "Don't Miss the Joy!" by Dale Parnell, reviewing positive aspects of leading a community college; (8) "Can Community Colleges Do the Job?" by Robert A. (Squee) Gordon; (9) "The Evolution of Community College Workforce Development Programs," by James Jacobs; (10) "Who Are Community Colleges' Distance Learners?" by Carol Cross; (11) "Regarding Technology," by Larry Johnson, reviewing the growing use of technology in community colleges to prepare students for the modern workplace; and (12) "Endowed Chairs for Instructional Leadership," by Paul C. Gianini, Jr. (TGI)

Leadership Abstracts, Volume 8, Numbers 1-12, 1995.

League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

REDESIGNING THE SYSTEM TO MEET THE WORKFORCE TRAINING NEEDS OF THE NATION

Larry Warford

There is general agreement among business, educational, and government leaders that there is a critical need to train a work force that can compete with any in the world. A gap has grown between the declining skills of our work force and the increasing skill levels demanded in the global workplace. As we move from an industrial-age economy to an information-age economy, the United States has failed to invest in its human resources to the level necessary to keep our place of leadership in global economic competition.

As this situation has developed, a great deal of pressure for meeting the increasing workforce training needs has fallen on the formal education system. Unfortunately, the formal American system of education is really just a system of "schooling," and typically provided to young people not yet in the work force. The system, as it now stands, is "front-end loaded" and too inflexible to meet the increasing demands for training that today's workers will experience throughout their lifetime.

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., former president of the American Association of Community Colleges and an advocate of lifelong learning for many years, suggests that this "front-end" view of education must change—learning and education should, indeed must, be a continuing process. In Gleazer's view, lifelong education is distinct from traditional forms of adult education; it is the continuum that encompasses and unifies all stages of education—preprimary, primary, secondary, and beyond—and all patterns of education, whether formal or informal.

Redesigning the System for Lifelong Learning

Building on Gleazer's view of lifelong learning, the American Council on Education (ACE) recently prepared an open letter to President Clinton which stated, in part, that "satisfying the educational needs of adults is as important to the good health of America as satisfying the educational needs of children and young people."

ACE argued that there are two clusters of problems that need to be addressed if progress is to be made in improving learning opportunities that enhance the employability and well-being of American adults. The first cluster involves philosophical issues. The second is primarily structural. Philosophically, for too many American policy makers, learning is still equated with "kids" and "school." Accordingly, this translates into a preoccupation with classroom-based instruction that is provided at times and in formats and settings that are unsuitable for employed adults. Similarly, prior learning of adults is often ignored or devalued, with the result that an unwholesome separation of education and life is prevalent in our society.

Structural problems stem from the fragmented and unsystematic nature of the present educational enterprise. ACE suggests that formal educational providers are too far removed from the workforce realities of the community, and that in rising to fill that gap, employers and labor unions tend to address education and training on a piecemeal basis in terms of their own immediate concerns. The result is a "mishmash" in which national goals are too often ignored, resources unnecessarily wasted, and individual needs left unmet.

To resolve these issues, policy makers must stop seeing work and learning as separate. Work settings must become learning environments. Employers must realize that ongoing education and training are vital aspects of global economic competitiveness—and workers must realize that their current and future employability is at risk.

The Changing Work Place

In September 1993, the American Association of Community Colleges published a policy paper, *"The Workforce Training Imperative: Meeting the Training Needs of the Nation,"* making the point that as much as 75 percent of the existing work force will require significant job retraining in the next decade. Furthermore, the problem is not going away soon; fully 85 percent of the American work force of the year 2000 is already at work today; unfortunately, the half-life of occupational skills is only five years.

Experts on the future of work in this country have painted a picture of a workplace far more dynamic and uncertain than that of even the recent past. Consider: Today's workers will make four to six career changes in their lifetime. As a result, by 2000, America's corporate training budgets will triple and job mobility—changing job location or firm—will dramatically increase. And the work place will be much more diverse: one out of three workers will be an ethnic minority; and over 60 percent of the work force will be women.

Workforce Training

Workforce training programs have proliferated in response to these changing realities in the workplace, and include all types of programs that prepare persons in some sort of employment transition for reentry (or in some cases, initial entry) into the work force by providing them with new or additional skill sets. They also include skill upgrades and other continuing education programs for the current work force.

Until very recently, however, training of the current work force has been largely the responsibility of employers, professional associations, and licensure agencies. Since most of the training from these kinds of providers has fallen outside of the requirements of certificates, degrees, and diplomas in the formal system of "schooling," little attention and fewer resources have been devoted by the public sector to support such endeavors. Nonetheless, driven by the rigors of the ever-changing workplace and the need to ensure currency in the professions, associations and licensure agencies increasingly require continuing education as a prerequisite of membership. In the same spirit, employers are requiring (and often providing) ongoing skills upgrading as a condition of employment. Because little of this training is an easy fit with existing certificate and degree requirements of the formal system of schooling, professional associations and licensure agencies have become major credentialing forces for the work force, supplanting in some cases the more traditional (but less current) certificates and degrees of the formal system.

Only recently has any part of our formal schooling system paid any attention to the real needs of the work force. In the 1980s, however, community colleges began to recognize the opportunity and challenge posed by customized contract training designed for flexibility and responsiveness to the needs of the current worker. Today, hundreds of community colleges across the country are partnering with business, industry, labor, and government to deliver customized training to employees, often at their workplace.

In establishing these partnerships, community colleges have enjoyed a good deal of success, emerging as major providers of workforce training. What is needed now is a commitment by community college leaders to develop structures that will bring workforce training into the mainstream of the community college while retaining the flexibility of customer-driven programs. As Gleazer suggests, community colleges "must cease to be trapped by the traditional view of college" if they are to be successful in maintaining the position of community colleges as major contributors who bring creative and innovative approaches to bear on the critical training needs of the current work force.

Transcripting Training: A Place to Start

Tradition in the formal system of education holds that a record be kept of students' progress toward degrees, certificates, and diplomas. In higher education, the credit is the typical measurement of this progress. The educational system monitors student progress toward degrees and allows some transfer of credits from one institution to another.

Transcripting training for lifelong learners would be a simple extension of this traditional practice and a way to extend the credentialing power of the community college to lifelong learners who may simply be pursuing their educational goals in an alternative fashion to that of degree-seeking individuals. The advantages of transcripting lifelong training for students and employers are many; among the more obvious are a documentation of informal learning and associated skill sets, and a verifiable record of the commitment of the worker-student to maintaining currency in his or her field. These records could be easily centralized and made portable in much the same way that credits are now stockpiled for service men and women in the credit banks of the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF). Like the colleges articulating with the CCAF, community colleges that participated in such a national database of transcripted continuing workforce education and training would become preferred providers.

Community colleges need to build a new system of learning and credentialing that is based on, yet expands the utility and relevance of our existing structures. Community colleges must rid themselves of traditions that do not serve the needs of both young and adult learners alike. Taking the bold steps necessary to create a lifelong learning transcripting system is an easy and obvious place to start—and one that will do much to change the widespread but misguided view that only "formal" learning can have a lasting value.

Larry Warford, a longstanding advocate of comprehensive workforce development, is vice president for instructional services at Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon.

Volume 8, number 1
January 1995

leadership abstracts

THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT, THE BOARD, AND THE BOARD CHAIR: A PRIMER ON EFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Wayne Newton and Norm Nielsen

It is axiomatic that the president and board of trustees of a community college exercise leadership that is responsible for the success and health of the institution. They exercise leadership in tandem, with their own sets of roles and responsibilities. When all members understand their respective roles, the organization can function effectively. But when these are out of balance, the college, its community, and its students suffer.

The Role of the President

The president of a community college has many responsibilities, ranging from providing academic leadership and ensuring provision of quality programs and services to exercising oversight for college personnel and fiscal resources. The one role of the college president that is singularly characteristic of the position is the president's responsibility for providing leadership for the board of trustees. As the president interacts with the board, he or she must focus on the following key responsibilities.

Inform the board. The first responsibility of the president is to keep the board informed about the major issues facing the college, especially sensitive information before it becomes public. Presidents should establish regular means for communicating with the board, including weekly communiqués and phone calls as needed. Board members should also receive all significant reports published by and about the college.

Educate the board. Related to informing the board is educating board members not only about college programs, resources, and challenges, but also about important state legislation affecting the college, federal initiatives, and other educational trends. Educating the board can and should include ensuring that trustees attend regional and national meetings.

Involve the board. The president should ensure that trustees are given plenty of opportunities to feel ownership in the college they serve. They need to be involved in making policy-level decisions, and they should be accorded meaningful roles in college events. The president should also seek appropriate ways for members of the board to represent the college to its community.

Inspire the board. By creating an overarching future vision of the college, the president can help the board stay focused on the achievements of students, faculty, and staff, as well as its potential for innovation.

Prepare well-planned board meetings. Critical to dealing with the board are effective public board meetings, free from surprises, confusion, or contention. An effective meeting is usually one which includes a mix of information and reports, activities involving board members in recognition events and ceremonies, discussions of important issues facing the college, and formal decision making as required.

Conduct periodic board retreats. Presidents should schedule periodic retreats with their boards in order to create the healthy climate of mutual trust and respect that is key to all successful president/board relationships. These retreats should deal in depth with college vision and values; long-range financial, facilities, and strategic planning; review of college policies and procedures; and a frank discussion of the operating styles and values of both the president and board.

The Role of the Board of Trustees

Board members of public community colleges are elected or appointed to represent the interests of the many constituents served by the college. They are responsible for setting policies for the college, and then exercising general oversight to ensure that their policies are fairly and consistently carried out. It has often been noted that the board's most important responsibility is to select, hire, and retain a quality president for the college, and then to delegate to him or her both the responsibility and necessary authority to administer the institution within the policies set forth by the board. However, there are other keys to serving effectively as a member of the board of trustees.

Model the highest standards of integrity. Board members occupy a position of trust in the community, and fundamental to their effectiveness is the confidence that they inspire by modeling the highest standards of integrity. Board members must insist on conducting board business in public view, with the exception of those personnel and legal matters which are excepted by state law. They must never seek personal benefit from their service on the board, and in this regard, appearance of propriety is as important as the fact. Good board members would never ask for special favors in hiring. They never fudge on expense

accounts. They scrupulously avoid any conflicts of interest, abstaining from participating in board decisions that could have any impact on their personal financial holdings. The operational rule is "when in doubt, don't."

Become informed about the college. Board members must take seriously their responsibility to learn about the college. They must be patient and willing to study board policies, understand the college mission, read planning documents, scrutinize budgets and financial plans, and generally inform themselves about the college, its programs, and the many issues it faces.

Become part of a team. Regardless of any board member's individual expertise or creative ideas, the effectiveness of a board of trustees can only be found in its operation as a team. Each member must seek to understand and respect the personalities and perspectives of other members, even when these are different from his or her own. The goal of an effective board team must be to reach consensus on the major issues facing a college, even if that means submerging individual opinions and priorities. The board must speak as one. Individual members have no authority when the board is not in session, and can speak for the board only when authorized by the board team to do so. Lone rangers are seldom effective board members. The goal of consensus, however, does not preclude an occasional and principled "no" vote.

Represent the whole institution. Despite one's individual passion for occupational education or the fine arts, a board member's responsibility is the best interest of the overall institution, not his or her favorite parts. In this regard, a clear and well-defined mission statement can be a very useful document to keep the focus on the larger purposes of the college.

Work to secure adequate support for the college. Perhaps an underappreciated role for effective board members is their ability to help develop support for and raise funds for the college. The board and the president both must share the task of informing the community, the state, and other funding sources of the financial needs of the college. Trustees should work to be recognized in all circles, from the local electorate to the governor and in the civic and philanthropic communities, as advocates for adequate funding for community colleges. When appropriate, a trustee should be willing and ready to request funds on behalf of the college.

Make policy, but leave administration to the professional leadership of the college. Perhaps the most repeated advice to all those who would serve as effective members of college boards of trustees is the reminder that the function of the board is policy making and exercising fiduciary responsibility on behalf of the citizens of the community. The board must delegate authority for the administration of the college to experienced professional administrators and educators. Board members must stay out of day-to-day administrative detail and focus efforts on the large issues facing the institution. The board can only damage the effectiveness of the president by second-guessing administrative decisions.

The Role of the Board Chair

Next to selecting the president of the college, the most important task of the board is to select a board chair, for the board chair plays a key role in supporting the president and in molding the independent members of the board into an effective team. He or she serves in a critical intermediary role, working more closely with the president than other board members but at the same time serving as a member of the board team.

Working with the board. The board chair must exemplify the roles and responsibilities expected of all members of the board, but should also work with the college president to orient new board members and to assist others to understand their roles and responsibilities. The chair does the president and the college a great service by working directly with board members who need some help in being effective members of the board team, thus insulating the president from potential conflict with board members that could be debilitating for the college. It is the responsibility of the chair to keep all members of the board involved in their policy-making role for the college. It is his or her responsibility to communicate openly and effectively with all members, and to work to build trust and mutual respect among all members. A good board chair will steer members away from becoming contentious and toward becoming a mutually trusting and responsible team. A good chair will help clarify the lines between policy and administration for board members. To achieve this, the board chair has to have the confidence and trust of board members and should have the capacity to act on their behalf as appropriate.

Working with the president. It is also the board chair who works most closely with the president of the college on a day-to-day basis, providing informal feedback on likely board preferences. A community college functions most effectively when its president and board chair operate on the basis of a mutually supportive relationship, with each performing the roles unique to their positions. Such relationships need not be rare or attributable only to longevity in the positions. If the president and chair are united in their vision of service to the college and lead a united team of board members, the beneficiaries are the students and the community.

Wayne Neeton has been a member of the Kirkwood Community College board of trustees since 1973, serving as chair since 1984. Mr. Neeton has also served as president of the Association of Community College Trustees. Norm Nielsen serves as president of the college, located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Guest editor — Don Doucette.

Volume 8, number 2
February 1995

leadership abstracts

FROM TEACHING TO LEARNING: A NEW REALITY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Robert B. Barr

That community colleges today face tremendous challenges is obvious. One budget crisis follows another. Demand for education and retraining is greater than ever. Student populations are becoming more diverse. While the common response is to look externally for help in developing solutions—to the governor, the legislature, the corporate sector—long-term successful strategies may well require a good hard look *inside* community colleges, at the unwritten rules and assumptions that govern how community colleges view themselves and respond to the challenges they face.

These rules and assumptions flow from an invisible construct—the operating paradigm of community colleges across the country. Often misused, the term does not refer to something thought *about*. It is, rather, a structure *through* which the thought process occurs. Paradigms are to thinking what lenses are to seeing. Paradigms are sets of rules that establish boundaries and lay out what should be done to be successful within those boundaries; they map the world and help predict its behavior. While operating within a paradigm, rules and boundaries are taken for granted. The paradigm is the "reality."

Shifting to a new paradigm creates a new reality and with it, a whole new domain of possibilities. In the 19th century, for example, manufacturers enormously increased the leverage applied to their human resources by changing the paradigm from one of uniquely crafted items to mass production. The essence of the structure in which people worked was changed, and with it the leverage applied to their efforts increased dramatically. Today, corporate America routinely examines its operating paradigms through organizational restructuring and process redesign, vital business strategies necessary to cope with increasing domestic and world competition.

Applying these same levers of change—organizational restructuring and process redesign—to community colleges offers the promise of greater efficiency and effectiveness. To be successful, however, it will require more than restructuring or redesign. Colleges must critically examine their operating paradigm, from which flows the very nature of the community college.

The Existing Paradigm

The key assumption of the community college paradigm now in wide use is that the purpose of community colleges is *to provide instruction*. Community colleges refer to themselves as the premier *teaching* institutions of higher education. They all have "instructional divisions" and "vice presidents for instruction." It is revealing that virtually every mission statement contained in the catalogs of California's 107 community colleges fails to place a focus on "learning" in its statement of purpose. When the word is even used, it is almost always bundled in the phrase "teaching and learning," as if to say that while learning may indeed have something to do with community colleges, it is only present as an aspect of teaching. Despite the movement to focus on student outcomes, California's recent reform legislation, AB 1725, defines the community college mission in terms of instruction. This pattern is found in colleges across the continent. Institutional success is judged comparatively on the basis of the quality and quantity of resources, students, faculty, programs, and courses—not on learning outcomes and student success. Clearly, the current purpose of community colleges is to provide instruction, not to produce learning.

Thus the paradox. To say that community colleges are in the business of providing instruction is equivalent to saying that auto companies are in the assembly line business. It is to say that the method is the product. To make instruction the end (rather than the means) gives undue credence to the view that the traditional means for producing learning are the only legitimate, acceptable means for doing so. It is no wonder that institutions have been so resistant to innovation and reform in their methods and structure. Since traditional classroom-based instruction is the archetype, alternative forms of delivery such as ITV courses, computer-based distance education, and credit for life experience are commonly misunderstood, or worse, even viewed with suspicion.

If this key assumption were to change slightly—to one where these institutions *produce learning* as their core purpose—the effect would likely be a dramatic wave of change that would permeate through every aspect of the organization. Viewed from the vantage point of this

simple refocusing of purpose, some of our most basic ways of doing business would begin to look unseemly.

Consider the corollary assumptions related to a purpose focused on providing instruction, particularly those that specify what counts as instruction. Under the current paradigm, faculty are primarily teachers—"sages on stages." Their purpose is to provide classroom-based instruction. Each player's role under the existing paradigm is clear—faculty teach, nonfaculty support teaching, and students learn—but there is a triumvirate of different purposes at work. Under a paradigm that focused instead on producing learning, these roles would change—faculty, for example, would come to be viewed as *designers* of learning experiences and environments. Under such a paradigm, *all* employees—and students as well—would share a single overriding purpose: to produce learning.

A New Paradigm

Such a paradigm would carry the implication that colleges take responsibility for learning. Success would be judged not on the quality of instruction but on the quality of learning. Long-term success would depend on the ability to produce ever greater and more sophisticated student learning with each passing year, each exiting student, and each graduating class. By taking responsibility for learning and holding the institution accountable for learning outcomes, colleges would not, however, relieve students of any of *their* responsibility for learning.

Student outcomes and greater accountability have been discussed in varying forms in higher education circles for decades, but the ability of institutions to really focus on these issues has been constrained by the current paradigm; that is the reason they have not penetrated very far into normal organizational practice. Only a handful of colleges across the country systematically assesses student outcomes. Virtually no college can say whether this year's graduating class has learned more than the class that graduated five years ago. The reason for this is profoundly simple—and obvious once the effect of the operational paradigm is exposed. Student outcomes under the current paradigm are irrelevant to the successful functioning of a college.

Shifting the Paradigm

The existing paradigm can be changed. The first step—surfacing the old paradigm—has already begun. As the language used in community colleges gradually shifts from the old paradigm to the new, structures will also begin to change. Indeed, an almost wholesale restructuring of community college methods and structures—guided by the pole star of the new paradigm—will be required to produce learning ever more effectively and efficiently. The implications of the shift may be profound. The new paradigm will almost certainly bring unforeseen changes, some dramatic.

These changes will not come without resistance, for there are many entrenched systemic forces supporting the current paradigm. Colleges are funded, for example, on the basis of student attendance. This powerful force severely constrains the kinds of changes that can be made in learning methods, virtually limiting them to changes occurring *within* classrooms, leaving the basic teacher-classroom construct intact. If community colleges were funded on the basis of learning outcomes, then the development of new means and structures for producing learning would be encouraged and rewarded.

The strong forces supporting the current structure are themselves, of course, a result of the near universal societal acceptance of the current paradigm. Paradigms are self-fulfilling; one is functioning when people say, "That can't be done" or "That's impossible." The initial response to a suggestion that community colleges be funded on the basis of outcomes is likely to be met with a list of reasons why such a change is not possible. But as the new paradigm takes hold, forces and possibilities will shift and today's "impossible" will become possible.

Paradigm shifts occur when at least two conditions are met. First, difficulties or anomalies begin to appear in the functioning of the existing paradigm which cannot be handled adequately. Such serious difficulties have appeared in the functioning of schools and colleges. Report after prestigious report has concluded that our schools and colleges are in "crisis" and are not getting the job done. Second, there must exist an alternative paradigm that will account for all that the original paradigm accounts for—but, of course, not in the same way—and offers real hope for solving the major difficulties facing the current paradigm. The paradigm in which the community college mission is to produce learning meets these conditions. The consequence of not adopting this new paradigm and welcoming its implications for change in the learning process and our organizations is to be judged ever less effective in meeting the needs of our communities and society.

Robert B. Barr is director of research and planning at Palomar College in San Marcos, CA.

Volume 8, number 3
March 1995

leadership abstracts

DEFINING THE PRODUCTIVITY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Phillip N. Venditti

Community college presidents, already acutely aware that questions about the value of postsecondary education have escalated nationwide to unprecedented levels, may soon find themselves faced with new legislative mandates which deal with a feature of their institutions which has been, up until recently, largely unexplored and unmeasured—productivity. Increasingly, in states across the country, decisions about which institutions will be funded and at what levels will depend on measures of institutional productivity. A component of institutional productivity, of course, is administrative productivity.

Illustrative of a widening trend, the Illinois Community College Board now requires each of the state's 50 community colleges to report annually on steps taken to improve administrative productivity. In West Virginia, the hard-won 1993 omnibus higher education bill—originally conceived by its supporters primarily as a long-overdue salary-enhancement package for faculty and staff—unexpectedly coupled its ultimate funding increases with a requirement that both faculty members and administrators in the state's public colleges and universities prove themselves to be 10% more productive than their peers in other states in the Southern Regional Education Board region by 1995. Similarly, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that state lawmakers in Colorado have begun linking decisions on supplemental funding for postsecondary educational institutions with progress along five criteria—one of which is improved productivity, a measure slated for implementation this year.

Community college chief executives who have not posed and answered the question of how the productivity of their leadership teams can be assessed may bring on serious difficulties for themselves. In fact, nothing short of a serious exploration of productivity throughout the entire administrative hierarchy of community colleges is apt to satisfy the growing expec-tations of money-strapped state and local lawmakers.

The con-sequences of an externally-imposed process may prove unnecessarily unsettling and disruptive for the unprepared. In West Virginia, for instance, the State College System's central office scrambled to assemble representatives of the administrative staff of every West Virginia college to devise a method of defining and measuring administrative productivity which could stand the test of legislative scrutiny. The result, while useful, was less than satisfactory for all involved.

Industrial Definitions as a Touchstone

"Total output per unit of input" is one simple formula for determining productivity which has been employed in industrial settings. By carrying this formula over to academe, some have conceptualized productivity as a stark measurement of the "volume" of students affected per "unit" of personnel time, per salary dollar, or the like. For instance, college faculty members are routinely said to "generate" student credit hours. The number of student credit hours divided by the number of FTE faculty members, indeed, is used in some states as a common indicator of faculty productivity and as a yardstick for attempting to compare the efficiency of various colleges.

By virtue of their commitment to academic outcomes assessment and to the measurement of "customer satisfaction" as part of their current involvement with the continuous quality improvement movement, many community colleges have also listed output indices which include several familiar variables intended to represent what outputs are "produced" in students. The most prevalent among these indices seem to be grades, subject-area and general education skill achievement, retention levels, transfer and graduation rates, achievement in transfer institutions, and posteducational employment performance.

The Community College Roundtable has lent a helpful degree of clarity and consistency to this arena by proposing a set of core indicators that includes outputs normally associated with faculty behaviors. If these and other agreed-upon outputs can be linked with tangible inputs, prospects for measuring faculty productivity in the future may well improve.

Difficulties in Defining Administrative Productivity

The process of determining precise, consistent definitions for general productivity among faculty may seem arduous, but at least it has been initiated in many

institutions. By contrast, questions related specifically to administrative productivity are not being addressed at all in most parts of the country.

In fact, a search of the literature on administrative productivity in education uncovers precious little to review. The scant list of journal articles and books which touch upon the topic tends to cover very broad questions such as how administrators can best manage fiscal resources, support faculty and staff development, and so on. Although such analyses promise to aid improvements in the quality and output of administrators, they have not proposed direct modes of calculating the productivity of community college administrators as a distinct population.

Academic administrators in West Virginia, given impetus by legislative action, have attempted to address this need by identifying several possible indices of productivity. These include the number of administrators as a percentage of all full-time employees in each college; the mean salary of West Virginia administrators compared to that of counterparts in other states; the total operating dollars spent per administrator; and the number of academic programs overseen per administrator.

Except for the last item on West Virginia's list, unfortunately, none of its indices relates to what administrators actually accomplish, i.e., their outputs. Perhaps other results—such as the number and size of grants which are approved because of the person's efforts, the number of innovations spawned by the person, or the number of crises the person prevents or resolves—should be taken into consideration.

To what extent is the success of the institution attributable to the efforts of administrators? Should students' achievements, for example, be viewed as outcomes resulting in some measure from the work of administrators? What portion of a given change in the persistence or graduation rates of an entering student cohort should be considered to be an "output" of the chief student development officer's efforts, as opposed to those of the faculty, the chief academic officer, or perhaps the CEO? And will next year's events justify the same breakdown in attribution of responsibility?

Prescription for Action

The issues of gauging administrative productivity are difficult. Except for some limited activity in a few states that can be traced to legislative pressures, American community colleges have not begun to tackle these kinds of questions.

Standards for measuring academic productivity, as has been the case in other domains such as budgetary management and student learning outcomes assessment, will be defined by others if not formulated already by community colleges. Legislative examination of faculty productivity has already yielded such disagreeably micromanagerial outcomes as mandates on the number of office hours to be kept by teachers in postsecondary institutions. When it comes to questions of whether and how to pay for administrative positions in the future, chances are that faculty groups whose own productivity has been rigorously scrutinized will insist that comparable attention be brought to bear on the performance of administrators.

Indeed, only by discussing the topic collegially as a shared challenge will administrators and faculty members be able to craft satisfactory definitions of administrative productivity. Regardless of the method chosen, however, the following elements will define a successful approach:

- ***Ease of implementation.*** The items must be of minimal complexity.
- ***Validity.*** Convenience must not be achieved at the expense of accuracy. Measures must be relevant to the definitions of both inputs and outputs. Simply calculating what proportion of an institution's total budget goes to support administrative activities—one technique currently being employed—sheds no light on whether those activities are worthwhile.
- ***Intelligibility.*** Everyone, including external audiences, must be able to understand what is being discussed.
- ***Political acceptability.*** Results of the discussion must earn the approval of governors, boards of trustees, citizens' organizations, alumni, faculty, staff, and the public at large.

Community college presidents who seriously grapple with this topic will be able to set clearer and more focused administrative goals for themselves and their institutions—and they will be in a better position to determine whether those goals are being reached. They will have the data they need to weigh and then meet the needs of their students, their communities, and their institutions' internal constituencies. And with hard facts in hand, they will be able to demonstrate the value of their own activities to their constituencies as never before in compelling, intelligible terms.

Phillip N. Venditti is executive vice president of Pacific International Institute, an affiliate of Lewis-Clark State College.

Volume 8, number 4
April 1995

leadership abstracts

WILL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY SURVIVE?

Patrick Callan

It is time to revive debate over the public purposes and social values that underline much of American higher education. In the last half century, Americans have taken two enormous gambles on higher education. Both were very high risk. There was no certainty that they would pay off, but they both ultimately paid huge dividends.

The first was a national policy—the GI bill, now 50 years old. At the time, the leadership of the most prestigious institutions in American higher education greeted the idea of the GI bill with enormous skepticism; in fact, most opposed it out of fear it would degrade the quality of American higher education. However, the GI bill changed the whole notion of who was educable in this country and who could benefit from higher education. In his most recent book, *Post Capitalist Society*, Peter Drucker calls the GI bill a signal event that symbolized the coming of the information age.

The second major event occurred in the late 1950s and early 1960s when that huge tidal wave known as the "baby boomers," the kids of the GIs, began to fill up the high schools and graduate. The nation could have taken a very conservative approach and assumed the same portion of these people would go to college as had happened with previous generations. But instead, the country did, what was in retrospect, a radical thing. At a time when keeping the proportion of the population in higher education constant would have forced government to build new colleges, spend more money, and expand drastically, the nation decided to expand the participation rates and to open the doors wider than they ever had been before. A public commitment was made that anybody, regardless of age, who was able to benefit and was motivated to do so, could go to college.

While it seems fairly obvious now that these were appropriate courses of action for the states and the country to take, at the time they were great leaps of faith. They were leaps of faith taken in the belief that investing in people would have economic, civic, and cultural returns. But no one knew if it would work.

Despite the many ways the country fell short of this goal, by any real world standard the United States did better in opening the doors of educational opportunity beyond high school to high quality education than any country in the world. Over the subsequent twenty years, almost every state implicitly or explicitly adopted a goal that every person who could benefit and was motivated could have education beyond high school, and this became, despite its imperfection, something that has not been questioned or debated. That debate, however, is coming. Over the next ten or fifteen years, social and demographic pressures will undoubtedly force the nation, states, and colleges and universities to revisit the issue of higher educational opportunity, and ask again whether that broad extension of participation is a good thing.

The Next Tidal Wave

The issue will be precipitated by another tidal wave of students that will begin to hit American higher education in the last part of this century. Between now and about 2009, the nation's high school graduating classes will increase by more than 34 percent. Some states, like California, Arizona, Washington, and Maryland will have a 50 percent increase in the number of students graduating from high school. In Florida, it will be 73 percent, 35 percent in Minnesota, and almost 40 percent in Texas. Nationally, what this means is an increase of about three-quarters of a million young people graduating from high school between now and the year 2009. This is not speculation. These are students already born and most of them are already in the education pipeline. And these large numbers mask an incredible increase in the diversity of the population; the states that experience this increase and growth in the greatest numbers also have a young population that is much more diverse than the older, middle-age segment of the population. The last time the country had to deal with such issues was in the early 1960s and 1970s, and this second tidal wave will put to the test the nation's commitment to opportunity in postsecondary education and training.

The coming boom will be quite different from previous expansions of higher education demand because

of the political and economic environment in which it is occurring. Most of the expansion of higher education that took place through the community college movement of the 1960s and 1970s happened in the midst of the largest increase in revenues available to state and local governments in the history of the country. The nation is now looking at a period when economic growth will probably be slow. The federal government is tied up with the federal deficit and much-reduced discretionary domestic spending, and the states are dealing with antiquated tax systems that have not kept up as the economy has switched from a goods to a service economy.

At the same time, taxpayer resistance continues. The disenchantment with government indicated by polls is a huge problem for education because in order for the public to give public education money, it must be willing to give to the government first. The competition for resources is more intense now with an aging population, enormous demands for children in the K-12 population, rising health care costs, and an increasing amount of money going to the correction system. This environment challenges higher education opportunities.

Reducing Access Is Not the Answer

Yet despite these constraints, no one is arguing publicly that improvement will come by educating fewer people or by lowering the education level of the American population. President Clinton's address to the American Council on Education contained charts that substantiated his theme that learning is the key to economic success. As he put it, "What you learn determines what you earn." He demonstrated that access to the middle class in this country is almost impossible without education beyond high school. More than any time in the history of this country, higher education is the gatekeeper to the good life. Thus, when states make decisions about tuition, downsizing, or increasing enrollments, they are making decisions that control the opportunity structure of society in a way never seen before.

While the American public still shows strong support for education, a majority of Americans (54 percent) believe that public higher education needs to be fundamentally overhauled. This appears to be based on public perceptions that higher education is becoming less available as it becomes more important, and there is enormous fear about that. Public opinion polls have found that when people are asked about K-12 education, they immediately raise questions about quality, but when polled about community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities, their concerns center on access and affordability. When given alternatives for dealing with financial problems, reducing enrollment is the choice that is least acceptable to the public.

The essential reality is that there is an enormous mismatch between the need for education and the actions that some states have taken. Furthermore, community colleges, the higher education sector as a whole, and the states are generally unprepared to deal with what is going to be a period of intense, increased demand. Public expectations for higher education have never been higher. So the nation, states, community colleges, and higher education system in this country face some very difficult choices.

Challenges for Colleges, Challenges for States

This problem cannot be addressed without additional public investment. But according to *By Design or Default*, an analysis published by the California Higher Education Policy Center, even if there is additional public investment, it will not be at the same rates per student as were enjoyed in the 1960s and 1970s. Colleges will still have to reduce costs. If that is to be done without a sacrifice in student learning, then major changes will be required in the organization and delivery of higher education—especially changes that will have the effect of extending the instructional reach of faculty and institutions, moving to alternative learning paradigms, and increased use of technology. There is no way to squeeze the kind of gains needed by putting more pressure across the board on the existing model—in essence asking people to work harder and do more.

States must not only learn to reinvest additional dollars in higher education; they are going to have to make choices that put resources behind the institutions that are willing to lead the effort to change the ways in which instruction is organized and delivered. The rhetoric of governors and legislatures about the need for change notwithstanding, the institutions they end up funding more often than not are those that have resisted change the most. The incentive system that the states provide for colleges and universities to address this problem cannot work if the lion's share of whatever new revenue is available is devoted to maintaining the status quo.

The basic question for the 1990s and beyond is this: Will this period of massive access and high hopes for educational opportunity for Americans be just a blip on the screen that will be looked upon in the middle of the twenty-first century as something this country indulged itself in for a few decades when resources were available? Or will it be something deemed essential for the quality of American life, the viability of the economy, the collective view of social justice, and the very nature of democratic society?

Patrick Callan is executive director of the California Higher Education Policy Center, San Jose, California. This article was abstracted from his keynote address to the 1994 "Leadership 2000" conference in San Diego, California.

Volume 8, number 5
May 1995

leadership abstracts

MISSION POSSIBLE: TEACHING THE DISENFRANCHISED

J. William Wenrich

The times are reminiscent of Charles Dicken's classic opening line in *A Tale of Two Cities*: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times...." In the past six years, communism has collapsed, apartheid has fallen, and democracy has taken root in more of Latin America than ever before. At the same time, there are mounting examples of man's inhumanity to man as people are slaughtered in Bosnia, Rwanda, Somalia, and in gang killings across the United States in every city.

In higher education, it is equally true that it is the best of times and the worst of times. Education has at its fingertips advantages provided by the most advanced technology the world has ever known, and support from the most democratic, due-process-oriented society ever seen. American institutions of higher education have the greatest number and the greatest percentage of the citizenry attending college of any society in history. On the other hand, there is decreasing public and legislative support for higher education, and a lower and decreasing quality of achievement by students coming into our institutions.

There is less sense of agreement on education's function and mission, and less sense of community among educators and those they serve—a condition aggravated by the growing schism in society between the "haves" and the "have nots." Perhaps the greatest challenge facing this country is the fact that society is split in two. On one hand, many are highly educated, computer literate, globally-oriented people who travel, communicate across the world, and live very well. On the other hand, large numbers of people in the disenfranchised half of society are functionally illiterate high school dropouts with no job skills, no jobs, no future, and no way out of drugs, gangs, poverty, and self-deprecation.

The advantages of the global community envisioned by the North American Free Trade Agreement will never accrue to that group of people, who will continue to be less competitive and less economically viable, victims of the axiom, "Without a future, the present is in jeopardy." That truism comes from a true story about a time when the Corps of Engineers proposed to build a dam in a valley that would prevent flood inundation downstream. Unfortunately, the plan would have also inundated the town that was in the valley. As it turned out, the dam was never built, but at the time, people *believed* it would be. As a result, they did not maintain their homes, they did not paint things, and they did not fix the streets. Businesses did not add to their inventory, and high school graduates got out of school and left because the town was going to be under water. The government never did flood the valley, but the town died anyway. It had no future.

It seems that many American youths find themselves in that position today: seeing no future, their very present is in jeopardy. So many people are in that kind of conundrum of not seeing the future for themselves and struggling with all of the deficits they face. At the same time, that focus on the barriers, not the possibilities, is extending to public institutions, including community colleges. Community colleges are struggling with budget crunches and increasing state and federal regulation. Costs are going up, as are public demands.

Educating the Uneducable

The critical question is, in a contentious environment in which community colleges are being confronted from all sides, can they address the issue of bringing the bottom half of the bifurcated society into the mainstream? The answer is that community colleges can. Only community colleges can; therefore, they must.

There is much talk about educating Americans for smart jobs to be competitive in a global economy. The unanswered question is how to reach the 25 percent of the population that don't even finish high school or the next 25 percent who cannot read above a ninth grade reading level. What about the 18-35 year-olds who currently lack the knowledge, skills, or even the motivation to try, because they perceive no future for themselves in this competitive environment? What is to happen to them? Some argue that a portion, maybe even a significant portion, of society is not educationally redeemable and should be written off as a lost cause. But community colleges know better. They've seen those students pass their GEDs, develop through ESL classes, catch up in adult basic education and developmental classes, then perform successfully at the college level. In short term job programs, they can learn and be functional on the job. Are they educable? Of course they are.

The Value of Contextual Learning

People who are currently left out or rejected from the technical jobs in society can perform them if they are trained in the context of work requirements. The Ford Foundation-sponsored study, *Cast Off Youth: Policy and Training Methods from the Military Experience* (1987), examined the four times in history the U.S. military has taken people who don't traditionally qualify for military service—people who scored in category four on the ASFAB test, which theoretically meant they had an IQ level of 70-90. Two of these times came in during periods of great need—World War II and the Korean War. Then, during the war on poverty, Robert McNamara proposed taking some people who were theoretically ineligible, in a program called *Project 100,000*. The military called them "McNamara's Morons," and did not receive the new recruits well. There was a fourth time in the late 1970s when a miscalculation on conversion of ASFAB scores to a normative percentile score led the Department of Defense to inadvertently classify 300,000 ineligible people as having passing scores, and let them in without knowing their correct IQ.

The study found that the overall attrition rate for these groups was 16 percent, twice the normal attrition rate for army inductees. While that may initially seem like a high failure rate, looking at that statistic from another perspective leads to a different conclusion. Since the group was theoretically 100 percent rejects, if only 16 percent left, that is an 84 percent success rate. The study also found out that two-thirds of the people who went through that program took the GI bill and went to college; many others stayed in the military and had successful careers. The conclusion of the study was that training programs that included proper motivation and learning in context enabled even marginal students to learn and to perform their jobs successfully.

Such contextual training for the most disadvantaged students is totally consistent with the mission of community colleges. As Patricia Cross, Professor of Education at the University of California at Berkeley, has said, "In the final analysis, the task of the excellent teacher is to stimulate apparently ordinary people to unusual effort. The tough problem is not in identifying winners; it is in making winners out of ordinary people." She goes on to say, "Historically, in most of the periods emphasizing excellence, education has reverted to selecting winners rather than creating them." The community college role is to make winners out of apparently ordinary people and out of those who may have already been cast off. This was the thrust of John and Suanne Roueche's study, *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The At Risk Student in the Open Door College*. They examined 12 colleges and concluded that community colleges can successfully teach at-risk students if the institution is truly committed. The community college is the institution most capable of educating the disenfranchised, the high risk, the low skilled, the lower segment of the bifurcated society. Community colleges have that ability. The question is: do they have the commitment?

Toward Increasing Commitment

At the convention of the American Council on Education last year, Secretary of Education Richard Riley said, "My friends, this nation cannot waste its talent; we cannot lose the genius, the energy, or the imagination of any of our young people." In Texas, Comptroller John Sharpe published a three-volume tome, *The Forces of Change in Texas*, in which he forcefully made the point that Texas cannot rely on its traditional natural resources. There is simply not going to be any more cotton or oil or cattle. The last resource the state has is its human resource—its people. He said, "You are fixin' to make them, our multicultural youth population, either our biggest liability or our biggest asset and the critical factor in the difference is education."

Community colleges should revisit the admonition from Thomas Jefferson that "We should build an aristocracy of achievement based on a democracy of opportunity." Access is what the community college—and America—is all about. Community colleges are the answer to providing high-quality educational opportunities to our bifurcated society. It is not the job of the universities, where quality is usually measured by the SAT scores of the entering class, or the job of the public schools, where 25 percent of the students drop out and another 25 percent cannot read. It is a job only community colleges can do.

Some say this is unrealistic. A lot of critics say the plate is too full at community colleges; community colleges have too many missions and too many poorly prepared students to serve already. But as Garrison Keeler said, "Sometimes you have to look reality in the eye and deny it." The imperative is clear; the country must bring its bifurcated society back together. This nation must extend the franchise to the disenfranchised and reintegrate those who have been cast off. If not the community college, then who? If not now, then when? This is the Mission Possible that only community colleges can perform. There simply is not anyone else.

J. William Wenrich is chancellor of the Dallas County Community College District. This abstract is based on his keynote address to the 1994 Leadership 2000 conference. An earlier version of these remarks was published as a "Celebrations" by the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development and The University of Texas at Austin.

Volume 8, number 6
June 1995

leadership abstracts

DON'T MISS THE JOY!

Dale Parnell

What makes life cave in for you as a leader? What set of circumstances throws you into a panic? When the situation blows up around you, is bitterness your inadvertent response? Negative circumstances seem to force many community college leaders into a sort of grimness. Everywhere there are "white-knuckled" leaders to be seen, enduring their work—their leadership role—rather than enjoying it. Certainly, many of these administrators face some pretty grim circumstances, but concentrating on poor circumstances and on unfairness only brings a downward spiral toward negative thinking. The best advice for future community college leaders may be this: "Whatever you do in your leadership role, don't miss the joy!"

The antidote to grimness is to step back and take the big look. Grimness comes from taking oneself too seriously and not taking one's mission, one's service—one's fundamental beliefs—seriously enough. Every community college leadership role is a self-portrait of the person in the job.

The Joy of Mission

Probably no set of institutions in the world has such a glorious and profound mission as community colleges. Community colleges provide opportunity for millions of people across this great land and do that in an excellent way. The community college movement is a vast and growing force in America, one that is now moving around the world. Community college leaders are acting out and modeling national commitments that many others are just talking about.

Belief is a powerful thing. Belief in freedom has caused thousands of Americans to give their lives for their country. Belief is also important to community colleges. What are some of the beliefs that drive community college leaders? What really motivates one to action? George Bernard Shaw captured the essence of this subject when he wrote: "This is the true joy in life—being used for a purpose recognized by yourself as a mighty one, instead of being a feverish, selfish little clod complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy."

The foundation of community colleges is built upon the philosophy of opportunity with excellence. Community colleges are opportunity colleges. The word *opportunity* undergirds so much of what is American. Opportunity with excellence is not merely a catch phrase, an empty slogan, or an "oxymoronic" statement. Opportunity is the very soul of America, and providing opportunity with excellence is the soul of the community college movement—the driving force of these workhorse institutions. So, have joy in the mission of the community college.

The Joy of Service

Government leaders are commonly thought of as public servants. However, it would be misleading to say that the servant-leader concept has become very popular in thinking about leadership. The true servant-leader should be servant first and leader second. The best test for a servant-leader is whether the individuals around him or her are helped to grow, to feel more confident and competent. Another good test is the impact of one's leadership on the least privileged in our society—the true servant-leader encourages, indeed persuades, the more able and the less able to serve each other.

The servant-leader emphasizes increased service to others and building a sense of community within our institutions. The central theme of the AACC Futures Commission report, *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century*, states "The term community should be defined not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created." In many ways the breakdown in the sense of community can be traced to a failure of leadership, whether that be in the home, schools, colleges, or other organizations.

Servant-leaders must first of all recognize the delicate balances, the *ying* and the *yang* of competing forces, and how to deal with these forces without losing their sense of balance. There will not be much joy found in service to others without knowing how to renew one's own physical, spiritual, and psychic energy reserves. The individuals needed to lead colleges in the future must be able to bring together divergent constituencies, develop

consensus, and build a renewing sense of community within the institution—and find joy in this kind of leadership service. If someone is happier or wiser because of such service, it will not have been in vain. Have joy in your service.

The Joy of Hope ... Of Vision ... Of Planning

What drives you? Your hopes or your fears? Too often, leaders are motivated far more by fears than by hopes and dreams. Negativism, H. L. Mencken once said, is the haunting fear that someone, somewhere, may be happy.

There are two basic kinds of community college presidents. There are the "fire-fighters" and there are the "planners." The fire-fighters fight fires all day; they go home tired and without much joy. They are motivated by fear—fear of failure, fear of the unknown, fear of controversy. The planners try to look ahead and head off trouble, to steer the college around the storm clouds. Their motivations lie in hopes and dreams; they do not concentrate on what is, but rather what can be.

One of the most commonly expressed requirements for leadership is vision. The term can mean a variety of things, but in particular, visionary leaders can describe the outlines of a possible future that motives and lifts people. People enjoy belonging to an organization where there is progress and forward movement. But at the root of progress is hope, vision, and planning. Hope is a tonic for the soul and the driving force of any good organization. What oxygen is for the body, hope is for the spirit. Have joy in your hopes and dreams.

The Joy of Diversity

The most culturally diverse institutions in higher education are the community colleges. Some individuals view this diversity and see it as a problem. Others view this diversity and see it as a joy. Consider that it has taken the U.S. a long time to appreciate the contributions of the immigrants who entered the country through the portals of Ellis Island. The nation does not have another 100 years to begin to meet the challenges of responding to, and indeed celebrating, diversity in this country. America is greatly blessed by those whose ancestors came from Africa, Central and South America, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. Cultural diversity is the great strength of this country. Now is the time to stress cultural diversity as a strength rather than just another problem. It is vital that the nation fully develop its culturally different human resources to strengthen the competitiveness of the work force.

Unfortunately, most federal social policies seem to have been designed primarily to foster social equity rather than to encourage the development of human potential, economic self-sufficiency, and individual empowerment. People must be educated and trained not just because they are poor, but because they represent a fundamental resource for maintaining the economic health of our nation.

Allow a word of caution to enter here. The word "minority" is too often used as a label. Like all other labels, it is too often used to separate people rather than bring them together. It is much easier to dislike a label than to dislike a person. Labels do not have names and faces. The danger, of course, is that people end up communicating label to label instead of person to person. Human relationships can become suffocated by labels, and community college leaders must reach beyond labels and across cultures, languages, and races to bestow upon individuals the greatest gifts of all: meaning, hope, and respect.

The whole tone of leadership must be conditioned by a faith in human possibilities. That faith—that belief—is the energy that gives life to an organization. A leader's faith in human possibilities will be reflected in the life and work of those around him or her. Even though the backgrounds and cultures of the people one works with may be different, faith in individual human possibilities—in seeking the best in people—can lift the human spirit and will motivate action like nothing else. Have joy in diversity.

Conclusion

In a nation with a moral commitment to access and opportunity, community colleges are the accessible institutions. In a nation with a tremendous need for skilled workers, community colleges are helping a host of our citizens develop marketable skills—the inescapable beginning of human liberation. In a nation committed to human resource development, community colleges are the institutions that are triggering economic revitalization by matching student skills to the needs of the employers. In a nation that emphasizes accountability, community colleges are the most cost-effective institutions in higher education. In a nation asking urgently if there is life after work, community colleges are leading the way by providing liberal and fine arts experiences for working men and women. The community college is where the action is in higher education. Community colleges are providing opportunity with excellence—and they are making history. Whatever else you do, don't miss the joy of working, serving, and leading in a community college.

Dale Parnell is professor of education at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon; he served as president of the American Association of Community Colleges from 1981 to 1991.

Volume 8, number 7
July 1995

leadership abstracts

CAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES DO THE JOB?

Robert A. (Squee) Gordon

The atmosphere in which community colleges operate is changing significantly. At the same time, colleges are operating under a growth and expansion model which may no longer be tenable. The one question that needs to be asked, in the midst of all the rhetoric about community colleges providing workforce training for the twenty-first century, is: Are community colleges really equipped to handle the job? And if they are not, what should they do to ready themselves?

Current Trends

- The budget crisis is going to continue indefinitely. Colleges will be under pressure to create fee-for-service activities that will generate the new sources of revenue they will need in order to survive, let alone perform all the functions for which there are demands.
- Societal disruption will continue. In the global economy, those who have the information and the skills will do well, and those who have low skills and low educational levels will be struggling to survive. This will put tremendous stress on community colleges, which have traditionally served the underprepared.
- Traditional learning centers, which have implicitly meant that students had to be physically present on campus to learn, will become a thing of the past. Future educational services will necessitate a reexamination of educational delivery systems, depending heavily upon the electronic highway that is rapidly becoming available. Students will be able to bring in international experts from around the world via the Internet or through interactive video—an interesting prospect with considerable implications for the faculty in classrooms today.

Institutional Mission

- If community colleges change their mission to include workforce training, what impact will this have on what they have done traditionally? Can colleges reconcile their egalitarian agenda with the new agenda—one that includes generic and literacy skills, as well as those that are company specific? The private sector wants employees who are trained in current, relevant, and up-to-date information and processes. For this reason, colleges must reconcile business and industry agendas with their own.
- Are community colleges prepared to adjust their current mission to meet the needs of the changing environment? For instance, is it still viable to be offering programs for the underprepared and underemployed? Should colleges be exploring new ways of doing things, and are there things they are presently doing that can and should be done by others? Perhaps public schools should be charged with offering basic education to all age groups, leaving community colleges free to concentrate on the higher end of the training spectrum—especially given that technological advancements are moving forward with incredible speed.

Strategies for Success

- In order to participate effectively in the private sector training market, colleges must move from those learning services that are given uniformly to groups to those that are customized, individualized, and tailor-made for all students. And, particularly given current budgetary restraints, colleges must also move away from delivering fixed educational courses and move towards modular competency-based packages that are flexible, cost-effective, and client-scheduled. Without these changes, colleges will embarrass themselves and weaken their credibility.
- Colleges must learn to adopt a larger world view. They need to start thinking globally and then apply that perspective to local situations. Colleges can do this by rethinking narrow, parochial views of the world and creating one-stop educational centers that will allow students to take advantage of the comprehensive community college network. Of course, such an approach is totally antithetical to the existing pattern. While community college administrators adhere to the mandate of serving local needs, that stance does not help them address issues relating to the global economy. The more myopic their approach, the less organizations will be able to change and meet the demands of tomorrow.
- While community colleges must never underestimate the value and commitment of their employees, at the same time they must move away from catering to the comfort level of staff and faculty. They must focus on operating in ways that meet the needs of their client base. For example, shopping center customers are rarely made to walk great distances to get to the shops. Yet, often, college employees consider it an imposition if parking spots (which at many colleges are at a

premium) are located any distance from the main entrance. In fact, most colleges allow their employees to park conveniently, thereby forcing students and visitors to fight for parking spaces and walk through variable weather conditions to get to the campus and to class.

• Colleges must accept the fact that they cannot serve the needs of everyone. To that end they must abandon weak areas, focus on what they do well, and develop specialized niches. At the same time, institutions can remain comprehensive by working with other colleges. If, for example, students want a career in Hispanic business, they might be better served by faculty at a college in Miami or San Diego, rather than by faculty at a college in, say, Butte, Montana. This measure, however, will call for administrative ingenuity, cooperation, and less territorial approaches to relationships between districts and colleges around the nation.

• All college staff should contribute to the acquisition of technology. While educators argue that offering industry programs requires state-of-the-art equipment, they have really never considered that obtaining such equipment might be part of their responsibility. But the fact is that colleges can no longer afford to buy all the necessary equipment. Humber College, for instance, recently bought a half-million dollar digital imaging system. Humber faculty agreed to perform fee-for-service activities on weekends and summers for business clients to reimburse the interest-free loan from the college. The money can then be recycled. This has been an important lesson for faculty. They now realize that by helping to increase revenues they get modern equipment, the program survives, and as a result, so, too, do their jobs.

• Community colleges must serve as learning consultants by establishing partnerships with companies that desire training. In some cases, these companies may have people more competent than the college can provide, but their employees don't know how to write curriculum, or how to evaluate the progress of training sessions. And while colleges may not actually teach the course, they are capable of offering course development services. These can often be profit-making ventures. For colleges to become learning organizations, they must shift their thought processes from the "what" to the "how" and arrive at the understanding that community colleges are management consultants rather than teachers of traditional course materials.

• Colleges need to examine new concepts of distribution because companies want employees who can learn without taking time away from their work. This approach calls for the teacher to shift from being the person who controls the class to being the person who coordinates the learning process. Increasingly, teachers will become managers of learning resources with a streamlined staff to look after copying, testing, and tutoring. In this way, they will be able to handle hundreds of 'students' working at learning stations, either in the college, in the workplace, or at home.

• Colleges must form strategic alliances with other colleges. Multinational companies do not want to negotiate separately with colleges in each of the districts where they have plants. Nor can they afford to have a product that varies in quality from site to site. For these organizations, product standardization is essential. College consortia are in an excellent position to serve the national and international training needs of corporations.

• Colleges cannot afford to hire clones of their existing faculty. They must hire people for tomorrow—people who are comfortable with the electronic highway and who have experience in the private sector. Often, there are talented people available as a result of corporate restructuring, 50-year-old executives capable of teaching and contributing a level of professional expertise to their students. Also in the labor pool are younger, new entrants—often very talented people who can draw upon their fluidity in technology to make significant contributions to the college.

• Colleges must maintain extensive, ongoing professional development of current staff. Most community college employees are not thinking of retiring in the near future. Colleges have to do a serious job of keeping them abreast of change by increasing their curriculum content subject mastery, assisting them in learning to use educational technology, and ensuring they know how to teach adult learners, as well as those from different cultural backgrounds. They also need to understand the corporate culture mentality of the private sector—which is vital to understanding workforce training.

• Colleges have to act more like businesses, with performance measured in terms of cost, quality, and quantity. Education must mirror the global economy and change the habits of the past. Colleges have to adopt continuous improvement practices such as benchmarking, integrating employees into small teams, and eliminating traditional fiefdoms. Community colleges must also learn to rely less and less on public, tax-based funding and operate as if survival is at stake.

• Finally, colleges must build trust, respect, and confidence with the private and government sectors, starting by assigning their best staff to the job of workforce development. Colleges that put their cast-offs into workforce training are forfeiting the business. Those that use their best people to work with industry will be winners.

No doubt, implementing these ideas amounts to sweeping change—and change is difficult to accomplish. Also of no doubt, the challenges community colleges face are enormous—but so are the risks of inaction, which are tantamount to failure. Community colleges can, indeed must, rise to the occasion. The rich history of the institution lends credence to the belief that they can. At the very least, they must try.

Robert "Squee" Gordon is president of Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology.

Volume 8, number 8
August 1995

leadership abstracts

THE EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

James Jacobs

In the course of the last ten years, community colleges have progressed through three major stages in their relationship to the modernization needs of small- and medium-size firms. The emphasis during the first period, roughly 1984 to 1987, was to build programs around emerging technologies. Community colleges rushed to establish course-based programs in such technical areas as robotics, computer-integrated manufacturing, and machine vision. Often, these were designed within traditional instructional structures and calendars, utilizing full-time faculty in the schools' occupational or technology divisions. The second stage of evolution in workforce development programs, from about 1988 to 1992, emphasized customization of programs, services, and delivery. The third and current stage of this progression has been characterized less by technology or the organization of service delivery than by the methods and tactics used to deliver business and industry services.

Stage One: Centers of Knowledge

In the workforce development efforts of the mid-1980s, colleges positioned themselves as centers of knowledge, gurus of the technology; the assumption was that businesses would send personnel to these centers to "learn about" emerging technologies. This approach negated any notion that how and in what context the technology was to be used was important. Businesses, particularly small- and medium-size companies that employed highly specific applications of technology, often understood their needs better than did the educators. Moreover, there was little attempt to relate training and educational courses to other problems of modernization such as technology transfer, supplier-OEM relationships, and quality issues.

Community colleges began to shed this perspective in the face of state modernization initiatives in the form of grants and other dollars provided for customized training activities. Michigan's Technology Deployment Services and the Michigan Modernization Service, for example, were vital in promoting awareness that smaller companies' needs differed substantively from those of larger manufacturers, and that training and technology needed to be embedded in the overall modernization process. This led to the development, in the late 1980s, of extensive customized-training units that were independent of traditional occupational education departments.

Stage Two: Enshriners of Technology

The second stage of evolution began with the creation of these customized units; the change in direction was accompanied by a proliferation of new "advanced technology centers," a new kind of instructional facility that emerged from an understanding that businesses' specialized needs for customized training often dictated special facilities. Considerable institutional resources were often expended on the construction of these centers, with local industry frequently playing a role in planning, fund raising, and staffing.

Even community colleges that did not develop advanced technology centers evidenced an emphasis on conducting their work with business and industry as a separate function, often reporting to the president's office. The assumption of many institutions was that new state programs, coupled with the training demanded by business, would create an entrepreneurial opportunity for community colleges in the delivery of services. Within the advanced technology centers, the assumption persisted that technology was the key variable in the modernization of companies.

Although construction of advanced technology centers has generally been a positive force that has motivated community colleges to understand their clients' needs, their usefulness has been open to question. Many were ill-conceived structures that lacked a strategic plan for accommodating themselves to the needs of local industry. Enormous energy was expended simply to raise the money to build the centers, but after the dust from the construction battles settled, there were few plans for how to use them.

Too often, the assumption was, "if we build them, they will come." All too frequently, they did not. Where institutional support for continually upgrading equipment and providing adequate faculty was lacking, the centers did not generate the extravagant payoffs their proponents anticipated. This stage, like the first,

assumed that the colleges had something to "teach" business regarding the use of manufacturing technology.

Stage Three: Partners and Facilitators

The cumulative experience of the 1980s and early 1990s led to a simple but important realization: small- and medium-size companies tend to learn best from one another. This being the case, the best niche for the community college in the process of modernization appears to be as a provider or "broker" of connecting activities that sustain and enhance this unique form of learning process.

In other words, the community college is evolving from a "teacher" of particular technologies and business strategies into an advisor and facilitator concerned with companies' internal learning processes. Targeted training and education continue to be offered, but only in response to the learning initiatives of business and industry. Companies must want and need the services of community colleges and define, from the perspective of customers, the role they want these institutions to play.

In fact, community colleges are well positioned to broker learning among small- and medium-size companies. They have, for one thing, the advantage of location, being close to most clusters of such firms throughout the nation. Because most have mission statements that mandate the support of economic development, their resources tend to be readily accessible to firms. Community colleges have what is probably the single largest reservoir of teachers who understand the needs of adult students. Finally, and not unimportantly, small- and medium-sized companies are comfortable with community colleges; indeed, many of their owners have attended a community college.

Macomb Community College's extensive industrial cooperative education program, for example, has over the past twenty years graduated more than 10,000 students, many of whom are today managers and owners of small- and medium-size manufacturing firms. These alumni assist in the development of programs both traditional and customized. Many are presently playing a role in the construction of the Macomb Industrial Network (MIN), a monthly meeting of small- and medium-size manufacturing establishments in Macomb County.

Macomb is attempting to link the MIN organizations it serves with programs that can provide work-based learning opportunities for students, including tech-prep, school-to-work, and customized training grants. Because this network has been developed with the Mid-West Manufacturing Center, the college can bring technical or organizational expertise from across the entire region to aid in these efforts.

What do the colleges get out of this? In the short run, only the overall economic development experience that comes from providing a means for companies to come together to share experiences. But in the long run, the organizations community colleges help to modernize will become future employers of the colleges' students and supporters of college programs and activities.

It is too early to tell how many community colleges will enter this next stage of relationships with small- and medium-size businesses, but the recent expansion of NIST centers suggests that this sort of activity will increase.

Ultimately, community colleges' current attention to the modernization needs of the small- and medium-size companies will move "up stream" to the education of new workers for their partners. It appears clear that current postsecondary occupational programs must be reengineered, both in terms of substance and delivery, if they are to continue to produce a flow of well-prepared workers into businesses. Smaller manufacturing firms need multiskilled clusters of talented employees who have not only a set of core skills, but also the ability to add new skills and to adapt to new processes, products, and tools.

A response that may have a very significant impact would be for community colleges to develop accelerated programs that produce generalists in manufacturing technologies, with curricula geared to rapid entry-level employment. Then, based on the particular unfolding needs of each company, workers would return to the college in continuous cycles of training and retraining as the need for new specialties arises.

The college would play two key roles in this process: first, as the initial "broker" between a student and potential employer; then as the lifelong education provider for skill enhancements the worker will need once he or she obtains a job. The initial skills necessary to function in the industry could be determined through some form of industry-developed certification program. The recent school-to-work, tech-prep, and national standards programs may provide a programmatic structure to help colleges make this transition.

Community colleges have come a long way in the last ten years working with businesses and manufacturing firms. Nonetheless, it is vital that they continue to adapt and develop programs as their understanding of the needs of the nation's companies and employers increases. Only by emphasizing flexibility and responsiveness can the community college continue to advance its role as a learning institution—and continue to contribute to the development of people and the organizations in which they work.

James Jacobs is associate vice president of business and community services at Macomb Community College in Warren, Michigan

Volume 8, number 9
September 1995

leadership abstracts

WHO ARE COMMUNITY COLLEGES' DISTANCE LEARNERS?

Carol Cross

Increasingly, legislators and public officials, business and community leaders, educational reformists, and college administrators are heralding distance education as a means for maintaining educational access in a climate of increased demand but decreased funding. Distance education is not only a cost-effective way to serve growing student populations, such advocates point out, but allows students to study at their own time, location, and pace, providing access to thousands of learners who cannot attend traditional college classes.

In fact, distance education is no longer merely an alternative to the most popular sold-out classes on campus or a handful of courses offered by a few progressive instructors; telecourses now represent a complete and viable alternative to the traditional associate's degree program. Sufficient numbers and varieties of nationally-distributed telecourses exist now to allow community colleges to offer virtually an entire AA degree program in the homes or offices of students throughout their districts, broadcast on public or college-operated television stations.

Naturally, there are those who challenge such optimistic visions, questioning whether distance education, particularly a complete degree program, can truly meet the needs of community college students. Some suspect that telelearning only appeals to a narrow spectrum of the broad community college student population, fearing that only an elite number can benefit from such programs.

Are Distance-Education Students Different?

The last major national study (1984) of telecourse student demographics, conducted by the Annenberg/CPB Project, found the following characteristics of telelearners: they are predominantly female (over 66 percent); the majority are married with at least one dependent; and they are overwhelmingly (80 percent) employed, with over half working full time.

All the distance-education professionals contacted for this article felt the statistics were still valid, reporting that their college's average telecourse student was a working adult, usually female, who had both work and family responsibilities to juggle along with her education. Most claimed that while the percentage of women students, average age, and work responsibilities tended to be somewhat greater for distance-education students, their demographics were not much different than their college's overall population averages.

Distance educators admit that telecourses require a higher level of self-discipline and self-motivation than instructor-led courses, so that successful telelearners may differ somewhat on those characteristics. But Steven Sachs, associate dean for instructional technologies and extended learning at Northern Virginia Community College, argues that "Distance-education students are becoming more like the mainstream students all the time. As we find ways to use additional technologies to increase communications and student support services, the differences are blurring between the telecourses and the traditional courses, and thus between their students."

Will the MTV Generation Tune in to Telecourses?

Educators have been concerned about "traditional age" (18-22) students now entering community colleges, because these students have spent more time watching television than they have in school. Despite their viewing experience, however, this group is not particularly drawn to telecourse education. In the 1984 Annenberg study, only 23 percent of telecourse students fell into the 18-22 age category. An informal sampling of current community college distance-education enrollments confirmed that, while the number of younger students has increased, the average age of telecourse students is 25-30 years-old, usually a year or so over the college average. In the opinion of at least one respondent, the average telecourse age is dropping because more traditional age students are working, thus increasing their need for more flexibility.

In fact, while telecourse users say they appreciate the multimedia information conveyed by video, it does not appear that they enroll in telecourses because of their affinity for television. In two Annenberg/CPB studies

(1985, 1988), students rated both the quality and the importance of the course textbook above that of the videos.

Are Distance-Education Programs Only for Rural or Geographically-Isolated Students?

Actually, no. In the 1985 national Annenberg/CPB study, 60 percent lived within a half-hour of the campus; only 7 percent lived more than an hour away. The 1988 survey found that one of three students lived within 15 minutes of the college. Individual colleges confirm those figures, pointing out that the majority of their telecourse students are concurrently enrolled in on-campus courses.

While many of the largest telecourse providers are in urban/suburban settings, even rural areas downplay the "distant" aspect of distance education. Tom Wilkenson, director of learning resources and instructional technology at rural New River Community College, explains, "When we started the program, we were looking at serving students who were far away, but it didn't work out that way . . . most of our telecourse students don't live that far away." Wilkenson voices a common sentiment when he says, "We've come to the conclusion that the real advantage of distance education is more that it eliminates the barriers for those who are time-bound, rather than place-bound."

Community colleges report that it is time flexibility that is more important to the current working, child-raising telelearner than the unwillingness or inability to travel to the campus. Consequently, both research and experience reveal that the trend in telecourses is for students to view them on their own time schedule on videotape, using tapes either supplied by the college or recorded by the student.

Do Minority Students Enroll in Telecourses?

While this subject has not been addressed in the national research reports, individual colleges claim that, for the most part, minority enrollment in telecourses mirrors minority enrollment in credit programs on campus. Distance educators tend to attribute under-representation of minority students to gaps in telecourse content areas, rather than on problems with distance-education programs per se. For example, at De Anza College, fewer Asian students are among the school's 8,000 annual telecourse enrollments than attend credit classes on campus. A plausible explanation is that De Anza offers few science classes and no math courses via television; the college's Asian students are heavily enrolled in those disciplines. Because most telecourses are designed for core curriculum courses and other classes leading to a liberal arts or general studies degree, perhaps the question at the top of this section should be posed as: Do minority students enroll in a given telecourse program at the same rate they enroll in similar programs delivered in other ways?

How Many Students Would Complete an Entire Degree Program by Distance Education?

No one knows yet, because it is only recently that community colleges have put together enough curriculum material to offer a complete associate's degree via telecourses and other distance-education methodologies. In the 1994-95 school year, about 20 colleges and universities began to promote their ability to offer a complete degree via distance education under PBS's new "Going the Distance" initiative.

At the same time the PBS project began to gear up, however, a study at Northern Virginia Community College, one of the handful of colleges in the country with a complete distance-degree program, found that less than 15 people out of some 3,000 distance education enrollments had completed 50 percent of their degree requirements via distance education. The study's author, Steven Sachs, reports that "Half of our current distance-education students say they take telecourses because it's impossible for them to enroll in the on-campus classes, while another 25 percent say it would be very difficult. Clearly, the majority of students are enrolled in telecourses because it is the only way that they can take that class. However, more than half also take another class that semester on campus, so evidently they can work things out to some extent, particularly when they don't have an alternative."

While Sachs believes that complete distance-education associate's programs may attract some additional students for whom that is the only option, he expects the majority of students will continue to pursue a mix of telecourse and on-campus instruction. However, he contends a distance associate's program brings additional benefits to the college. "Offering a degree program," he states, "makes distance education a more recognized choice and brings it into the mainstream culture of the college. This draws in the leaders on the campus, both among the students and the faculty, and raises the quality of the courses for everyone. I've also seen students and faculty take the skills and techniques they developed in the telecourse classes, such as communicating by computer, back to their classroom-based courses, improving the overall college education."

Carol Cross is executive director of Edudigm, an educational consulting firm located in Washington, D.C., and editor of Signals, the information technology newsletter of the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Volume 8, Number 10
October 1995

REGARDING TECHNOLOGY

Larry Johnson

Even a cursory look at the everyday workplace will reveal that the world of work has undergone profound shifts in recent years. Few jobs have not been affected. Information technology is everywhere, in manufacturing, in marketing, even in hands-on trades like construction and automobile mechanics. Virtually every part of our daily lives has been touched in some way by technology.

Students coming to community colleges expect to see technology put to extensive use there as well, and in many, many ways, colleges have accommodated them. *Campus Computing 1994: The USC National Survey of Desktop Computing in Higher Education* revealed that community colleges use computer-based labs or classrooms in almost twice as many courses as other segments of higher education. Community colleges are leaders in using computer-based simulations, computerized presentation tools, CD-ROM materials, commercial courseware, and multimedia.

Furthermore, community colleges are joining the global electronic community in incredible numbers. Community college access to the Internet has almost doubled in the past two years, to the point that more than three-quarters of community colleges are now connected.

Technology Across the Curriculum

Because community colleges are, at their core, teaching institutions much of the growth in information technology and access to equipment and software has been fueled by the promise of these technologies for instruction. Indeed, the use of computers in teaching and learning began as the subject of instruction. Colleges offered (and still do offer in vast numbers) courses in data processing, computer programming, information systems design, hardware repair, telecommunications, and manufacturing design and control. As the technology advanced and became more accessible, especially after the emergence of the personal computer, community colleges' view of computer technology underwent a transformation in which the computer itself was less of a focus and the way the machines could be used as tools became more important.

The current stage of this progression, the implications of which colleges are just beginning to understand, has been a move to where information technology has come to be viewed as a *medium* for instruction. The earliest steps in this transition came in the form of tutorials and practice software. Computer adaptive testing and assessment provided new kinds of support tools. Independent learning systems, another approach to instructional software that evolved from work done in the 1970s with programmed learning, are beginning to come into broad use.

More recently, experiential activities and simulations have begun to be developed using multimedia techniques. This approach has generated considerable excitement because it allows material to be presented in an eye-catching way using motion and sound, and lets students stop, repeat, and bring in alternative examples as they progress through the material. Simulation software, a special form of multimedia which first appeared in the sciences and healthcare programs, has emerged as a compelling instructional tool because it allows parameters to be altered repeatedly in experiments and procedures. The effects of students' actions can be safely observed in a "virtual" setting, solving a number of problems inherent in handling hazardous materials and processes and avoiding the need for expensive, elaborate, or time-consuming setups. The benefits of simulation software have now expanded into other areas, such as art, history, and economics.

With the increased access to computer networking and communications tools, some teachers have begun to discover that active learning approaches, group work, and other forms of collaborative learning can lend themselves very well to the computer classroom. The key defining feature of many of these efforts is that they are not based on a particular software package, but rather use the power of network communication and information access tools to enrich the learning experience in ways that allow students to assume more control over the learning process, with the teacher acting as a facilitator and guide.

Taken together, these kinds of innovations are building to a critical mass that is slowly—but surely—transforming the way we think about teaching and learning. The secret behind the current and emerging teaching innovations that are using information technology is clear—although somewhat challenging, for it means a fundamental change in the way teaching and teachers are viewed. The locus of control over learning is being shifted to the student. Students

are increasingly empowered to choose the ways they acquire information.

Nonetheless, even with all of the progress that has been made in establishing effective models of technology use in instruction, teaching technologies have not, by any stretch of the imagination, made their way into the mainstream and broad-scale use. The real technological challenge we face is not how to use information technology, but how to get more people to use it. The reasons we have not seen more use of teaching and learning technology, the most important issues surrounding greater implementation, are not technological. The problem community colleges face with technology is primarily human and organizational—and one that presents an unparalleled opportunity for leadership.

Technological Leadership

Success in this endeavor is not something easily accomplished by a single leader operating in isolation. Colleges that have created a technologically-minded culture have drawn on the significant participation of the entire leadership of the college, from the president and senior staff to faculty leaders, chairs, and deans. This is not to say, however, that technological leadership requires the leaders themselves to be extremely adept at using technology. The role of the technological leader is to communicate in human terms, through word and deed, that embarking on a course toward greater integration and understanding of technology is expected, valued, and rewarded.

Modeling. Whenever practical, effective use of technology should be modeled—in meetings, presentations, classes, and other settings. In particular, the technology-minded leader should endeavor to demonstrate that even relatively low-level technologies can be used effectively to enhance presentations or to create active-learning situations. Using even simple technology creatively can send a powerful unspoken message communicating that technological skills are important, useful, and valued.

Staff development. Coupled with a college's ongoing technical support activities, tremendous strides can be made in advancing faculty and staff skills by providing internal opportunities for nontechnical people to work together and share learning and expertise in technology, even in very informal ways. Rather than relying on a purely technical approach, care should be taken in structuring these opportunities to include healthy components of human interaction and idea exchange. The leader's personal participation in these activities is very important. A form of modeling, such involvement communicates volumes about the importance of the activities and should not be underestimated.

Ensuring broad participation. The technologically-aware leader should look for broad participation not only in technological planning and decision making, but also in an ongoing collegewide "conversation" about how and why to use technology. In the process, it is important to recognize that the needs of early adopters differ from those of the mainstream; care should be exercised in structuring these processes so that the experience and expertise of the early adopters can be applied as it is appropriate, but applied in ways that will ensure all voices are heard.

Building electronic learning communities. If the college provides electronic mail to faculty and staff, the leader should encourage electronic discussions on teaching and learning topics. Including students and other nonteaching groups in some of these discussions can provide additional perspectives on the value of a particular approach or software package, and sometimes will lead the electronic community to nonintuitive conclusions or insights. In colleges with Internet access, teams might be formed to participate in or explore teaching-focused Internet discussion groups and web sites.

Advocating appropriate reward systems. The aware leader, noting the vertical orientation of many faculty and staff, can use his or her influence among other administrators to advocate recognition processes for successful adaptations of technology, see that enterprising faculty are written up in the college paper and other publications, encourage presentations at academic meetings, and generally show support for the work that people are doing. Internal reward systems can be simple (an occasional note) or more formal (recognition at a division or collegewide convocation), but share one key characteristic for success: they should be noncompetitive. Rather than making a single recognition or award, several should be made, and at various times during the year.

Creating a learner-centered workplace. The sum total of the above kinds of activities will carry the leader far in creating a learner-centered workplace—a work environment where the risk is taken out of change, where experimentation is encouraged and supported, and where learning is not just something that students are expected to do. The key is to clearly communicate the expectation that college personnel will, in conformance with their preferred learning styles and at an individually appropriate pace, work continuously to upgrade their technical skills. The final step is to then ensure that "high-touch" structures, processes, and focused teams are put to the task of helping them to do just that.

Transforming the mainstream of college practice will be no easy task. From an historical perspective, it certainly has not been easy so far. But it is essential that community colleges confront and deal honestly with the structural changes that must take place if they are to be successful in the inexorable move to more and more integration of information technology.

Larry Johnson is associate director of the League for Innovation in the Community College, Mission Viejo, California, and the editor of Leadership Abstracts.

Volume 8, Number 11
November 1995

leadership abstracts

ENDOWED CHAIRS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Paul C. Gianini, Jr.

The long-term outlook for funding of community colleges continues to grow bleaker. Budget recisions, proposals to phase out education and training programs at the federal level, and state revenue caps will mean that many colleges will have inadequate funding even for mandated programs. Local private-sector funding will grow in importance as public funding is cut back. A privately derived ongoing base of support for instructional development, a base which in turn supports faculty in seeking increasingly competitive external funding, has proven to be as effective a strategy for sustaining program development during lean budget years as it was for expanding program opportunities in more bountiful times. Used as leverage, such a program can also enable community colleges to be more competitive for the public and private funding programs that survive budget cuts.

In the 1980s, several Florida community colleges initiated campaigns through their foundations to establish endowed chair programs to enhance instruction. Miami-Dade, Broward, and Valencia community colleges are among the institutions whose programs have benefited greatly from the instruction-oriented private funding bases which resulted.

Six years ago, Valencia Community College became involved in the endowed chair program believing that an investment in its human resources was at least as vital to the continuing development of the college as was investing in the expansion and renovation of physical facilities. The creation of the endowed teaching chairs program has helped reduce the impact of funding cuts in Florida, strengthened ties to the community—and to local business and industry—and has proved to be an excellent way to promote the professional growth of the faculty.

Valencia's Endowed Chair Program

The purpose of Valencia's endowed chair program is threefold: to recognize and promote teaching excellence at the college; to spotlight outstanding members of Valencia's teaching faculty; and to provide the college with financial resources needed to support teaching excellence. The latter has been realized through salary stipends and supplementary budgets for instructional support.

The program enables the college to honor outstanding members of the teaching faculty and provide resources needed for the advancement of teaching. In contrast to the endowed chair programs at four-year institutions which aim to attract preeminent researchers, this program recognizes and supports faculty for instructional leadership. Approval of the program by the Florida Division of Community Colleges allowed the endowed chair program to receive matching funding through the Florida Academic Improvement Trust Fund.

Criteria for Selection

The criteria for selection of a faculty member for an endowed chair includes a faculty committee's judgment of the candidate's record of teaching excellence, contribution to the advancement of instruction within his or her field, and the degree of esteem expressed by his or her colleagues. In addition, the candidate must submit a proposal outlining in general terms how endowed chair funding will be used to enhance individual instructional activities or foster professional development personally, departmentally, collegewide, within the Central Florida community, or within an academic discipline. An important criterion is that the candidate's goal(s) could not be readily achieved without the award of the chair.

The candidate is required to submit two letters of nomination, one of which must be from a peer faculty member, and must have the approval of the department chair and the provost of the campus. The faculty awards committee reviews all candidates' materials and sends its recommendation directly to the president of the college, who has final approval.

An endowed chair term normally consists of two academic years. At the end of a term, a recipient is eligible for reappointment or renomination, with a previous award not being considered prejudicial to his

or her candidacy for subsequent terms. Each recipient must submit an annual report to the foundation that includes an accounting of discretionary funds and a brief narrative of activities.

Types of Endowed Chairs

Half of the interest generated by an endowment is awarded to the faculty member as an extra stipend. The other half is applied to activities such as student instructional projects; field trips; the acquisition of resource materials, literature, and audiovisual materials for the classroom, studio, or laboratory; travel; and study stipends for professional renewal. Examples of this type of endowed chair (Category A) include the Martin Marietta Electronics and Missiles Group Chair in Mathematics and the NationsBank Chair in Business.

To address other types of activities in the instructional arena, two more types of chairs were created. Category B awards are made to departments, disciplines, and programs with fewer than three full-time faculty. Category B chairs may be utilized to bring an eminent scholar, distinguished practitioner, or speakers to the college. In accordance with guidelines specified by the endowment donor, funds are used for professional development via participation in conferences and workshops, travel, and study reimbursement; instructional projects involving speakers and resource specialists; and the purchase of resource materials and equipment.

Examples of Category B chairs include the Hubbard Construction Company Chair in Technical and Engineering Programs, the Walt Disney World Company Chair in Film, and the Central Florida Motel and Hotel Association Chair in Hospitality Management.

Category C chairs may be used to support credit or noncredit educational activities. These chairs provide educational support for a variety of activities within the area of expertise, academic discipline, or programs specified by the chair donor and foundation. These chairs normally fund educational activities rather than faculty or staff stipends.

Activities under a Category C chair can include sponsored residencies for outstanding academicians and field practitioners; student instructional projects; field trips; travel and study reimbursement for professional development; classroom speakers and resource specialists; job placement, job development or job referral services; curriculum development; student internships; lectureships; symposia; and joint ventures that promote business association, agency, and industry partnerships.

Category C awards include the SunBank Chair in Economic Development, the Dr. P. Phillips Chair in Free Enterprise, the William C. Demetree, Jr. Foundation Chair for Education in Special Needs, and the Bessie Galloway Henkel Chair in Women's Studies in Business.

Activities of Endowed Chairs

To date the college has established 24 endowed chairs resulting in a foundation endowment fund balance in excess of $1 million. Interestingly, it has been the rule, rather than the exception, that faculty holding endowed chair positions initiate projects that benefit peer faculty as opposed to focusing only on themselves.

The Walt Disney World Company Chair in Film brought producer/director Robert Wise to the college for a two-week seminar. Mr. Wise, who produced *The Sound of Music*, *West Side Story*, *The Andromeda Strain*, and *The Day the Earth Stood Still*, shared his invaluable experience and insight with students in the classroom and on the sound stage. His presence also focused attention on Valencia's film program, with newspaper articles, television interviews, a Disney tour, and a special theater screening accompanying the visit.

College faculty used their endowed chairs to bring in experts in foreign languages and orchestrated several field trips that afforded students direct interaction with the art, artifacts, architecture, and traditions of Spanish culture. A visit to St. Augustine allowed students to explore the period of Spanish rule in Florida, the architecture of that time, astronomy in Columbus' era, Ponce de Leon's fountain of youth, and authentic Spanish cuisine. Additional Spanish culture was brought to the college by using the funds of the chair to underwrite a flamenco dance presentation during the Spanish Heritage Celebration.

A faculty member receiving a chair in mathematics used the money to attend, present, or sponsor attendance for several of his fellow faculty at several key conferences throughout the year. He also purchased specialized equipment and integrated graphing calculators into the curriculum.

The initial goal of 20 foundation chairs has already been exceeded, and more are in the offing. The ultimate goal? A foundation campaign that, like its endowments, will continue to grow, in both numbers and effectiveness, in perpetuity.

Paul C. Gianini, Jr. is president of Valencia Community College in Orlando, Florida. Valencia will serve as a host college for the League's "WORKFORCE 2000" conference to be held in Orlando, January 31–February 3, 1996.