DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 728 JC 990 056

AUTHOR Milliron, Mark D. Ed.
TITLE Leadership Abstracts, Volume 11, Numbers 1-10, 1998.
INSTITUTION League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Leadership Abstracts; v11 n1-10 1998
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Community Colleges; Cooperative Learning; *Educational Change; Educational Facilities; Educational Strategies; Educational Technology; *Leadership; Learning; *School Community Relationship; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The abstracts in this series provide brief discussions of issues related to leadership, administration, professional development, technology, and education in community colleges. Volume 11 for 1998 contains the following 10 abstracts: (1) "What If They Learn Differently: Applying Multiple Intelligences Theory in the Community College" (Rene Diaz-Lefebvre, Nancy Siefer and Tessa Martinez Pollack); (2) "Technology Education: Striving for Excellence and Equity" (Willard R. Daggett); (3) "Certificates on Center Stage: Occupational Education for a Working Economy" (Stella A. Perez and Carol C. Copenhaver); (4) "Laptops for Everyone: Changing the Way Students Learn and Colleges Do Business" (Lynn Cundiff and Sandy M. Briscar); (5) "Celebrating Presidential Leadership Transitions" (Ned J. Sifferlen); (6) "Community Colleges Go International: Short-Cycle Education Around the World" (Frederick C. Kintzer); (7) "Dream Catchers: Community Colleges and the Coming Prosperity" (Bob Davis and David Wessel); (8) "Community Colleges Perched at the Millennium: Perspectives on Innovation, Transformation, and Tomorrow" (Kay M. McClenney); (9) "Moving From Innovation to Transformation in the Community College" (Paul Gianni); and (10) "Seven Practices to Prepare Our Students for Success in the Digital Age" (Beth Richardson). (AS)

Leadership Abstracts

Volume 11, numbers 1-10, 1998

Mark. D. Milliron
Editor

League for Innovation in the Community College

leadership abstracts

WHAT IF THEY LEARN DIFFERENTLY: APPLYING MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES THEORY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

René Díaz-Lefebvre, Nancy Siefer, & Tessa Martinez Pollack

As community college leaders enter the twenty-first century, a wide range of efforts are underway aimed at providing new and exciting incites into learning. Social scientists are exploring aspects of public education (e.g., social class, economics, race) and how these challenges support or hinder the iearning process. Cognitive scientists are finding that people do not learn in a vacuum, but through social interaction. Human development researchers are studying motivation to uncover what makes people exert the effort to learn. Others are exploring how different intelligences—such as musical talent or the ability to see things spatially—lead students to deal with and learn academic subjects differently. These efforts result in today's educational leader having at his or her finger tips varied and powerful research on how students learn.

The concepts and practices of learning by leveraging multiple intelligences is one approach around which a group of faculty and administrators at Glendale Community College (AZ) have begun to focus their efforts. "It's not how smart you are; it's how you are smart!" is their rallying cry as they expand on their partnership and experience with the work of Harvard University's Howard Gardner, author of the award-winning book on multiple intelligences, *Frames of Mind*. They are dedicated to designing educational experiences for students that demonstrate and explore how they are smart in the synergistic environment of a community of learners. This abstract will briefly outline the foundations of multiple intelligences (MI) and profile their application at Glendale Community College (GCC).

Learning Differently

Multiple intelligences theory asserts that when it comes to being "smart," differences count. It takes human differences seriously, elevating the dignity and giftedness of each individual.

Gardner argues that intelligence is not some static reality fixed at birth and measured well by standardized testing. Instead, intelligence is a dynamic, ever-growing reality that can be expanded in one's life through eight intelligences: (1) linguistic (words); (2) logical-mathematical (numbers); (3) spatial (pictures); (4) musical (musical/rhythmic); (5) bodily-kinesthetic (movement); (6) interpersonal (people); (7) intrapersonal (self); and (8) naturalist (flora and fauna).

In addition to these different types of intelligences, researchers on MI believe that the *process* of learning is both wondrous and complex. They are peering deep into this wonder to more fully explain how the brain works and to redefine learning itself. They have found that brain activity occurs in a number of ways: spontaneously, automatically, and in response to challenge. To learn effectively, this brain activity must be stimulated in at least one of these ways and be combined with useful and suitable feedback systems. Moreover, for learning to continue, the brain must be provided challenging tasks that require significant amounts of reflection or emotional energy. This challenge is an important part of healthy brain functioning.

Applying MI in the Community College

What would it be like to teach a college-level class that begins with assisting students through an assessment to identify, acknowledge, and stimulate the different ways of being "smart?" MI theory contends that many of the brightest and most capable learners are caught in a system that places heavy emphasis on linguistic, word-smart intelligence and logical-mathematical, number-and-computer-smart intelligence. Higher education traditionally emphasizes these two ways of being smart. Focusing solely on these types of learning strategies has in some cases encouraged rote-memory teaching strategies that may foster little connection to material, low motivation, and poor performance. Many students thought to be lazy are actually bored and frustrated because, even though they are "smart," they are craving multiple methods of stimulation—methods that may be more effective in helping them master course material.

In order to explore some of these MI assumptions in the community college setting, a pilot project was conducted during 1994-1996 at GCC. The MI teaching and learning approach was applied to ten introductory psychology classes with 131 students participating. The introductory psychology courses were preidentified in the college catalog as classes that were going to utilize a multiple-intelligences approach to course material. The class sizes were limited (i.e., average class size of 13) in order to better observe the results of the project efforts. In addition, other discipline areas—linguistics in particular—piloted some MI techniques and monitored the outcomes. While not a strictly "scientific" study of MI in the community college, the project resulted in useful data that provided some interesting insights on community college

ERIC Published with support from SCT.
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

student MI characteristics and about MI outcomes in the community college teaching and learning process.

Student MI Characteristics

One aspect of the pilot involved assessing student dominant or preferred intelligences. The assessment instrument used at the semester's beginning was a pictorial inventory that has been used with success in other educational environments; however, this was the first field test in a community college.

Results from all courses utilizing the MI inventory showed that the most frequent MI profile for these students was bodily-kinesthetic (BK) intelligence (27 percent). Research and practice on BK students in other settings show that they process knowledge through bodily sensations and use their body in differentiated and skilled ways. They respond best in learning situations that provide manipulative action activities and hands-on learning experiences.

Twenty-four percent of the students were assessed as dominant in interpersonal intelligence (IP). IP students enjoy being around people and learn best through person-to-person relationships and communication. These students are often best suited for cooperative learning environments.

The subsequent intelligences assessments were spatial (16 percent), linguistic (8 percent), and logical-mathematical (8 percent). Ironically, the intelligences most emphasized in higher education were the least likely to stimulate this group of community college learners.

In addition to the initial assessment, the project students were given the opportunity to choose learning options that appealed most to them during the term. Project coordinators provided a wide range of teaching and learning options—options tailored to appeal to specific MI styles. For example, students could choose assignments and class projects that emphasized collaboration (IP learners), active learning (BK learners), or more standard repetitive techniques (linguistic learners). The coordinators then correlated the original student MI inventory assessment with their choices of learning options and found a strong positive correlation.

Teaching and Learning Outcomes

Throughout the pilot study, students using the variety of learning options demonstrated more risk-taking behavior in applying the different ways of learning to academic material. Students were particularly more interested in exploring different learning options when the instructor modeled, encouraged, and rewarded their getting out of "comfort zones" (e.g., the instructor taught using multiple and creative methods and seemed to be taking chances). In evaluation documents, students shared that their motivation and out-of-class effort increased because they saw more clearly the value of their learning experiences, they enjoyed the opportunity to be creative, and they began to develop their own "love of learning."

In an introductory linguistics class where the MI techniques were used, the instructor—Nancy Siefer—perceived increases in students' interaction, cooperation, enthusiasm, and the quality of their work. Student papers and projects showed more depth and analysis than previous assignments; moreover, the students seemed to have fun in the process.

The theory and practice of MI focused these students on learning rather than competing with each other, and this encouraged risk-taking. Students reported putting "twice the effort" into their projects and papers as they had in other classes on traditional assignments. The integration of MI into the curricula fostered an intellectual excitement and zest for learning that helped replace the often-heard expression, "you didn't teach me this," with "where can I get more information to make this more clear."

Conclusion

What if they learn differently? Are we as educational leaders making gross and often incorrect assumptions about how our students learn? Perhaps paper-and- pencil testing and the lecture delivery system reaches only a narrow band of student learning potential. Perhaps, despite the current hyperbole, not everyone learns academic material well through enabling technologies such as the computer. Perhaps collaborative learning, small group interaction, and integrated learning communities are more compatible with some learning styles than others.

While not "proving or disproving" any of these assertions, results from the pilot project provide interesting information that guides GCC into the next phase of implementation. Currently, a multiple intelligences expansion project using a multidisciplinary framework is underway. Classes in biology, chemistry, math, English, art, family studies, anthropology, speech, and psychology will be providing multiple-learning options for their students based on the theory and practice of MI in the classroom. As the project continues at GCC, MI will be incorporated into the well-known curricular innovation, integrated learning communities.

The MI project team at GCC will continue exploring how to make learning more effective for today's college students. Faculty and administrative collaboration, dedication, and ongoing dialogue are essential to helping us foster an environment where our commitment to diversity of thinking and learning is as accepted, tolerated, and encouraged as the community colleges' longstanding commitment to diversity of students. Only in this environment can the exciting and often unorthodox ways of learning be explored and utilized to make a difference in the lives and learning of our students as they move into the next century.

René Díaz-Lefebvre and Nancy Siefer are professors, and Tessa Martinez Pollack is president at Glendale Community College (AZ). They can be contacted at diaz@gc.maricopa.edu.

Volume 11, number 1
January 1998

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

leadership abstracts

TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION: STRIVING FOR EXCELLENCE AND EQUITY

Willard R. Daggett

Every day, innovations in technology are revolutionizing life and work in the United States. Educators at all levels face two monumental challenges with respect to technology: how to use technology to achieve excellence and how to ensure equity of access for all students. With their appeal to a broad diversity of students, community colleges must give careful consideration to these issues.

In looking at the role of technology in education, it is a strategic error to examine the current technology. Instead, educators must anticipate the future of technology, a future that will be dramatically different from the present. The skills, knowledge, and aptitudes needed in the workplace and society of tomorrow will be quite unlike those required in the past. Moreover, community college leaders' responses to these changes may require a new way of looking at technology's role in assuring excellence and equity in education.

Rapidly Changing Technology

To understand the impact of changing technology, it is helpful to consider it in the context of the evolution of society in general. For hundreds of thousands of years, humans lived in a hunting and gathering economy. Approximately 10,000 years ago, humans made the transition to the agricultural economy. The agricultural society prevailed until about 200 years ago, when the Western world ushered in the Industrial Revolution. A few decades ago, the industrial economy began to give way to the technological/information-based society. This current era is projected to end 20 to 30 years from now.

Each passing economy has been progressively shorter than its predecessor. In addition, each society saw an exponential amount of change take place in the way that people lived, worked, and recreated. This trend promises to continue, especially in view of the new ways that technology will be used in the second half of the technological/information-based society.

The first half of this era was the number-crunching stage—using computers to develop spreadsheets, perform calculations, and do word processing. That is, people used the new technology to improve the things they already did and to make tasks more efficient. An example can be seen in the production of letters, reports, and other documents. Making mistakes became much less costly and time consuming when the advent of word-processing software, and desktop publishing made it possible to produce quality products in-house efficiently and inexpensively.

With 93 percent of current jobs in the private sector requiring ongoing interaction with a piece of information technology, workers who have not mastered the fundamentals of grammar and writing are rendered ineffectual. Basic skills are more relevant than ever—it's just that they are no longer enough. Today's employees are expected to use technology in ways that require them to possess higher-level processing skills in addition to the basics, such as reading and communication skills.

The Next Stage

The second stage of the technological/information-based economy focuses on communications technology. The key to the use of computers for communications is *connections, connections, connections*. Technology innovators are continually devising new ways to connect people to information, as well as to other people around the world. A few examples of these new connections can shed light on what to expect in the decades ahead.

Every car manufactured in the United States in 1997 had more technology than Apollo 11, the spacecraft that put the first man on the moon. In the coming years, automobiles will become increasingly connected to the world outside. Global positioning systems (GPS) technology offers one remarkable example of these increasing connections. By linking to satellites, a computer system in an automobile can determine its exact location anywhere on Earth. The computer then communicates with the driver via text display and voice synthesizing, providing precise directions for any given

Published with support from SCT.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

destination, as well as identifying all gas stations along the way and rerouting in case of human error.

While the GPS mapping system is impressive, it does not have as much potential to revolutionize the auto industry as "real-time maintenance," a technology just around the corner. Today, more than 80 percent of all automotive repairs now consist of computer adjustments rather than replacement of parts. As computerization increases, the next step is for every car to be connected via satellite to a service center. Minutes after a problem is detected (and it will be detected and identified much more easily with the new technology), the car will be fixed through a computer adjustment via satellite transmission of the data to and from the automotive technician, who can be located anywhere in the world. This represents a fundamental shift in the concept of car repairs and the job of the automotive technician.

To look at the broader implications of computerization, it is estimated that the United States will lose two-thirds to three-fourths of all technician jobs in the next five years, because a computer chip is more efficient and more cost effective. As for the technicians hired to do the computerized maintenance, they will have to possess a high level of technical training and a willingness to work for low wages. When U.S. automobile companies recruit their technical employees, they no longer will be limited to hiring local workers to fix cars, because repairs will be done via satellite. Instead, the companies will look to other nations, such as Hungary, where potential employees meet all of the requirements. Here is the intersection of the global economy and the development of new technology.

Continuing Quests for Equity and Excellence

The question community college leaders need to answer is: What skills and knowledge do students need to interface with the coming technology, and how will they have to be able to use these skills in this world of connections? The answer must come from looking to the future to determine not only how to teach technology in the classrooms, but also what the curriculum must be in order for students to continue to be successful with the technology to come.

Trying to keep pace with every technological advance is a game most community colleges are bound to lose. Luckily, doing so is unnecessary. Providing students with exposure to technology and helping them develop the academic skills and concepts that will allow them to interact with technology are significant ways to achieve equity and excellence in educating students.

With respect to equity, there is a direct correlation between family income and computers in the home. According to 1997 data, 15 percent of families earning less than $25,000 a year have a computer, versus 85 percent of families earning more than $70,000.

Community colleges enroll many nontraditional students, including those least likely to have computers at home. Community colleges can equip these students—and all students—for success in life by teaching them the academics that underpin technology, especially rigorous language arts, math, and science skills, as well as knowledge made relevant through real-world applications. Especially important are technical reading and writing, applied physics, statistics, logic, probability, and measurement systems. Curricula must also be structured so that students learn to apply existing knowledge to new situations and unfamiliar technology.

Conclusion

As leaders reflect on the significant changes in technology and the changes in curricula needed to equip students for the second stage of the technological/information-based society, they should consider that technology is not only something with which we must "keep pace." Technology itself can fundamentally change the way educators reach students, allowing them to do a better job of teaching what has always been taught, while presenting opportunities to teach what is seldom taught—how to integrate knowledge and apply it to new settings. Thus, technology can become a force for excellence and equity in community colleges.

This article abstracts the keynote address Willard Daggett delivered at the fall 1997 League for Innovation Conference on Information Technology in Atlanta. Willard Daggett has been a keynote speaker for two League conferences and continues to be one of the most well-received presenters.

To contact Willard Daggett, please send correspondence to 219 Liberty Street, Schenectady, NY 12305 or to info@daggett.com.

Volume 11, number 2
February 1998

lliron, Editor
bstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html
on Recycled Paper

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

leadership abstracts

CERTIFICATES ON CENTER STAGE: OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION FOR A WORKING ECONOMY

Stella A. Perez and Carol C. Copenhaver

Not so long ago, college graduates followed career paths leading from campuses to companies where they worked throughout their 30- to 40-year professional lives. Many of our parents and grandparents climbed a single corporate ladder through a series of promotions to the culmination of their careers and into retirement. During these times, college degrees ensured access and opportunity for professional life-styles. Degrees also served symbolically and functionally to secure a position for graduates as contributing members of the American middle class.

Several changes in higher education and the work force in recent years have called into question the college degree as the certain ticket to career success. As a result, students are reconsidering their career pathways, and colleges are redesigning the content, sequencing, and delivery of their degree programs to make them more relevant and accessible. This abstract traces the development and implications of the change in status of the college degree and examines how one community college is responding by "reengineering" a number of its Associate of Science degree programs to put certificates on center stage, give students immediate job skills, and answer employer needs for a new kind of educated citizenry.

Changing Higher Education Backdrop

Institutions of higher education are no longer the sole proprietors of knowledge or the exclusive developers of new professionals. Since the founding of this country, the seat of postsecondary educational power has migrated from the church to the state, and now it is "getting down to business." Originally, churches, monasteries, and seminaries controlled higher knowledge and reserved it for the elite classes. Later, state-governed colleges and universities brought advanced educational opportunity to a broader spectrum of class, color, and gender groups. Recently, businesses and corporations—out of self-proclaimed competitive necessity—have moved into postsecondary teaching and professional development activities, bringing a new cast of characters to the story of American occupational preparation.

The backdrop for this new stage of higher education is the colossal macroeconomic factor redefining American corporations and lives—global competition. The magnitude of this change is evident in the everyday corporate language of the 1990s. Downsizing, rightsizing, reduction-in-force, and outsourcing were unheard of in job placement discussions with college graduates of the 1940s, '50s, '60s, or '70s. In these eras, the American Dream endured and the link between college diploma and career security was intact.

Changing Players and Scripts

Today the scene has changed. The factors affecting higher education—new players in the marketplace and the backdrop of global competition—also influence the professional roles that contemporary college graduates expect to play. Workers now expect to change jobs, if not careers, many times during their lives, and they increasingly recognize job skill development as a lifelong endeavor.

A catalytic subplot underlying changes in higher education and the work force over the last two decades is the explosion of information technology, the *Tell-Tale Heart* of the Information Age. Scholars, researchers, and economists agree that these interdependent factors have created the most rapid changes our society has ever experienced. Couple these elements with some of the lowest unemployment rates on record, which normally signal less demand for education and training, and the imminent shortage of technology workers, which cries for highly specific skills training, and a sizzling higher education drama emerges.

The current scene churns these influences. Higher education leaders struggle with intransigent bureaucracies, learners enter college with less preparation and higher expectations, and industry races to remain competitive in the face of employee skill deficiencies. The news is filled with stories of how the pipeline of information technology workers is running dry. Public institutions are watching their former understudies, the proprietary colleges, take on leading roles. New for-profit institutions, such as University of Phoenix, promising to fulfill *anytime, anywhere, and anyplace* learner demands, are now significant contenders. As public institutions confront increasing competition, they continue to face the higher education reality of the '90s—growing accountability mandates and diminishing fiscal resources.

Old Baccalaureate Props

Community colleges, recognized for their adaptability and responsiveness, generally balk at playing out the script of unraveling public higher education. These institutions do not dispute the educational pathway to success documented

Published with support from SCT.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

by the American Council on Education in 1994, which noted that baccalaureate graduates earn $12,000 to $14,000 more per year than high school graduates. Rather, they take their cues from detonating new facts about how today's technical employee, with two-years of technical skills training, often earns as much as a four-year college graduate.

Kenneth Gray, professor of education at Penn State University, studies the relationship between education and career outcomes and dubs the traditional degree pathway to the work force the *baccalaureate myth*. Gray's research reveals that 70 percent of our nation's high school graduates enter college, but one in three does not complete a degree. Of those who graduate, one-third take jobs they could have obtained without the expense of a college degree—a cost he estimates at $11,112 per year. Gray argues that beyond the three *R's* of *reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic*, America needs to add a fourth *R* to the higher education curriculum—*reality*.

Adding Reality to the Curriculum

One college taking on the challenge to add reality to its curriculum is St. Petersburg Junior College (SPJC). SPJC is the oldest community college in Florida—a state, like many others, that is experiencing the lowest unemployment rates recorded in 10 years. Information technology industries are exploding, and these companies offer prime wages for technical skills. The currency in this new marketplace is *skills*, not *credentials*. College leaders recognize that the traditional degree pathway may not work for students who come to the community college with an urgency to obtain skills to get a good job or advance in their careers.

Rightsizing the A. S. Degree

In the last year, SPJC has responded to the skill-based marketplace by developing 34 new one-year certificate occupational education programs and revamping 6 existing ones in high-demand program areas such as technology, health management, manufacturing, and public safety. These were developed using a dual process of "looking back"—relying on existing resources—while "thinking forward"—designing programs to meet work force needs and student goals as the first step toward an Associate of Science degree.

Lacking resources to develop entirely new courses and processes, the college relied on extensive market analysis and guidance from local work force development boards and welfare reform advisors to rebundle existing courses with new skill-based offerings. The new certificate programs are 18- to 24-credit-hour programs that couple basic degree requirements with specialty skills oriented to the latest innovations in industry training, with particular attention given to new developments in information technology. Courses are closely calibrated to business and industry standards and are offered evenings, weekends, and in other flexible formats. These new skill-based programs allow students to complete a one-year certificate training sequence and get immediate experience in their field of study before taking general education courses.

Inverted Degree Plan

Course sequencing and content are changed in the new program design. Participating students enroll in a technical certificate program and begin taking technical skills courses immediately. They engage in internships or work-related activities while completing their certificate and getting a job. While working in their chosen field, they may return to complete the A.S. degree requirements or transfer to pursue a four-year degree. This "inverted" degree plan creates a direct path for students whose goals are to gain, maintain, or retrain into high-wage, high-demand technical occupations.

Judging Success

The reengineered A.S. degree programs at SPJC are too new to evaluate for long-term effects, but early responses have been strongly positive. Interviews with students and employers suggest both groups appreciate the "reality" built into the new certificates. As one student observed, "I have a bachelor's degree, and I value that, but this program gives me the opportunity to jump in and be productive in my job TODAY." Enrollments in many of these program areas have increased already. In addition, some faculty members involved in program revamping have reported professional development benefits, such as one who described the process as a "shot in the arm for the whole department."

Recasting Programs for Work

Colleges experimenting with rightsizing and inverting technical degree programs may be judged avant-garde or threatening by traditional academics. Some may argue that such programs encourage vocational tracking. Yet, the data beg the question that if over 60 percent of America's high school graduates are not attempting or completing college degree programs, where are they going, if not to work? Most community college students do not have the luxury of staying out of the work force until completing their higher education goals. These students need educational pathways that complement, rather than compete with, their need to work.

If higher education is to keep alive the classic tale of hope and progress for future American workers, it must try out new designs to place alongside traditional programs that no longer "play" to all audiences. Industry-related certificate-first programs that integrate flexible course scheduling, inverted degree design, and high-demand technical skills training may be one answer to meeting powerful work force demands and student needs in a new era of work. These new occupational education program designs may even signal a new era in higher education—the stage call to many encores.

Stella A. Perez and Carol C. Copenhaver are Associate Vice President and Vice President, respectively, for Educational and Student Services at St. Petersburg Junior College (FL). The authors can be contacted at perezs@email.spjc.cc.fl.us or copenhaverc@email.spjc.fl.us.

Volume 11, number 3
March 1998

ndy Miles, Editor
adership Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html
Printed on Recycled Paper

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2885. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

leadership abstracts

LAPTOPS FOR EVERYONE: CHANGING THE WAY STUDENTS LEARN AND COLLEGES DO BUSINESS

Lynn Cundiff and Sandy M. Briscar

Twenty-four college freshmen enter their biology classroom, remove laptop computers from their backpacks and tote bags, plug them into Internet connections built into the desks, and log onto the campus server. They click on the class folder and examine pop-up comments from their instructor on reports they submitted by e-mail after their last class. They check the class Web site and read responses from their classmates to anonymous versions of their papers. The instructor directs students to an electronic chatroom where they are joined by a renowned Ecuadorian botanist, the guest lecturer for the day. Later at home, students use their laptops with modems to research a topic related to the botany lecture on the Web and the statewide online library and to correspond with teammates about their collaborative research project.

What makes this scenario unique is not so much the technology—laptop computers and online learning options are increasingly common in colleges today. What is special about this scene is that it takes place in a public two-year college in the northwest Georgia foothills and that the technology described is changing the way *every* student in *every* classroom in the college learns, as well as the way this college does business.

In 1997, Floyd College, which serves 3,000 students at its main campus and four extension centers, became the first two-year college in the country to require all students to lease laptop computers. This project stems from a three-year planning and lobbying effort of Floyd College and a four-year institution, Clayton College and State University, with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Last spring, the regents approved the Information Technology Project (ITP) as a pilot to study the effects of integrating telecommunication skills across the curriculum and providing personal computers to all students.

The regents gave Floyd College three years to demonstrate success in reaching its two major ITP goals: (1) increase student learning, and (2) build partnerships to decrease dependence on state funding and student fees. Educators across the country will watch this pioneering approach as a potential answer to the perennial challenge of how to "do more with less." It may be useful for community colleges considering such a model to examine the obstacles to be overcome, as well as the changes it calls for in teaching and learning processes and in the business of running a college.

Overcoming Obstacles

College administrators were convinced that by placing a notebook computer in the hands of every student, building connections to the Internet in every classroom, and training faculty to use the technology to enhance their courses, students would learn more, faster, and better. From conception to implementation, however, was no small step. College leaders had to secure funding and philosophical support from the Board of Regents and convince faculty to buy into the project. They had to assure and reassure students of the values of an initiative that would add a $200 technology fee to their college bill each quarter for the lease of a laptop computer and related services. Finally, they had to devise plans for developing the network infrastructure, renovating classrooms, acquiring the computers, training students and faculty, distributing and recollecting laptops each term, providing a technical support system, and coordinating inventory control and risk management at five campus sites.

To jump-start the project, the college initiated a pilot in a few Instructional Technology Intensive classes during the 1996-97 academic year, before final approval from the board. In each quarter that year the college offered special sections of English, accounting, art, social sciences, or geology courses that had computer technology infused into the curriculum. Students were issued laptop computers at no charge for their exclusive use, and faculty members who were comfortable with computer technology and enthusiastic about using it in the classroom volunteered for the pilot.

The pilot classes helped reveal challenges and strengths in the ITP model. Varying computer abilities of students proved to be the greatest challenge, and faculty found themselves spending class time teaching basic computer skills. Nevertheless, after sluggish starts and periods of high frustration, most students and faculty embraced the technology and reported the merits of its use in the classroom.

With these valuable lessons and final board approval in April 1997, the college set to work wiring classrooms, building customized teaching consoles, and buying computers, printers, and projection systems. Faculty began training in the use of technology in the classroom and many had Web pages for their classes on the Internet by fall quarter 1997, when the project went into full swing. The ITP has transformed classrooms at Floyd College, but, more important, it has introduced new approaches to teaching and learning.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Changes in Teaching and Learning

The Information Technology Project is changing teaching at Floyd College through extensive faculty training and curriculum revision. Just as every student is required to use a laptop, every faculty member is issued a notebook computer and charged with integrating information technology into all their classes. ITP committees have established expectations for faculty use of technology that include: (a) communicating with students via e-mail, (b) establishing a Web page for each course, (c) requiring Internet or online library assignments in each course, and (d) demonstrating proficiency in a software application appropriate to one's discipline area. Multiple training options, such as workshops, peer mentors from other institutions, and one-on-one tutoring, help faculty reach these goals. A number of faculty members have completely revamped their courses and have pursued external funding for "technology-infused" curriculum development projects. Faculty and students alike are beginning to instinctively access previously unavailable learning resources.

The ITP is intended to build students' technology skills, change the way they learn in and out of the classroom, and help them become more responsible for and involved in their own learning. Each student's portable, high-end notebook computer—equipped with the latest software and a CD-ROM, modem, and network card—offers extensive flexibility and options for learning. The learning options offered through the project are particularly valuable to students most often found at two-year colleges—older, commuter students who have families and hold full-time jobs. Of particular benefit to these students is the "any time, any place" access to the Internet, online libraries, and e-mail, which allows them to avoid travel and child-care costs when they can do research, access assignments and course resources, and participate in study groups from home.

Changes in the College Business

New organizational designs and partnerships with public and private organizations have emerged from the ITP that are influencing the ways Floyd College does business. The college established the program as an auxiliary college enterprise to allow greater flexibility in managing and funding the project. Project costs were initially supported by lottery funds and by a special allocation from the Georgia Board of Regents.

The ITP plan calls for high-end laptop computers for every faculty member and student (full- and part-time)—3,500 were needed to start the project. The college chose to lease rather than buy the computers to allow upgrades and replacement every three years. By partnering with Clayton College and State University in a single bid process, the college was able to negotiate a volume discount with vendors to significantly reduce hardware and software costs.

In addition to educational partners, the college has built partnerships with several corporations to support the project. ARSYS Innotech Corporation of California, the vendor chosen for the laptop computers, has provided funds for the program's infrastructure. Microsoft Corporation is using Floyd College as an alpha site to test software. The Nebraska Book Company is converting college textbooks to CD format. A new banking partner may contribute online services to students and alumni. Additional partnerships are being continually cultivated to bring in additional funding support and innovative learning solutions.

Measuring the Changes

Floyd College has three years to perfect a model for integrating information technology across the curriculum that can be replicated at other institutions. Assessment is key to this process and has been integral to the ITP since its inception. Project planning involved extensive research and consultation with students, faculty, administrators, community leaders, and information technology experts in business and education. Since last fall, the college has been collecting data to evaluate each component of the ITP model through multiple assessment mechanisms—faculty and student surveys, focus groups, online evaluations, and faculty and student journals. Early findings indicate consensus among constituents that the college is moving in the right direction with the project and that it is beneficial to students now and in their future professional lives. Community leaders laud the project and its potential to provide a technologically savvy workforce that will benefit workers and employers and attract new business to the area.

Since the ITP's central purpose is to enhance student learning, student outcome goals have been established and are beginning to be evaluated. Already, students have shown increases in independent learning, experimentation, collaboration, problem solving, team skills, motivation, and concept recognition.

The project is still in its infancy, with learning outcomes and costs yet to be thoroughly assessed, so it is unclear whether the 100 percent computer-use model sets a standard for others to follow. Nevertheless, the Floyd College community believes that using information technology as a *means* and *end* to learning—giving all students basic technology skills while enhancing their learning options—is a powerful way to prepare students for the Information Age.

Lynn Cundiff is president and Sandy M. Briscar is director of public information at Floyd College in Rome, Georgia. They can be contacted at lcundiff@mail.fc.peachnet.edu and sbriscar@mail.fc.peachnet.edu, respectively.

Volume 11, number 4
April 1998

...lliron, Editor
...bstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html
Printed on Recycled Paper

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (714) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

leadership abstracts

CELEBRATING PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP TRANSITIONS

Ned J. Sifferlen

More than ten years ago, the third *Leadership Abstract* ever published, "The Discovery Stage of Presidential Succession," dealt with the issue of leadership transitions. In the abstract, Estelle Bensimon explored the entry of a new CEO into an institution and compared how inside and outside candidates handled "getting to know an institution" and "becoming known." These and other issues surrounding executive leadership transitions have re-emerged today as key topics of conversations, as waves of CEO retirements loom in the near future. Surveys report that almost half of the nation's community college presidents plan to retire within the next six years, and boards, presidents, and communities will be forced to wrestle with the issues surrounding these transitions.

What follows is a look at some of the key issues surrounding managing presidential transitions, as seen through the eyes of a team of educators at Sinclair Community College (SCC)—an institution that recently inaugurated a new CEO. Transition strategies are explored using the SCC experience as an example of how community colleges can truly celebrate the endings and beginnings involved in leadership change.

Transition Strategies

Every major leadership transition is rife with the potential for conflict and controversy. The complex and sensitive procedural aspects (national searches, interim leaders), coupled with the symbolic organizational cultural issues (internal power struggles, uncertainty) can lead to widespread dissent and distrust. In addition, internal constituents (faculty, staff) are deeply concerned with the directions a new leader may take the institution, and external constituents (community members, business leaders) wonder how the new leader will relate to and serve the needs of the local area.

All of these conditions can be proactively addressed and thoughtfully planned for during presidential transitions. Working through its own transition, Sinclair discovered that each of these procedural, cultural, internal, and external issues can be tackled within a positive framework of celebration. Most important, however, is that these celebrations be part of a systematic plan.

Sinclair Community College announced the change in leadership eight months in advance. The lengthy time frame assured that the complicated structure of the transition plan could take shape and provided for an effective and meaningful transition. The SCC transition involved a longstanding CEO retiring after 22 successful years of service. The Board selected the provost and chief operating officer, who had served the college for 30 years, as the new president based on a comprehensive process of interviews and constituent focus groups. Unlike many presidential changes, in this case the incoming and outgoing presidents worked side by side through the transition. They worked not only with each other, but also with all groups that interacted with the presidential position.

Whatever the circumstance surrounding a senior leadership change, however, a transition plan bolsters a college's ability to maintain a stable institution. Plans for presidential transition can ensure that the new CEO develops a better understanding of the organizational culture and goals and help those selecting the new CEO to more carefully consider the type of leader needed by the college. *The key factor is to not focus solely on the leaders in transition, but to consider all the people who will be touched by the change.*

Two key strategies SCC engaged to focus on all involved in the presidential transition were celebrating endings and beginnings. While some may argue that these strategies are unique to Sinclair's situation, there are several aspects that may be useful to any organization facing such a "change of the guard."

Celebrating Endings

There are many ways a CEO's tenure comes to an end—some positive and some not so positive. Regardless of the circumstances surrounding the transition, it is important to strategically celebrate endings. Whether the outgoing president is retiring, moving on to a new position, or leaving under other circumstances, honoring the past while looking to the future will serve a community college well as it brings in a new leader.

When the outgoing president is retiring, special retirement events can be designed for various constituencies. At Sinclair, retirement events were held

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

for students, faculty, staff, and a lengthy list of community leaders. A general reception was held for the entire community. People were given opportunities to contribute to a scholarship fund established in the outgoing president's honor and were encouraged to write personal notes and talk individually with the outgoing CEO. At each of Sinclair's retirement events, the new president was introduced and the excellent relationship between the outgoing and incoming presidents was emphasized. This endorsement fostered the sentiment that the new president would continue to lead a successful college and reassured the community that he was going to be active in the 25 community-based organizations associated with the institution.

The outgoing president in this case was sensitive about making decisions with long-term implications. He carefully reviewed decisions and left key long-term operational decisions to the new leader. This helped existing staff prepare psychologically and procedurally for the leadership transition and is a prime example of an outgoing CEO helping celebrate endings by literally and symbolically "letting go."

Celebrating Beginnings

As important as honoring the past by celebrating endings are the activities that point to the future, or new beginnings. Strategies should be devised to introduce the college and local community to the new leader and to celebrate his or her selection. In Sinclair's case, the new president had a long working relationship with college staff, and trust in his personal adaptability was outstanding. College employees perceived that the many years of service to the outgoing president by the incoming president had resulted in his being groomed for the new role.

Any new president should take the lead in speaking at key events across the college and working with news media and community groups to send the message that he or she is "on the job." In addition, the new leader must work hard to develop an understanding of staff and faculty and begin to build productive relationships. The new leader must embrace his or her role as figurehead, team builder, communicator, facilitator, community liaison, and advocate for the college. At Sinclair, the key challenges facing the incoming leader included (1) continuing the college's commitment to becoming a truly learning-centered community college, (2) demonstrating an ability to work effectively with the news media, and (3) supporting efforts to maintain and expand the current high quality of the college's programs and services.

On a more personal level, the combined efforts of the outgoing president to "let go" and the new president to "take charge" required sensitivity to every situation. In any context, the process of a new leader with a different leadership style beginning to work with a new team is a touchy one.

Heightened sensitivities may occur when college-related groups compare the new president to the former president. Overcoming the comparison process can be a formidable challenge. The former president of Sinclair, for example, is a recognized national community college figure who is also highly respected in the local community. Fortunately, the 30-year tenure of the incoming president at Sinclair who had been "second in command" had definite advantages. The college was able to advocate his special skills and attributes, plan the timing, the publicity, and the activities that were vital to maintaining the college's high-performance level during the transition process.

In other contexts, however, incoming leaders may face a range of other challenges. Healing old and some new wounds, developing relationships, and building widespread commitment for the new leadership are not simple tasks. Nevertheless, gracefully blending a thoughtful celebration of the "ending" by strategically honoring the past will help the celebration of a new "beginning" start off on the right foot.

Conclusion

The transition process at SCC created an environment where all groups could again embrace their values and goals within the contexts of the range of activities designed to celebrate the "endings" and "beginnings." These activities and outcomes did not happen by chance or good fortune. Deliberate and thoughtful planning was vital to the process, and this type of forethought will help any institution better manage a major leadership transition.

As Terry O'Banion, CEO of the League for Innovation, stated during the incoming president's inaugural keynote, "the transition process at the 111 year-old Sinclair Community College truly celebrated a community, a college, and a longtime leader." By focusing on celebrating the presidential transition, SCC was able to connect with its community, further strengthen its positive organizational culture, and inspire faculty and staff to continue taking risks as they strive to improve and expand student learning for years to come.

Ned J. Sifferlen is the President of Sinclair Community College (OH). He can be contacted at nsifferl@sinclair.edu.

Volume 11, number 5
May 1998

leadership abstracts

COMMUNITY COLLEGES GO INTERNATIONAL: SHORT-CYCLE EDUCATION AROUND THE WORLD

Frederick C. Kintzer

Community colleges have a core mission to serve their local constituency, nevertheless many have become involved in multinational collaborations, often in the development of two-year colleges in other countries. More than 48 percent of American community colleges are involved in a variety of international education projects. This abstract explores international applications of community college education—referred to here as "short-cycle education"—and outlines strategies they have used to serve well on the international level.

Community Colleges on the International Stage

Many nations, including both developed and developing countries, are taking steps to reform their higher education systems, often adapting U.S. ideas. Problems hastening the need for reform include accessibility, technology, and the intransigence of university-dominated systems. Three organizational models for higher education reform that have emerged on the international front are: (1) restructuring or extending secondary education with curricular links to higher education, (2) expanding existing higher education units into comprehensive universities, or (3) providing new, flexible educational systems separate from both secondary and university models.

The third model, better known in America as community colleges, is growing most rapidly in public higher education around the world, especially in areas focusing on economic development (e.g., Russia, Indonesia, and South Africa). Experienced administrators say that streamlined governance, flexible decisionmaking, and closer communication with faculty, staff, and community are the advantages of this model. There are various additional examples of community college-type models: *junior colleges* were developed in India in the mid-1950s, the *collegios universitarios regionales* began in Chile in the early 1960s, and *junior university colleges* in Sri Lanka (Ceylon) were instituted in the late 1960s.

In Europe, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), coined the term "short-cycle colleges" to describe this workforce-responsive model that so closely resembles the American community college. The term emerged from an international meeting in 1971, where conference delegates concentrated on major problems that faced Norway, the United States, Yugoslavia, France, and Britain. OECD's 1971 publication, *Short Cycle Education: Search for Identity*, introduced this concept to educators and politicians around the world.

Short-cycle college education as defined by OECD emphasizes three types of programs: (1) two- to three-year certificate and degree programs in preparation for employment; (2) shorter courses, especially in trades for which the preparation requires less formal schooling; and (3) preparation for university enrollment, in which students who complete authorized, short-cycle higher education courses may receive university advanced standing through qualifying exams.

Four decades of trial-and-error experiences by nations on every continent have brought positive and negative assessments of these educational systems. From these assessments emerge some common strategies that help international short-cycle education achieve success.

International Short-Cycle Education Success Strategies

Offer Innovative and Community-Based Studies

Countries have entrusted enthusiastic educators and politicians who are careful planners, but who are also risk takers, to develop short-cycle colleges. For example, in Yugoslavia after World War II, provinces were devastated and in disrepair. Teacher training for early grades was a great need. Colleges that survived the war quickly organized teacher certification courses, but these were inadequate to meet the demand. In a few short years, certified teacher training below university degrees was instituted. By 1970, 250 to 300 "Vise Skoles" (Schools of Higher Education) were founded. Today, despite the demise of the old Yugoslavia, many are still in operation and continue to prepare students for the workplace.

Develop a Strong Community-Based Support Group

In Japan, community college-type training began after World War II, when private institutions were established to offer short courses to women in a variety of technical fields. More than 500 such institutions still exist, and the demand for vast numbers of technicians has encouraged the government to organize and finance public vocational institutions. While many university students and 90 percent of junior college and technical institute students still enroll in private schools, a large number of vocational postsecondary schools (as many as 2,000) have now gained government support.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Gain Direct Support from Leaders in National Governments

National government leaders, when convinced that technical education must be emphasized, invariably favor the third organizational model—a flexible community college-type system separated administratively from secondary and university education. In Argentina, the Federal Education Act of 1993 brought dramatic changes, shifted elementary and secondary education from the federal government to provincial governments, and supported a system of 1,500 free, public "terciarios." As is often the case in developing nations, communication difficulties exists between the universities and these short-cycle colleges in terms of curriculum and transfer of students and credits.

Six junior university colleges opened in 1969 in Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) after their Minister of Education visited the United States. The minister visited exemplary U.S. community colleges that were building and selling homes at cost, designing new fashions, and teaching brick laying. He returned home and facilitated passage of the *Junior College Act* by Parliament. Consultation from a series of Fulbright Scholars helped establish the new junior colleges. [illegible] has All the schools had several required courses, including physical education, English, and library, and several specialty courses that most closely suited particular communities. Although the colleges lasted only two years (the demise occurring after a change in govemments), the model of an independent system should be investigated by developing nations.

Win the Support of the Major Universities

Although a separate system of community colleges is widely favored by college presidents, a consistent, positive relationship with major university leadership is imperative to assure the success of a new system. In America, endorsement by the University of California (UC) president during the 1950s enabled the new junior colleges to survive and prosper. The UC system's 1960 Master Plan created the tripartite state system that guaranteed lasting power to the community colleges. Establishment of three education systems short circuited potential university domination over a "junior partner," which often has negative results. Such was the case in Chile where the technical institutes were placed within the university hierarchy and soon became weak university branches.

A unique relationship was established in Quebec, Canada, in 1967, between the university system, the community colleges, and the secondary schools. Colleges d'Enseignement General et Professional (CEGEP) were established. After grade 11, students were allowed to take two-year college transfer courses for university admission or three-year technical-vocational programs for immediate placement on the job. Completion of a two-year transfer curriculum remains today as the only way to gain university admission. This provincial system has been regularly assessed and evaluated, and continues intact. The rigidity of early secondary and university systems is a major concern, but the inherent guarantees of articulation of courses and student transfer support the tripartite model.

Seek Advice and Help from Experienced Countries

In India, the Madras Centre for Vocational Education was established in 1991, and has been expanded into Madras Community College. Its founding principal, a Fulbright Scholar, worked at Sinclair Community College (OH) to assist Madras with workforce skills courses. South Africa is also making progress toward a community college-type system because of that country's need for employees with technician-level skills. With the advice of U.S. experts, the National Commission on Higher Education in South Africa has recommended a consolidated university system comprising 30 to 40 universities and technical institutes. The International Consortium for Economic Development (ICED) in Mexico, created in 1992, works to ease higher education problems within its poorly financed and supervised system of technical institutes. ICED also functions cooperatively in several Mexican states with community colleges in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas.

Numerous consortia initiated by American community colleges function as communication vehicles with developing nations. Collaborative training, provided by community college-business alliances is rapidly developing [illegible] nple, capstone involve their [illegible] ssionaries of the good news about community college education. Today, they are more likely to act as consulting members of teams interested in the knowledge and technology that other nations produce. Especially in developing nations, these collaborations contribute to expanding secondary or higher education systems into new, flexible, stand-alone institutions. Community college leaders help international developers of short-cycle colleges conduct solid community assessments; achieve community and national support; achieve curricular transfer with major universities; and collaborate with the educational systems of other countries.

Conclusion

While not their core mission, involvement with international programs offers American community colleges opportunities for exchange of ideas, experiences, and resources. As said, almost half of American community colleges are already involved in international education projects. These international relationships, and the learning from international short-cycle education, can help provide a "bigger picture" for all leaders grappling with new economic and social challenges in their local communities.

Frederick C. Kintzer is professor emeritus of higher education, UCLA, and lecturer, Programs for Higher Education, Nova Southeastern University. The author can be reached at kintzerf@fix.net.

Volume 11, Number 6
June 1998

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (949) 367-2885. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

leadership abstracts

DREAM CATCHERS: COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE COMING PROSPERITY

Bob Davis and David Wessel

The widening inequality that distinguishes the past 20 years of American economic history comes in many forms and has many causes. Divorce and unwed motherhood have created a growing number of single-parent, single-paycheck families at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder. A new willingness to pay extraordinary salaries to superstars—in sports, television, investment banking—has created a highly visible super-rich elite. But ultimately, most Americans live on their paychecks. The root of discomforting inequality is in wages. Among the most important factors driving inequality has been employers' growing demand for educated workers, at a time when there is a glut of unskilled workers. This scenario drives up the wages of the educated and drives down the wages of the less educated.

This situation won't persist. With wages for workers with a college education rising far above those of workers who finish only high school, more Americans are going to college. Many of them are going to community colleges, two-year state-funded schools that have evolved into one of America's most successful institutions for giving workers the skills that employers need. Community colleges often are derided as second-rate schools for third-rate students who can't go to four-year colleges. This depiction is simply false.

The book, *PROSPERITY: The Coming 20-Year Boom and What It Means to You,* by two *Wall Street Journal* reporters, argues that the forces of technology, education, and globalization will combine to lift the living standards of the American middle class more rapidly than they have risen over the past disappointing 20 years, and that community colleges will be an essential part of this prosperity equation. Education promotes equality by increasing the supply of the most-desired workers. College graduates will still make more money than those without diplomas, but the size of the bonus they will get for going to college will shrink. So long as productivity improves throughout the economy, wages for all workers will rise, but the gap between educated and less-educated will narrow.

What goes on at a place like Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland and its sister institutions across the country is more important to the American middle class than what happens at Harvard. In the early 20th century, high schools evolved from institutions for the children of the rich, the ones destined to be doctors and lawyers, teachers and preachers, to institutions for the masses, for working people's children and immigrants. The expansion of high schools during a time of changing industrial and office technology improved living standards and narrowed the gap between well-paid and poorly paid workers. Community colleges are beginning to do the same today. In an avalanche of bad news about schools, community colleges are the exception. The unheralded aid stations of American education, they will continue to help Americans move from $7-an-hour jobs to $17-an-hour jobs.

A Case Study: Tri-C

At Cuyahoga Community College, one of the more successful of the 1,100 community colleges across the country, Sue LaPorati was 24 years old, divorced, raising two preschool children and working in the check-out line of a Cleveland supermarket when her union threatened to call a strike. "I went home that night and said, 'This is ridiculous. I can't survive like this.' Like Mom always told me: I should go to college." The union didn't strike, but in the fall of 1988 she enrolled anyway at Tri-C, as the community college is known locally. Living on a $6-an-hour part-time job at the grocery store, child-support payments, and food stamps, LaPorati spent six years as a part-time student, shored up along the way by a Tri-C program for "displaced homemakers." LaPorati tapped the program for books and got federal grants to cover most of her tuition. Her children went to a federally funded Head Start preschool, and often spent weekends with their father while she worked at the grocery store.

At Tri-C, LaPorati stumbled into an introductory computer course and was hooked. She completed an associate degree in computer studies in 1994, and two years later finished a bachelor's degree in business at a local private college. Even before graduating from Tri-C, she got a part-time computer job at Allied Signal Corporation. She now works there full time, monitoring on her desktop computer the prices her company charges for its truck brakes. She earns $30,000 a year. "I'm not complaining," she says with more than a little understatement. "Tri-C was a very good stepping stone for me."

Older Students

At Tri-C, 41 percent of the students taking courses that count toward degrees are older than 30. Cornelia Wade, 47 years old, was stuck in $6-an-hour jobs until she enrolled. "I

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

just got tired of getting these little jobs that don't pay much money," she says. The mother of nine received her associate degree in the spring of 1996 and immediately signed up at a local hospital's nursing school for two more years of schooling.

Older students like Wade do well at community colleges. Adults in their late 20s and early 30s who enroll in community colleges get an even larger payoff in higher wages — 8 percent to 10 percent more than those who enroll immediately after high school. Veteran steelworkers in their 30s who lost their jobs in the mid-1980s and participated in a program for dislocated workers at the Community College of Allegheny County in Pittsburgh ended up making between 6 percent and 7 percent more a year than those who hadn't.

Anecdotes Backed by Academic Research

Academic research supports the anecdotal evidence that community college education pays off. In the most thorough examination, published in 1995 in the *American Economic Review*, the nation's premier economic journal, Thomas Kane and Cecelia Elena Rouse compared the experiences of men and women who graduated from high school in 1972. Looking at students who are alike in most respects except their education—sex, race, family income, test scores—Kane and Rouse found that each year's worth of college course work, whether at a community college or a four-year school, added between 4 percent and 6 percent to a worker's subsequent annual earnings in the 1980s. A year's worth of college was just as valuable for those who didn't finish an associate degree as for those who did, and more than paid for itself over the student's working life. This finding is particularly significant because most community college students don't finish degrees. Of the students who enrolled at Cleveland's Tri-C in the fall of 1988, only one in 10 had graduated by the spring of 1995, a result that would seem disappointing in any other light.

Brian Surette, a Federal Reserve Board economist, drew even more encouraging conclusions when he used different techniques to examine similar data for men. A man who earns one year of community college credits, he estimated, earns 9.6 percent higher wages than a man who didn't go beyond high school; a second year adds another 7.5 percent. Completing an associate degree brings 8.6 percent more.

The quality of community colleges in the U.S. is uneven, but the best of them shows how the U.S. can educate its workers for solidly middle-class jobs. "It was the community college, which painted its ivory tower a rainbow of colors, that demolished the notion that a college education was only for the affluent," the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* once wrote.

A Success Story: Remedial Education

Despite the enthusiasm for community colleges at the White House and among local employers, particularly those in need of technically skilled workers, Tri-C is occasionally ridiculed as "Tri-High." It is a not-so-subtle reference to the fact that a whopping 60 percent to 70 percent of those who enroll are required to take remedial—known these days as "developmental"—English or math classes before enrolling in college-level courses that count toward a degree. Community colleges are often embarrassed by the size of their remedial programs. This reflects both the appalling shortcomings of American high schools and the ambitions of community colleges: When nearly two-thirds of high school graduates go to college, some of them will be below average.

But these programs demonstrate the capacity of community colleges to cope with such students. Tri-C offers three levels of remedial courses in English and math, as well as tutoring on demand until 10 p.m.; other community colleges do the same. Although they enroll almost anyone with a high school degree, rigorous community colleges such as Tri-C require that students finish remedial-level work before enrolling in occupational programs.

The Success of the "Dream Catchers"

Foreign educators who visit community colleges are as entranced by this American institution as their predecessors were by high schools at the Paris exhibition in 1900. One issue comes up routinely, says Laurel McFarland, a U.S. economist who consults on education and training issues for the European Commission. "They find it fascinating that enrollments fluctuate with demand," she says. Europeans rely much more on bureaucrats to allocate classroom seats.

One secret to the success of community colleges is an exquisite sensitivity to the local labor market. The best constantly revamp their curricula in response to, and even in anticipation of, employer demands. "Employers go into the labor market looking for skills. Both students and the community college pick up the signals," McFarland says. "Community colleges are the most flexible of any of the institutions of higher education. If they have classes that don't have students who want to take them, they drop them."

Community colleges haven't always been so focused on preparing students for the job market. They have been struggling for decades to resolve an identity crisis like the one that plagued high schools early in the century: Are they preparing students to transfer to four-year colleges or are they preparing them to get good jobs? The best of America's community colleges, the "Dream Catchers" as they have been called, are not afraid to answer "yes" to both questions.

Bob Davis and David Wessel are reporters in the Washington bureau of The Wall Street Journal. This abstract was adapted from PROSPERITY: The Coming 20-Year Boom and What It Means to You (Times Books/Random House, 1998). Bob Davis can be contacted at (202) 862-9258 or bob.davis@news.wsj.com; David Wessel can be contacted at (202) 862-9217 or david.wessel@news.wsj.com. Questions about this abstract should be addressed to David Wessel.

Volume 11, number 7
July 1998

leadership abstracts

COMMUNITY COLLEGES PERCHED AT THE MILLENIUM: PERSPECTIVES ON INNOVATION, TRANSFORMATION, AND TOMORROW

Kay M. McClenney

The inclination to innovation has served community colleges well for the past 30 years. It has positioned us at the forefront of America's higher education community. But we are at a point where innovation, even lots of it, is no longer enough. The reality is that innovation does not equal transformation, and multiple innovations do not add up to fundamental change. Effective innovations are seldom effectively replicated. Even when replicated, innovations seldom change institutions or systems. Evidence of this fact is widely available and equally widely ignored. It is convenient to ignore because otherwise we might have to disrupt the status quo. In fact, the willingness to allow innovation on the margins is a way of containing it, preventing it from contaminating "core functions." Innovation on the margins relieves pressure on the institution to create more essential change.

As we approach the millennium, however, forces are compelling us to raise the questions, make the hard choices, and implement the necessary changes so that innovations can move to something greater—from first order to second order change, from the margins to the centers of our organizations, from the superficial to the fundamental, from the exception to the norm, from scale-model to full-scale—from *innovation to transformation*.

The Forces of Transformation

A number of transformational forces are at work on our institutions, but three are operating so powerfully that to ignore them is to risk annihilation. These forces are markets, technology, and the drive for performance and accountability.

Markets

Who are the students? The good news is, there are going to be more students than ever before. Higher education enrollment is projected to increase from an estimated 13.9 million in 1995 to 16.1 million by 2007, and perhaps to 20 million by 2010. A number of states will have far more students than their systems handle. There will be many ways of describing these students, but "traditional" is a word that will not often apply. According to the U.S. Department of Education, by 1995 44 percent of all college students were over 25 years old, 54 percent were working, 56 percent were female, and 43 percent were attending college part time. Almost half of all freshmen and sophomores attend community colleges, most with no residential facilities, some with no campuses. In 1997, more than 76 million American adults—40 percent of the adult population—participated in one or more adult education activities, up from 32 percent in 1991. An article in *Futurist* projects that the amount of education and training needed globally over the next 30 years will exceed the cumulative amount provided since the time of Plato and Aristotle. And this coming hoard of students is the most racially and ethnically diverse in our history.

What do these students want? One trend that has been on the rise for some time is that college students are increasingly unabashed vocationalists. In a recent *Change* magazine article entitled "Collegiate Life: An Obituary," Levine and Cureton summarize findings from several studies of American undergraduate student. They note that these older, part-time, working students want something different from the traditional relationship with their colleges. To put it simply, students want to be treated like customers. They want a relationship like they have with their bank, their gas company, and their supermarket. Students now say, "I want terrific service. I want convenience. I want quality control. Give me classes 24 hours a day, and give me in-class parking if possible." Students do not want health services or bowling leagues. They can get these elsewhere—better, faster, cheaper—and they do not want to pay for anything they are not using.

Lest we begin to think of these market shifts as a problem, let us hasten to remember that we helped to create this monster. In the 1960s we touted lifelong learning. In the 1970s we touted the learning society. In the 1980s and 1990s we touted the learning organization. Toward the millennium we are excited about creating the *learning college*. Levine and Cureton point out that the current market is what happens when 65 percent of all high school graduates go on to college, when higher education is open to the nation's population across a life span, and when higher education is democratized.

Who is the competition? The University of Phoenix is the fastest-growing higher education institution in the world. While enrollment has been flat at elite institutions, this private, for-profit organization has expanded over the past decade from 3,000 students to nearly 70,000 students on almost 100 campuses in 32 states. University of Phoenix president William Gibbs understands the new student vocationalism. In a *New Yorker* interview, Gibbs explains, "Our students don't really want the education. They want what the education provides for them." Now, in addition to neighborhood campuses, the University of Phoenix has an entirely online campus with complete degrees online. Since the parent company, Apollo Group, went public in 1994, the stock has increased in value, split-adjusted, from $2 to $35 per share—1,650 percent.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Within little more than five years, postsecondary proprietary education has been transformed from a sleepy sector of the economy to a $3.5 billion-a-year business, making education one of the hottest emerging growth sectors of the U.S. economy. The University of Phoenix is joined by other for-profit higher education companies including DeVry, Inc. (Chicago); ITT Educational Services, Inc. (Indianapolis); Education Management Corp. (Pittsburgh); and Computer Learning Centers, Inc. (Fairfax, Virginia). These, and a growing number of others, are coming soon to a storefront across from your campus.

Then there are the cable industry giants, the "corporate universities" (actually the fastest-growing sector in higher education), the course software developers, and the burgeoning array of new partnerships. One example is Sylvan Learning Systems, partnering with MCI and a collection of top-tier universities including the University of California at Berkeley. There are also the virtual universities, electronic campuses, and electronic community colleges, all without boundaries.

Technology

The time is rapidly approaching when our children and grandchildren will wonder how we, without interactive capabilities, ever learned anything at all. Today, more than 50 percent of U.S. homes have at least one computer. In 1997, for the first time, computers outsold televisions. Twenty-three percent of the population of the U.S. and Canada currently use the Internet. By the end of 1998, an estimated 80 percent of U.S. public schools will be online.

Many people argue convincingly that the emerging technologies—particularly interactive, online learning—will revolutionize education, producing an impact as profound as the invention of printing. For politicians, as Chris Dede says, "The Internet in every classroom has become the modern equivalent of the promised *chicken in every pot*." Policymakers are concluding that traditional, place-based, credit-for-contact educational models are too expensive to meet the rising demand for educational services.

One major conclusion from all of this technology and market talk is that there is a huge demand for educational services, even as traditional educational institutions find themselves increasingly under siege. Students "going to college" represent a very small and diminishing segment of the postsecondary education market. In the future, while more money will be spent on education overall, experts project that traditional institutions will experience cutbacks, downsizing, and closures. Over 200 institutions of higher education have closed in the past 10 years, and that is only the beginning. The richest and most prestigious will carry on with some modification, but probably not much transformation. Some will go out of business. For the remainder, survival will require dramatic action.

Performance and Accountability

The inescapable reality is that policymakers and the public are through signing blank checks for higher education. We are going to be expected to perform, to document performance, and to be accountable for producing return on taxpayer and student investment. We are going to see this dynamic reflected in performance indicators, performance funding, performance contracting, and performance pay. And it is not going away, however hard we wish.

Innovation's Failure to Transform

The Education Commission of the States is in the business of supporting and promoting education reform and transformation. This means we spend a lot of time tracking who is doing what, what seems to be working, and why. In trying to understand what goes wrong in reform efforts and what it takes to "bust things loose," we have found at least five reasons why effective innovations fail to scale up.

Innovation falls short when we use it as decoration. For at least the past decade, American educators—even our innovators—have been perfecting the Christmas Tree Model of reform. You hang one here, and then another pretty one here, and before you know it, you have a bunch of glittering ornaments hanging on . . . a *dead* tree. One example is the Los Angeles Unified School District. Recently, the number of externally sponsored reform initiatives in that district was tallied at an astonishing 20,000. Now, if innovation were more than decoration, or if multitudes of innovations added up to transformation, then you would expect that most 4th graders in Los Angeles would read at grade level. They do not.

Innovation falls short when we choose symbol over substance. Fullan and Miles note in their *Phi Delta Kappan* article, "Getting Reform Right," that we often adopt innovations for opportunistic or symbolic reasons—for the resources, prestige, or appearance of action that the "reform of the month" brings. "While we cannot have effective reform without symbols," they remind us, "we can easily have symbols without effective reform." And, the hollow symbolism of so many innovations is what makes so many educators cynical.

Innovation falls short because we keep creating innovations and reforms that focus on everything <u>but</u> learning. We have reforms dealing with structures, organizational charts, administrative processes, faculty, teaching, business partnerships, TQM, and one hundred other things. To transform learning requires *first*, clarity about what is to be learned; *second*, regular assessment of learning; and, especially *third*, a willingness to look at what those data tell us about the learning that is or is not occurring. Despite the rhetoric and exhortation of the past decade, much to our surprise and perhaps soon to our downfall, you still cannot find many colleges where this is actually happening.

Innovation falls short because in this business the solutions are just plain difficult and sometimes just not known. How do you provide effective remedial education to a single mother with three children, a 40-hour/week job, and no transportation, who reads at the 6th grade level (perhaps with limited English proficiency), who has had a lousy experience with schools and suffers from incredibly low self-esteem, and who wants desperately to create a better life for herself and her family? And, how do you help this person advance about eight grade levels in a few months (with no more second chances), use technology

only when technology works best, provide human support when only "high touch" will do, and ultimately provide documented, quantified (but reader-friendly) evidence of success that only the devil himself could deny? How, exactly?

Innovation falls short when, as Lizbeth Schorr says, we forget "you can't grow roses in concrete." As we all know, the *system* wipes out success. *System* means government and state bureaucracy and legislative one-size-fits-all mandates, but it also means your system—your closer-to-home district bureaucracy or administrative hierarchy, and that web of policies and traditions and sacred cows that operate to keep things stable and to protect the status quo. As Schorr points out, many examples of successful innovation and reform exist in education, however they often do not survive. They often require heroic effort, not sustainable over time. The innovators often either burn themselves out or seal themselves off. With ingenuity and external funding, campuses or schools can become hotbeds of innovation without system support, but they usually cannot stay innovative without that support over the long term.

Ultimately, innovation falls short of transformation unless we find ways that pockets of success can add up to new forms, new structures, and new cultures. So far there is little evidence of that happening. Will we make it happen in the future?

Targets for Transformation

Attempting to predict the future is a hazardous undertaking, particularly if we follow our academic custom of predicting the future by projecting the present and the past with a few changes in the descriptive statistics. One of the things we may learn from Buddhist thought is the value of the beginner's mind. Bring that beginner's mind to the task and imagine a college—or more likely, a postsecondary education—for the 21st century. What might it look like? Let us consider what may be different about transformed systems and institutions.

Systems

This system overall will be far more centered on learning and learners, far more customer-oriented, responding to heightened demands for responsiveness, convenience, and flexibility. Colleges will no longer hold exclusive monopolies on provision of instruction or on certification of learning. We will see the decline of the diploma, as other forms of certification come to represent competence.

We will see the eradication of boundaries of all kinds. As geography and place become irrelevant, so will the boundaries of college districts, state lines, and accreditation regions. Gone, too, will be the boundaries of sectors, as both competition and accountability demand seamless alignment of curriculum and certification of progress. We will see a proliferation of joint teaching arrangements and joint degrees involving community colleges, baccalaureate institutions, and research universities. Finally, the boundaries between academic and vocational, and between credit and non credit offerings will fall to dust. As a result, we will see much effort to create institutional niches in the education market. The focus will be on comparative advantage, eliminating marginal activities, and doing a few things exceptionally well.

Faculty

There will be profound changes in the roles of faculty and their relationships to students and to one another. The traditional model of the lone faculty member lecturing to students sitting in rows in an isolated classroom was never particularly effective educationally. Beyond that, it is an unaffordable and infeasible model for meeting future demands. Instead, we will see faculty deeply involved in mentoring and case management, serving as managers of an array of learning resources, using technology to deliver essential information, leaving themselves freer for functions only humans can perform.

The Stanford Forum on the Future of Higher Education suggests that the primary role of the faculty member will be as "modeler of competence," acting in the role of master to apprentice and demonstrating how the competent professional uses human and technological resources to solve problems. In a world where we are drowning in information and short on wisdom, this faculty member will spend less time preparing and professing, and more time facilitating reflection, making meaning, and sharing wisdom—managing the process of education.

Functions

For institutions, transformation will mean new work—fundamental changes in mission and core functions. A major function for someone (if not community colleges, then perhaps a for-profit competitor) will be educational brokering, working like financial planners or travel agents to help students craft coherent academic programs from a universe of choices. Transformed institutions will move from "courses" to instructional modules designed not in terms of semesters and credit hours, but in terms of content and educational goals. They will move from grades to competency assessment. Assessment centers will be a growth industry, providing certification of learning and a credentialing service—all competency based. Instruction will be fully separated from the summative assessment of learning. Virtually everything will be "performance-based"—multilevel admissions, certification, funding, faculty pay, and promotion.

A lot of these things may already be underway as innovations, but they cannot survive and prosper in the absence of a changed culture in our institutions. Cultural change is extremely difficult and usually politically hazardous. It takes a long time and a sustained commitment. It means addressing values, expectations, priorities, sacred cows, the very identities of people and institutions. It is far more likely to occur in response to crisis than in response to a golden opportunity. This cultural change is a profound shift from a focus on the needs of faculty and administrators to a focus on the needs of students and other customers. It is a shift from a culture of entitlement to a culture of performance, from a culture of anecdote to a culture of evidence. It is a shift from a model focused on student and community deficiencies to a model presuming potential and capacity. Most importantly, *it is a shift from teaching to learning.*

Tools for Transformation

We need to understand not only why innovation falls short, but also how to live out strategies for its success. So what are the tools for transformation? Probably there are many—I offer five that seem most crucial.

Will

For more than a decade I have been watching the transformational process in one particular community college—the Community College of Denver. I have watched while, with tight resources, CCD's people have doubled enrollment, while also dramatically increasing student diversity and student outcomes, defining methods of assessing and documenting student learning, and most incredibly, virtually eliminating the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students. It did take ten years of work. But the first thing it took was deciding to do it.

Vision

Peter Senge says that there are only two things that really prompt change: one is aspiration, the other desperation. By whichever route, though, the institution has to arrive at a vision of what it aspires to be—and this has to be a shared vision, the collective property of the college stakeholders. Some hollow phrase will not do. This vision has got to be a thing that lives in the hearts and minds of people.

Focus

Once you have in mind where you are going, you must focus-**focus-FOCUS** on what it takes to get there. That means every choice, every decision—about staffing, resource allocation, *everything*—gets subjected to a simple screen: "How does this improve learning?"

Data

Few people want to do mediocre work and be recognized publicly for their inadequacy. And, few people provided with credible, useful data on the outcomes of their work will fail to use those data to figure out how their work can be strengthened. The ugly truth about the current situation in American higher education, even in most community colleges, is that we do not have a clue what and how much students are learning—that is, whether they know and can do what their degree (or other credential) implies.

Guts

Moving innovation to the mainstream is not a walk in the park, politically or otherwise. Those who choose this path will encounter brambles and potholes and even fierce creatures. They will have to make tough decisions and will inevitably make wrong turns. They will write home about warring tribes and terrorism and technology that does not work. You can fail to lead transformation and be known as one of those who fiddled while Rome burned. Or you can get out there and lead and maybe lose your career as a consequence. As Alan Guskin says, "If it weren't necessary, we shouldn't and wouldn't do it."

Bringing Innovation Home

In closing, I offer a couple of caveats and a few words in praise of who we are. There are some things that don't need changing. And there are some things that, when we cross over into the new millennium, we need to be sure we are taking with us. We need to take the understanding that markets cannot be relied upon for everything. We can count on the University of Phoenix and Sylvan Learning Systems for some things, but there are things the society needs that an unsubsidized market is unlikely to provide. Business and computer science degrees, yes, but what about early childhood education? While we are working on developing corporate partnerships and high technology centers, we should also worry some about who is taking care of our grandchildren.

Finally, we must not forsake the role of community colleges in building community. There will be great forces in this market-driven, technology-rich future to separate, isolate, fragment, and balkanize people and their communities. There will be market segments and niches and specialized Web sites galore. But will there also be common ground, common purpose, community endeavor? Perhaps only if we retain our role as institutions that care about these things.

This transformation task is tough work. It is not just hard, but perilous. It calls for a radical letting-go (as Marjorie Kelly says) and an openness to the unknown. It is hard to imagine a task more daunting or a path more promising. For it becomes clear that neither significant public purposes nor the most important outcomes for students can be achieved simply through innovation.

The millennium is upon us. We have the opportunity to use it not for summing up, but as a summons. Not for a reckoning of past achievements, but for a reconnoitering of future needs. Not for grieving the passing of the way things were, but for celebrating what we can newly contribute. And so we approach the year 2000 resolved to leave behind that which we may actually have never needed, to carry forward those things that must not be lost, to imagine that which we have never seen, to serve a community never met, to soar from our present perch toward a future we will help to create, and to treasure our co-traveler on that forward flight.

Kay M. McClenney is vice president of the Education Commission of the States (www.ecs.com). This article is based on the opening keynote presentation given at the League's Innovations 1998 conference. Kay can be contacted at kmcclenney@ecs.org.

Innovations 1999 will be held at the New Orleans Hyatt Regency on June 20-23. More information about the conference is available on the League Web site at www.league.org.

Volume 11, number 8
August 1998

leadership abstracts

MOVING FROM INNOVATION TO TRANSFORMATION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Paul Gianini

Kay McClenney, in her recent keynote speech at the League for Innovation in the Community College's *Innovations 1998* conference and subsequent *Leadership Abstracts* article, challenges community colleges to find effective ways to move from innovation to transformation. She cites the failure of innovation to transform colleges and asserts that "innovation falls short because we keep creating innovations and reforms that focus on everything *but* learning." She observes that despite mounting pressures for change, most innovative practices are kept at the margins of institutions, thus relieving pressure on the college to truly transform the institution.

We at Valencia Community College (FL) share McClenney's concerns for the future of community colleges and understand all too well how difficult it is for any institution to achieve fundamental change in student or organizational performance. We are not surprised that McClenney finds little evidence that innovation is yielding transformation in community colleges. So much works against it.

However, we believe that a number of community colleges are acting rather than despairing in response to this report card of failure. Valencia Community College is among those working with purpose and focus to transform themselves into learning-centered colleges.

In 1995, we decided to deliberately craft a transformation effort to institutionalize effective innovations and to focus on improving measurable learning outcomes. We do not pretend to have all the answers or to have reached our destination. But, we believe the processes we have put in place and our lessons learned along the way may be useful to other colleges as they seek sustained institutional transformation focused on teaching and learning.

Action Steps Toward Transformation

Three years ago, an institutional leadership team comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators took charge of designing and implementing processes to enable Valencia to transform itself. We felt it was essential that an independent, collaborative group guide the process, one who has no other mission and whose meetings would not be consumed with the daily operational issues of the college. Under the guidance of this Leadership Team, we have undertaken a range of activities focused on collaborative approaches to becoming more learning centered.

Pew Higher Education Roundtable

In the fall of 1995, the college conducted a community seminar through the Higher Education Roundtable program to begin assessing what it would mean for Valencia to become a learning-centered college. The Higher Education Roundtable, sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trust, is a national laboratory program that seeks to identify and test "best practices" for academic restructuring (http://www.irhe.upenn.edu/her/her-main.html). Importantly, Valencia's Roundtable included a majority of faculty as well as representatives of major local employers and the Chamber of Commerce.

Collegewide Roundtables

From May through September 1996, the Leadership Team conducted 12 roundtables inviting all members of the institution to consider what it means to be a learning-centered college and recommend changes to make Valencia more learning centered. More than 300 faculty and staff participated, including almost every full-time faculty member. Comments from all the roundtables were collected and circulated for all college employees to suggest additions to the document. Additional comments were incorporated, and a final version was circulated. Based on this document, the Leadership Team developed a draft definition for a learning-centered college.

Transformation Workshop

In October 1996, the Leadership Team held a two and one-half day Transformation Workshop for administrators and faculty and staff leaders. The purposes of the workshop were to generate a common understanding of the transformation process, to review the findings of the 12 roundtables, and to make recommendations about how best to move forward with the transformation agenda.

Two major recommendations emerged from the workshop: (1) facilitate a collegewide roundtable on understanding change, and (2) establish action teams charged with addressing specific aspects of the change agenda. Rather than permanent committees that would continue indefinitely into the future, these were to be collaborative action teams with distinct assignments to be completed by July 1997.

Collegewide Roundtable on Understanding Change

In January 1997, the Leadership Team conducted a collegewide roundtable on understanding change. This roundtable's purpose was to introduce the concepts and language of change to a broad college audience, to invite membership on the action teams, and to continue to identify the "early majority" who would facilitate and support change at the college. More than 170 persons attended. Small group sessions were used to invite input into the college's vision and values, to generate goals, and to comment on the evolving draft definition of "learning centered."

Work by Action Teams

Findings from the roundtable guided the action teams as they were formed in February 1997. More than 180 persons volunteered to serve on four teams. Members of each team selected a facilitator and began their work by reading and discussing selected literature relevant to their charge. Each team developed a charter and committed to attend meetings between February and July 1997. Persons interested in team activities who could not or chose not to serve as team members were allowed to review and comment upon the draft products of the teams to help facilitate collegewide consensus at each step.

Short-Term Action Team. Some widely supported recommendations from the roundtables were noted to be achievable with relative ease and speed (within six months). The short-term action team identified these ideas, evaluated and ranked them in terms of the contribution that each would make to improving learning at the college, and recommended to the President's Council persons to be charged with carrying out these actions. The most important of these short-term achievements was establishment of a permanent collegewide structure for professional development called "Leadership Valencia."

Vision and Organizational Character Action Team. Based on the assumption that any major change at the college should be rooted in commonly held core values and serve the institution's core mission, this action team was charged with drafting statements of core values, purpose, and mission. This team focused on drafting a vision statement aimed at expressing the highest aspirations for the college and describing the direction in which the change project should lead the organization.

When the draft vision statement was circulated, feedback indicated that it was not visionary enough. So the team requested additional input that they incorporated into a set of vision statements for consideration. At this writing, the new vision statement is being finalized through the collegewide feedback process, and it will be recognized as a statement of purpose rather than as a vision statement.

Core Process Action Team. In the summer of 1996, a team of faculty focused on assessing the college's existing operations and core processes. This team studied the literature on core processes as a model for analyzing college operations and agreed that this model provides a useful lens through which the college could be viewed. They recommended more extensive study using this model to outline the currently existing core processes and to propose changes to bring them into better alignment with the new institutional purpose of becoming learning centered. The Leadership Team agreed, and guidelines for realignment of core processes were developed. This model is now being used in a variety of applications, including designing and revising job descriptions and evaluating results that can be achieved through new uses of technology.

Core Competencies Action Team. From the roundtables emerged the goal of identifying a set of core competencies that embody the heart of the learning college and create a successful higher educational experience for our students. This team set out to identify these competencies and recommend processes that would nourish them. First, the team examined the core competencies expected of our students. Using a learning-outcomes analysis, the team developed draft competencies that constitute a major departure from those previously expected of a Valencia graduate. The team recommended a collaborative, collegewide process to finalize consensus on the core competencies and to define procedures for ongoing review and improvement of core competencies, which is currently underway.

Institutional Review of Action Teams

In August 1997, as part of fall "welcome back" events, the Leadership Team provided a forum for all interested faculty to hear reports from each of the four action teams and to consider their recommendations. The more than 300 people who attended were split into small groups for discussion. Each group saw a videotaped presentation by a representative of each of the four action teams and received a written report on the work of the team. In addition, the groups reviewed draft documents of the recommended student core competencies, the vision statement, and the proposed core processes model. Participants' comments were recorded on evaluation forms for the reports of each action team and compiled into a cumulative feedback report.

Forum on Institutional Change

On November 5, 1997, the college held a forum on institutional change attended by 30 leaders in the transformation initiative. The consensus of those attending the Fall Forum was that the time had come for action. We agreed that important innovations were underway and that Valencia had laid sufficient groundwork to create the vision and the will for transformation to be implemented. Yet, we faced the challenge identified by McClenney: How do we use innovation to effect transformation? The Leadership Team responded with several key recommendations, all of which have been undertaken:

- The Leadership Team should be broadened and charged with leading the college through the transformation initiative by providing ongoing opportunities to learn more about teaching, learning, and change.
- A new position of vice president for curriculum development, teaching, and learning should be developed, to be focused on the analysis, design, and development of the learning experience at Valencia and the outcomes that it yields. (This position was filled in July 1998.)
- The college should finalize its purpose statement based on collegewide feedback on the draft vision statement and use the purpose statement as the basis to move forward.
- Opportunities should be made available to faculty and staff to learn more about learning. (A $1.75 million grant has been secured for staff development in learning theory and curriculum design.)
- The president should continue to lead the direction for college transformation, to provide support for the change initiative, and to require accountability from those involved.

Lessons Learned

Along this journey toward transformation we have learned much about ourselves, our values, and about the process of transformation. Six lessons stand out:

Lesson One: Institutional transformation serves to preserve and perpetuate a vision, a core purpose, and values that do not change.

McClenney asserts, "There are some things that don't need changing. And there are some things that, when we cross over into the new millennium, we need to be sure we are taking with us." Similarly, in their 1996 *Harvard Business Journal* article, Collins and Porras report, "Companies that enjoy enduring success have core values and a core purpose that remain fixed while their business strategies and practices endlessly adapt to a changing world."

At Valencia, we have found it helpful to identify what *does* and *does not* need changing. College members seem to fear change less if they focus first on what they want to preserve. Most of the changes we feel are needed are not changes in values, but, rather, changes designed to help us do a better job of serving our values. By articulating our core values and purposes as enduring aspects of the college, we find that change becomes less frightening since it represents an effort to better serve and preserve that which we hold most dear.

Lesson Two: Transformation involves both change and transition, which are two different things. Both are uncomfortable.

McClenney cautions that "the transformation task is tough work. It is not just hard, but perilous." Our experience bears witness to this, but also to the fact that it is navigable terrain. We find that we need to prepare for the internal transition that accompanies change, starting with every individual faculty, staff member, and administrator.

Our transformation experiences and discomforts mirror those described by Bridges in *Managing Transitions*. He explains that discomfort accompanying any major change is great because transition begins with letting go of something. After letting go, people enter a neutral zone in which they have lost the comfortable old ways but have not yet become comfortable with the new. The neutral zone is full of danger and also full of opportunity. It is here that organizations make or break change initiatives.

At Valencia we are striving to acknowledge the discomfort that change imposes and to equip faculty, staff, and administrators with the tools needed to make effective transitions. We are structuring multiple learning opportunities to give people the transition tools they need to understand and move past the discomfort of change.

Lesson Three: Transformation will involve changes of two distinct types—one enables you to improve what you are already doing, and the other enables you to create and implement an altogether new way of doing something.

McClenney challenges colleges to imagine a college for the 21st century. As Valencia looks to its future, an exciting picture has emerged that is a powerful force driving us forward. As more than 300 of our faculty, staff, and students met in a series of roundtables during the summer of 1996 to begin to define what Valencia would look like as a more learning-centered college, we found deeply rooted shared values and core purposes.

The recommendations that emerged from the collegewide dialogues dealt primarily with changes in operational processes, which can be categorized into two groups: (1) changes that would refine our current processes, making them work faster or better to bring about incremental improvements in outcomes, and (2) changes that would lead to the creation of entirely new processes to bring about a major, transformational leap forward in results. We recognize that both kinds of changes are important, but also that each requires different approaches and strategies to bring them to fruition.

Lesson Four: Creating an altogether new way of doing something involves a "Gulp Factor."

Collins and Porras argue that transformative change requires setting goals that seem staggering at first glance: "What's needed is such a big commitment that when people see what the goal will take, there's an almost audible gulp." McClenney shares the example of the Community College of Denver's (CCD) commitment to eliminate the achievement gap between minority and nonminority students. This is a wonderful example of ambitious, vision-based goals that make us gulp when we hear them, yet that make possible huge leaps forward. It has taken ten years for CCD to achieve its goal. At Valencia we also are setting "gulpingly" high goals for ourselves and our students, acknowledging the power of high expectations for organizations as well as individuals.

Lesson Five: Transformation in higher education is made possible by collaboration.

If we have found one lesson to be more important than any other, it is this: higher education rests on a shared governance model. We have found that for substantive change to be made, agreement on the changes must be reached collaboratively. In addition, what we have agreed upon has become conceptually stronger as a result of this collaboration. We have found most useful a process of collaborative decisionmaking that actively engages all those who want to participate in informed dialogue about the college's present and future. Still, this process has its challenges. Some college members feel that we are holding ourselves back when we allow time for full participation in the consideration of ideas and actions. Others caution that too fast a pace will derail the change process.

We are working to build our transformation process on a collaborative model that balances these concerns. We have found that collaboration will strengthen the results through the interchange of differing opinions and perspectives in the discussion process, which gives more faculty, staff, and administrators a chance to craft and own their change process. Through our mistakes as well as our successes, we have come to see that faculty and administrative leaders must be as committed to the collaborative process as they are to the change agenda itself. They must be willing to trust their colleagues as professionals and to rely on one another's judgment.

Lesson Six: New structures, and sometimes new positions, are needed to ensure that the transformation efforts are sustained.

The use of the Leadership Team and the creation of the new vice president for curriculum development, teaching, and learning are the two most critical elements to our ensuring that innovation results in desired transformation. The Leadership Team constantly scans the organization, the literature, other colleges, and national initiatives to determine innovations that merit consideration for integration into the college, weighing the potential impact on learning outcomes.

The Team establishes collaborative processes that yield recommendations to the president regarding these innovations, designs ways to achieve collegewide consensus on the innovation, carries out the process of achieving that consensus, and recommends strategies to fully integrate the innovation into ongoing operations. Likewise, the vice president for curriculum development, teaching, and learning concentrates on the design of the learning experience, works with faculty and other administrators to pilot test and evaluate promising innovations, and makes recommendations on the effective integration of these innovations into the college as a whole.

Conclusion

Our transformation activities bear witness to the fact that innovation can fuel transformation as long as we understand the pace of transformation and its demands. We are learning to balance the need to take the time to collaborate with the need to "hold our feet to the fire" to ensure that delays are for the right reasons rather than to avoid or derail change.

Have we fully transformed ourselves into a learning-centered college yet? Hardly. Are we well on our way? Absolutely. Kay McClenney points out that the tools for transformation include *will*, *vision*, *focus*, *data*, and *guts*. We consciously strive to use these tools in the processes supporting our transformation initiative.

Arriving at a shared vision of what Valencia would look like if it were more learning centered gave us the will to try to achieve that vision. Today we at Valencia have a renewed sense of mission, not only for our college, but for higher education as a whole. We believe that the transformation model we have developed, focusing on improving core competencies and processes to improve learning outcomes, has tremendous potential as a blueprint to transform higher education.

Furthermore, we believe that all sectors of higher education must change if this nation is to reach its potential in the next millennium. We are grateful to McClenney for her call to arms that compels us "to raise the questions, make the hard choices, and implement the necessary changes" to move from innovation to transformation.

Paul Gianini is president of Valencia Community College. His e-mail is pgianini@valencia.cc.fl.us.

leadership abstracts

SEVEN PRACTICES TO PREPARE OUR STUDENTS FOR SUCCESS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Beth Richardson

Nicholas Negroponte, in his national best seller *Being Digital*, says "Computing is not about computers any more. It is about living." Certainly, information technologies have infiltrated almost every area of our lives, professional and personal. As Don Tapscott notes in *The Digital Economy*, "Only 20 years ago, there were 50,000 computers in the world; now that many are being installed daily. . . . There will be a billion people on the Net by the end of the decade." Microsoft CEO Bill Gates believes the Information Highway is only beginning to revolutionize modern society, much like Gutenberg's printing press changed the Western World in the late fifteenth century. Many say we are at the dawn of the Digital Age, an era where the binary bit will reign supreme as deliverer of precise, boundless, instantaneous information.

In the realm of academics, technologies associated with the Digital Age are empowering us to actualize what Terry O'Banion describes as the Learning Revolution. Thanks to media like the Internet and Information Highway, many colleges are striking down time, place, bureaucracy, and role-bound limits on education and focusing on the quality and convenience of learning experiences. George Boggs, president of Palomar College, a pioneer in the learning-centered community college movement, points out that "college students of the early 1900s do not have a lot in common with today's students, yet classroom practices are probably not much different." Students understand this reality and are excited about the possibilities the Learning Revolution holds for them.

Clearly, the process of restructuring our institutions into learning colleges of the Digital Age is a significant task. All departments must work together to ensure that the college's mission statement, administrative processes, and academic practices are learning centered. With proper strategic planning, the time invested in such a restructuring process will be well rewarded. A college undergoing such transformation will be able to satisfy students' needs for convenient, quality education and to plan partnerships with, rather than being outstripped by, other colleges and private industries who are taking the Learning Revolution concept by the horns.

As institutions undertake the intensive work of restructuring, leaders might ask what our colleges could do for students more immediately. How can we prepare students for the Digital Age and maximize their learning experience, starting today instead of two months or two years from now? And, what immediate steps can we take that will not strain our already stretched budgets? Answers may be found in seven simple yet powerful practices for student success in the Digital Age. Students who are exposed to the seven practices—in a variety of contexts—will have better footing and direction as they steer their course toward the next millennium.

Practice One: Communicate high job potential in the field of information technology

The U.S. Commerce Department predicts that by 2006, America will require more than 1.3 million new systems analysts, computer scientists, engineers, and programmers. In fact, the current federal administration is budgeting millions of dollars in grants to handle what economists and business leaders see as a critical shortage of skilled technology workers. Many community college students want reassurance that they will obtain quality employment once they graduate. We need to share information about job potential in the field of information technology—it is promising and inspiring to most students.

Practice Two: Encourage students to view technology as a tool

Computer technology has taken on almost mythical power in our society, yet T.W. West reminds us that "there is nothing theoretical or metaphysical about it any more than a telephone or hammer are tools." The key is to keep everything in perspective—the human being is still infinitely more complex and sophisticated than any computer. Certainly, computers are only as good as the folks who put the machines together and use them. We can encourage students to think and dream beyond the existing hardware and software. They will be preparing themselves well for a future filled with much opportunity and innovation.

Practice Three: Teach students *how to learn*

According to Carol Twigg, "Tomorrow's students will resemble research faculty and will possess qualities

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.
Initial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

of increased independence and self reliance." The self-directed learning needed in the Digital Age is underscored in Dirk Rodenburg's account of constructivist learning: "Knowledge is constructed by the learner, not passively received or assimilated. Meaningful knowledge is the result of active reflection and integration on the part of the learner, and is best accomplished by means of tasks that bear some relationship to real-world experiences."

Ultimately, students will be more responsible for learning while faculty will enhance their roles as mentors and instructional designers. It makes sense that students be exposed to as many learning strategies as possible. Initially, we can help students discover their personal learning styles so they can select "best fit" instructional options among, for example, traditional classroom experiences, hands-on training, telecourses, and Internet courses. David Kolb's Learning Style Inventory and Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligence Theory assessments can be helpful tools in this pursuit.

Practice Four: Provide students with skills to deal with change

It goes without saying that during the shift from the Information Age to the Digital Age, society is experiencing radical change. We can prepare our students to ride the wave of change by helping them cultivate open minds, strong communication skills, lifelong learning, and "loose standardization," the notion that there is a general frame of reference from which one can operate for only a limited period of time before it becomes obsolete and another replaces it. In brief, we should guide our students "to bend like the bamboo in the wind," to have strong roots and values, and let the rest be flexible.

Practice Five: Prepare students to face information overload

David Shenk, author of *Data Smog*, reminds us that "information, once rare and cherished like caviar, is now plentiful and taken for granted like potatoes." Not only is information increasingly ubiquitous, it is growing exponentially. Currently, information doubles in fewer than five years. Futurists predict that by 2010, information will double every 70 days. With international publishing at the fingertips of everyone with access to the Internet and server space, students need to know how to prioritize information and "separate wheat from chaff." Skills to deal with information overload will become even more critical with the unfolding of more sophisticated search engines and Internet2, the next generation of Internet dedicated to research and governmental affairs. We need to prepare our students to rely on critical thought, creativity, and teamwork to produce knowledge from seemingly endless stores of information.

Practice Six: Advise students to maintain balance in their lives

Once students discover the possibilities associated with computers, they often find it tempting to spend a great deal of time using these devices for research and recreation. Many students say they lose track of time when they surf the Internet or correspond with others via e-mail. With an increased focus on technology, we cannot overlook the nontechnical joys in life, such as a walk in the park or lunch with a friend. We need to encourage students to be aware of how much time they spend with information technologies and to balance their lives for mastery over technology, rather than being mastered by the machine.

Practice Seven: Set an example for your students

Students need colleges that are "a step ahead" to provide quality instruction. Faculty, staff, and administrators need to stay abreast of innovations and the information technology job market. Three quality resources include the League's *Technology and Learning Community (TLC)* Web site: http://www.leaguetlc.org; *Horizon*, a Web site hosted by Jossey-Bass Publishers: http://horizon.unc.edu; and Microsoft's Web site that provides daily news on information technology: http://microsoft.com. In addition to exploring these resources, educators should use technology as a tool to complete tasks and find more learning strategies to share with students. Each of us needs to effectively ride the wave of change, forge knowledge from the masses of raw information available, and work toward technical/nontechnical balance in our lives. As educators, we have a special opportunity to make a difference in students' lives. We need to develop our own skills so we can guide our students to success in the Digital Age.

Conclusion

George Boggs reminds us that "the most important people on any campus are the learners. Everyone else is there to facilitate and support student learning." At the dawn of a new century community colleges are at a crossroad, restructuring to become successful learning centers made possible with cutting-edge technologies. Now is the time to include students in the journey and to enlighten, empower, and inspire them using the seven principles for success in the Digital Age.

Beth Richardson is Lead Faculty of Communication at Mayland Community College (NC); she can be contacted at brichardson@mayland.cc.nc.us.

Leadership Abstracts is published at the office of the League for Innovation in the Community College: 26522 La Alameda, Suite 370, Mission Viejo, California 92691, (949) 367-2884. It is issued monthly and distributed as a benefit of membership in the League-sponsored Alliance for Community College Innovation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").