DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 855 JC 010 021

TITLE	Leadership Abstracts, 1999.
INSTITUTION	League for Innovation in the Community Coll.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	12p.; Issue number 2 was not published in 1999. Published with support from SCT[R]. Published bimonthly. Initial support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Edited by Mark D. Milliron, Cindy L. Miles, Ann Doty, and Cynthia Wilson.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.league.org/leadabst.html.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Leadership Abstracts; v12 n1,3-6, Feb-Dec 1999
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Educational Development; Instructional Innovation; *Instructional Leadership; *Newsletters; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	League for Innovation in the Community College

ABSTRACT

This document contains five Leadership Abstracts publications published February-December 1999. The article, "Teaching the Teachers: Meeting the National Teacher Preparation Challenge," authored by George R. Boggs and Sadie Bragg, examines the community college role and makes recommendations and a call to action for teacher education. "Chaos Works," written by Charles J. Carlsen and Dan Radakovich, looks at the ordered progression to chaos, implementing chaos at Johnson County Community College (KS), and tangible results of chaos. The article, "Keeping Our Word: The Guaranteed Annual Schedule," authored by Bill Law, explores basic elements, the guaranteed annual schedule, tangible benefits of the guaranteed annual schedule, additional benefits, and costs and efficiencies of careful planning and keeping one's word. "Preserve and Transform: Integrating Technology into Academic Life," was written by Steven W. Gilbert and discusses embracing change and integrating technology, supporting the faculty, a roundtable and a center for collaborative change, new costs, plans, and value, and challenges and next steps. The article "Instructional Realignment by Consensus: The Community College of Denver Experience," authored by Barbara Bollmann, gives background, defines issues, and discusses taking next steps, creating beneficial outcomes, changing roles and responsibilities, and moving from now to beyond for instructional restructuring. (VWC)

Leadership Abstracts, Volume 12, 1999

leadership abstracts

TEACHING THE TEACHERS: MEETING THE NATIONAL TEACHER PREPARATION CHALLENGE

George R. Boggs and Sadie Bragg

It is common for professionals in higher education to decry the low level of preparation of students who enter colleges and universities today. Math, science, and technology literacy of our nation's students and our future work force is of particular concern. The recently released report of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study adds to existing concerns about the quality of education at the primary and secondary levels. While students in elementary grades at least matched international averages, the performance of high school seniors was virtually dead last in both mathematics and science.

Poor math and science performance in higher education should not be surprising considering the level of science and mathematics preparation of the teachers themselves. According to U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley, almost one-third of the mathematics teachers and one-fifth of the science teachers at the high school level do not have a major or minor in mathematics or science. The average K-8 teacher takes no more than three mathematics or mathematics education courses in college, and less than one-half of 8th grade mathematics teachers have ever taken a course in the teaching of mathematics at this level. Further distressing, teacher qualifications tend to be even lower in low-income and minority schools.

While it may be convenient to blame colleagues at the primary and secondary level for the low level of preparation of high school graduates, leaders of colleges and universities must also accept responsibility. Put simply, the nation's teachers are products of higher education. Teacher preparation traditionally has been viewed as the responsibility of four-year institutions. As the major point of entry into higher education for large numbers of Americans, however, community colleges have long played an important, if not widely recognized, role in preparing teachers. With the growing teacher shortage, the community college role in teacher preparation is becoming increasingly critical.

The need for new teachers is ever more daunting. The U.S. Department of Education predicts that 40 percent of our current public school teachers will retire or leave the profession by the 2003-2004 school year. At the same time, school enrollments are rising dramatically. Many fast-growing cities across the nation are struggling to build new schools quickly enough to meet demands. In the next 10 years, America will need to hire two million teachers to keep up with the rapidly rising number of students and teaching vacancies. Class-size reductions that are being legislated in some states may drive the numbers of teachers needed even higher.

The Community College Role

Currently, two-year colleges enroll nearly half of all U.S. undergraduates and more than one-third of all students taking science, mathematics, and technology courses. Community colleges are recruiting increasing numbers of future teachers, providing them with stronger mathematical and scientific preparation, and utilizing college resources to meet the challenges facing elementary and secondary educators. Luther Williams, Assistant Director for Education and Human Resources with the National Science Foundation (NSF), stresses, "The resources of the nation's community colleges must be utilized fully if the need for a teaching force well prepared in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology is to be met."

It is estimated that 40 percent of the nation's teachers have completed at least a portion of their undergraduate science and mathematics coursework at community colleges. Many future elementary and middle school teachers are taking most, if not all, of their science and mathematics courses at community colleges. Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the fourth largest school district in the country, estimates that 70 percent of their elementary school teachers receive all their mathematics and science training from Miami-Dade Community College. Nevertheless, neither two-year colleges nor the four-year institutions where teachers complete their preparation, nor the schools that hire teachers, fully recognize the essential role of two-year colleges in teacher preparation. With their clear commitment to teaching and learning and with so many prospective teachers as students, community colleges are in a pivotal position to recruit and help prepare the next generation of teachers. No one group can do it alone. All must cooperate. With support of organizations like NSF and educational leaders who share this vision, two-year colleges can help our nation produce a teaching work force highly qualified in science, mathematics, and technology.

Recommendations

In March 1998, NSF convened a national conference, "The Integral Role of the Two-Year College in the Science and Mathematics Preparation of Prospective Teachers," with three purposes in mind: (1) to call attention to the contributions of community colleges in preparing teachers in science and mathematics, (2) to recognize model community college programs for teacher preparation, and

(3) to make recommendations to improve teacher preparation in science and mathematics. Faculty, presidents, and other administrators from eleven community colleges identified by NSF as doing exemplary work in teacher preparation met with primary and secondary school teachers, pre-service teachers, and other national educational leaders to share their successes and examine the role of two-year colleges in teacher preparation. More than 100 individuals participated in developing recommendations targeted at helping community colleges enhance their contributions toward meeting the need for well-prepared teachers of mathematics, science, and technology. Among those recommendations are six that have particular salience for community college leaders:

1. Community colleges should actively recruit prospective teachers from their local service areas. Community colleges are uniquely positioned to participate in recruiting teachers to meet current and future national needs, and in particular, to recruit teachers who best understand the needs of the communities they serve.

2. Community colleges should demonstrate leadership in strengthening the undergraduate science, mathematics, and technology courses taken by prospective teachers. Community college faculty specialize in the development and teaching of freshman and sophomore foundation courses, and are, therefore, in a key position to influence curriculum reform in these areas. They should collaborate with four-year institutions to develop and align appropriate core courses for teachers. In addition, instructors in these courses should incorporate teaching methods that emphasize active, inquiry-based learning and reflect current findings from cognitive science.

3. Community colleges should provide rich and varied pre-teaching experiences, particularly in the areas of science, mathematics, engineering, and technology. Potential teachers beginning their undergraduate work can benefit greatly from pre-teaching opportunities, such as participating as mentors, tutors, or instructor aids in a variety of elementary, secondary, and college settings. Involving students in pre-teaching experiences that foster creativity, curiosity, and involvement can help them confirm their interest in teaching.

4. Community colleges leaders should provide institutional recognition and support for in-service courses and professional development experiences for current teachers. Many community colleges are deeply involved in providing in-service training to teachers at all levels, through credit and noncredit courses, as well as through special projects. However, these activities sometimes are viewed as unimportant elements in the college agenda. Providing continuing education for teachers, particularly in areas of science, mathematics, and technology, should be recognized as vital both for large urban districts with specific needs and for rural districts where the community college may be the sole provider of comprehensive science, mathematics, and technology in-service programs.

5. Community colleges must closely coordinate their teacher preparation efforts with those of four-year colleges and universities. Two-year institutions should establish new and enhance existing lines of communication and cooperative ventures for teacher preparation with four-year colleges and universities. Careful attention must be paid to articulation agreements, and clear policies must be developed regarding transfer, joint advising, and dual-enrollment of pre-service teachers.

6. Community colleges must become full partners in all discussions about the recruitment and preparation of future teachers. For community colleges to fully engage in the preparation of teachers they must actively join in ongoing dialogues and work to develop liaisons with colleges of education, business and industry, professional societies, state legislatures, and statewide and national policy boards.

A Call to Action

The preparation of the next generation of elementary and secondary school teachers, particularly in the areas of science, mathematics, and technology, is a critical national concern. The nation's community colleges are being called on to make teacher preparation a major priority, and every community college in the country has the opportunity and responsibility to rise to this call.

Meeting this challenge will require assessment of current practices in light of the importance of this mission to the college and its constituents. It will require full commitment from all sectors of the two-year college community—trustees, presidents, faculty, staff, and students—and careful collaboration with all pertinent education, community, and professional institutions and associations. With community colleges offering accessible, high quality, low-cost education within commuting distance of 90 percent of the American population, now is the time for our "colleges of the people" to place this item on the agenda for action and become significant partners in the national systems of teacher preparation.

George R. Boggs is Superintendent/President at Palomar College (CA). Sadie Bragg is Vice President for Academic Affairs at Borough of Manhattan Community College (NY). The authors can be reached at gboggs@palomar.edu and bmacdscb@cunyvm.cuny.edu.

Boggs served as a member and Bragg served as chair of the steering committee for the NSF-sponsored conference described in this article. The full report of "The Integral Role of the Two-Year College in the Science and Mathematics Preparation of Prospective Teachers," is available from NSF, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, pubs@nsf.gov.

Volume 12, Number 1
February 1999

Milliron, Senior Editor
es, Editor
, Editor
Leadership Abstract Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

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.

leadership abstracts

CHAOS WORKS

Charles J. Carlsen and Dan Radakovich

Community colleges around the globe are embarking on individual journeys to improve their institutional processes and to foster greater student success. While colleges are following a variety of pathways toward this common goal, Johnson County Community College (KS) has chosen the path of chaos. Sparked by Margaret Wheatley's applications of chaos theory to organizational leadership, college leaders have been applying the lessons of quantum physics and fractals to improve organizational processes and student outcomes.

New findings about chaos theory are intriguing, but the gap between this "new science" and leadership of a community college may seem vast. College leaders seeking to bridge this distance will likely encounter a series of preliminary questions: (1) What is chaos? (2) What do strange attractors, nonlinearity, and self-organizing systems have to do with this college? (3) What value can come from discussions about instability, disequilibrium, and complexity theory? Exploration of the new science for answers reveals such counter-intuitive findings as the principle that *less* rather than *more* leadership may yield better results. The explorer soon finds chaos to offer very different guidelines for organizational leadership than the ordered, top-down methods familiar to many college leaders.

The following sections describe what led Johnson County Community College (JCCC) to the path of chaos, how it has applied the principles of chaos theory to college management, and the effects of its journey into chaos.

The Ordered Progression to Chaos

In 1995, JCCC began to look at its administrative processes to encourage greater inclusion, not only of faculty, but also of other employee groups. Like many colleges, leaders at JCCC explored a Total Quality Management (TQM) approach as a means of improving its processes. TQM experts were invited to the college to share their experiences, and JCCC's administrators were soon sold on the concept. Who could argue with the value of quality, with the notion that those who actually do the work can best suggest ways to improve processes, or with the concept that decisions should be based on good data? Leaders were convinced that adopting the principles of TQM would get the results the college was seeking.

To implement the TQM model, college leaders first garnered support from the board of trustees and then gathered administrative resources for staff training on how to implement the quality team approach. Administrators began to provide just-in-time-training on a small scale so employee groups could learn to use quality tools.

At the same time, JCCC commissioned George Baker and his National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) group to assess the current status of the college, using three assessments based on TQM constructs. JCCC scored high, but not high enough to fall consistently into the top category of *Participative-Group Systems*. Four areas of concern emerged from the NILIE study: (1) organizational structure, (2) formal influence, (3) collaboration, and (4) communications.

College leaders believed that the answer to improvement in these four areas lay in building upon the new TQM applications underway at JCCC by integrating applications based on the learning organization work of Peter Senge. College leaders believed Senge's ideas captured the essence of what JCCC wanted for the future–to be a learning organization "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results of what they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together."

The college initiated a task force to recommend staff development activities to strengthen JCCC as a learning organization, which would be included in the 1996-1997 budget. This was expected to be an easy job, but task force members found that the more they learned about tenets of the learning organization, the more learning and leadership would be needed for implementation. The group concluded that the best way for JCCC to become a true learning organization was to take a top-down approach–for the president to become the expert and the collegewide learning organization facilitator.

Unrelated to the TQM/learning organization initiatives, JCCC's Business and Industry Institute set up a business forum with Margaret Wheatley as the featured presenter. JCCC administrators attended and were introduced to chaos principles ranging from disequilibrium to nonlinearity to strange attractors to fractals. Two principles in particular captured our attention related to *fractals* and *leverage*: (1) a *fractal* structure is composed of parts of a system that have the same qualities as the whole, thus institutions are fractal structures, and (2) in complex fractal systems, the principle of *leverage* suggests that small changes can produce big results if these changes are made in the right places.

Published by the League for Innovation in the Community College.

Implementing Chaos at JCCC

These principles from chaos theory led some JCCC administrators to begin to think we might become more effective transformational leaders by actually leading less. The goal of committing the institution to TQM and to Senge's learning organization principles matched the original goals of the board and administration. The aims of both were to improve processes, to broaden participation, to enhance communication, and to foster student success–goals reflecting broadly held college values that were clearly articulated in the institution's value statements.

Yet, college leaders were repeatedly bogged down at the point of training the entire staff in these new organizational ways of thinking and acting. The obvious solution was to mandate collegewide training. However, previous experience underscored by new lessons in chaos theory suggested that the most obvious management solutions often do not work or only lead to temporary improvements. Therefore, instead of mandating the changes desired, JCCC administrators chose to model and encourage them.

We decided to follow the path of chaos and to apply the principle of *leverage* by seeking to achieve desired results through small changes made in the right places. Leverage suggests that tackling a difficult problem is often a matter of seeing where the highest leverage lies and identifying actions that with a minimum of effort will lead to lasting, significant improvement. The president initiated one of the first acts of leverage by expanding the President's Council to include representation from the faculty association, hourly staff members, students, and a broader range of administrators. He stressed that the new administrative approach would emphasize involvement and communication.

The president also encouraged the board of trustees to become involved in the new leadership style. The board responded by initiating "Trustee Talks" in which they make themselves available to whomever wants to show up and talk. In addition, the president initiated the Communications Task Force to make recommendations to the board for improving college processes. The board reacted by asking the administration to implement many of this committee's recommendations, such as allowing staff to evaluate their supervisors.

The president and other key administrators took every opportunity to discuss the principles of chaos and learning organizations and to stress the importance of process improvement, broad participation, and enhanced communication. The marching song for the new administrative approach became "process, process, process." No training was mandated, but the Staff Development and Organizational Development office offered training classes in chaos theory and learning organization principles, and requests for this training began to grow.

Tangible Results of Chaos

The state of affairs facing JCCC as it undertook the chaos path to organizational improvement was troubled. The 1994-95 contract negotiations between JCCC administration and faculty were at an impasse. That same year had been marked by discord between the faculty and administration regarding personnel recommendations, causing the JCCC board considerable concern. Compounding the situation was the failure of a building bond issue in the spring of 1995. Finally, the college had scored high, but lower than desired, on the NILIE measures of institutional effectiveness. All of this was pre-chaos chaos.

Since embarking on the journey through chaos and making the changes noted, college leaders are seeing decided improvements in communication, inclusion of staff in administrative processes, and overall commitment to student success. JCCC is now entering the fourth year of what will be a five-year employment contract. As a means of improving communication, the board of trustees, administration, and the faculty association meet monthly to discuss contract issues and other pertinent topics. A joint study group is considering extension of the contract for three more years. Dialogue is ongoing about productivity, workload, merit and incentive pay, and especially about how everyone at JCCC can help our students succeed. People talk freely about learning.

A follow-up to the 1995 NILIE study found that in three years JCCC's overall ratings of effectiveness had increased from 3.80 to 3.88 in measurements of collaboration and 3.65 to 3.77 in communication. The highest score in both areas was in the category assessing the college's focus on students. In addition, in the summer of 1998 the college applied Donald Fisher's instrument for measuring Baldrige quality initiatives in higher education institutions. A score of 250-499 was expected, which would indicate that JCCC had a good TQM process in place with opportunities for improvement. However, the college's composite score was 624, suggesting that JCCC's process was "world class."

By following the path of chaos, JCCC has been applying principles of fractals and leverage to its management and leadership to make small changes that produce big results. This approach is reinforcing our values and fostering a more participative environment in which faculty, staff, students, board members, and administrators seek process improvements based on good data and communication. The result is a community of learners concerned about improving student learning–proof for us that *chaos works*!

Charles J. Carlsen is president and Dan Radakovich is vice president at Johnson County Community College (KS). They can be contacted at ccarlsen@johnco.cc.ks.us and dradak@jccc.net, respectively.

Miles, Senior Editor
ip Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

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.

KEEPING OUR WORD: THE GUARANTEED ANNUAL SCHEDULE

Bill Law

The lives of students, faculty, and staff at Montgomery College (TX) have been eased by the creation of a course schedule that announces classes for a full academic year and by the pledge that no course in the schedule will be canceled. With the Guaranteed Annual Schedule, college personnel have solved some of the most trying and tenacious problems associated with the registration process, and we have done so by following two fundamental principles: careful planning and keeping our word.

Basic Elements

The ability to plan and count on courses to be offered is a critical feature in students' efforts to fit college education into their busy lives. The disruption caused to students—working adults, in particular—when courses are canceled is an ongoing frustration.

To address this critical student challenge, the centerpiece of each year's planning and budgeting process at Montgomery College is the establishment of a careful and detailed course schedule encompassing an entire academic year. Each division head is charged with reviewing two or three years of historical data in student enrollment for each course offered in his or her division. From that review, the division head projects the student demand for each course and determines the appropriate number of sections necessary to meet that demand.

Upon the review of divisional plans with the academic vice president and president (making modifications as needed), the division head assigns an annual course load to each full-time instructor in order to determine the number of sections that remain and need to be funded as either overload assignments for full-time instructors or assignments for adjunct instructors. That amount—the funds necessary to meet student demand—retains the highest priority throughout the remainder of the budget process.

This student-driven budget planning is matched by an equally focused effort to provide registration services to students over an extended period of time prior to the beginning of each semester. The conceptual basis for this commitment is that many students who know exactly what they want to take and who do not need intensive advising or counseling services should be urged to register early. This permits additional time and service to be available to new students and others who need more intensive advising and counseling as the start of the semester nears. Surely, developmental students can use all the information, support, and encouragement the college can muster to assist them upon entry. The entry advisement experience is the cornerstone of the college's student retention program.

The Guaranteed Annual Schedule

Given the prospects and opportunities that have converged, Montgomery College has chosen to create a process that can provide significant and demonstrable benefits to everyone associated with the college. The creation, advertising, and implementation of the Guaranteed Annual Schedule has provided greater support for students, as well as enormous improvements for the administration of the academic and instructional aspects of the college.

Simply put, the Guaranteed Annual Schedule means that the budgetary planning and the commitment to student success that have always characterized the college have been shared in a more open way with students. Once listed in the schedule, no course is canceled. Although we may choose to add courses to the published schedule as demand necessitates, no course for which a student is registered is canceled.

About halfway through the spring semester, the annual schedule for the next academic year is printed and made available to all students, faculty, and staff. Students are able to choose courses for the fall semester with the full knowledge of course availability and scheduling for the following spring and summer semesters. Students then can proceed to make their decisions with 100 percent certainty that the courses listed in the college course schedule will be offered.

Tangible Benefits of the Guaranteed Annual Schedule

At Montgomery College, we have identified six major benefits of our Guaranteed Annual Schedule for our students, faculty, and staff:

First and foremost, students can plan their lives and can exert a significantly greater level of control over their

busy schedules. We have found that with this increased certainty, students have escalated their progress by taking additional courses in a semester. With the Guaranteed Annual Schedule, students do not have to protect themselves against the uncertainty of course cancellations and subsequent schedule juggling. Last year, our average student load jumped from below the average of the other colleges in the district to higher than the average of the other colleges in the district.

Second, the Guaranteed Annual Schedule provides a very powerful tool to assist faculty in their guidance and advisement of students. One of the best-kept secrets at Montgomery College, as at many other community colleges, is the extraordinary amount of time faculty devote to helping students choose courses and programs. Faculty now have the best possible information with which to assist students in planning paths leading to the achievement of their college goals.

Third, enhanced advisement by all staff, especially those whose primary responsibility is to advise students, is made possible. Advisors and others have been continuously challenged to provide students with information about registration for upcoming semesters. When an advisor has a Guaranteed Annual Schedule available, he or she is far better able to assist students in making choices for current registrations, knowing with certainty the choices that remain in subsequent advising sessions. In the first year of the Guaranteed Annual Schedule, average class size went up slightly in each division at the college.

Fourth, the Guaranteed Annual Schedule immediately spawned the planning of two-, three-, and four-year schedules for the college's occupational programs. While specific times and days of course offerings in future years are not fully established, each program area has developed a course-by-course "road map" of day, evening, weekend, and distance offerings for future semesters. This early planning allows students to anticipate the schedule that will help them achieve their goals.

Fifth, the ability to plan academic schedules helps meet the needs of welfare-to-work recipients. In meetings with welfare-to-work administrators, the single greatest impediment they cite for their clients is the cancellation of classes. They point out that canceled courses are problematic for clients who must continue to make demonstrated progress within a fixed period of time.

Sixth, students can register early without concern for cancellations. Many students currently wait until the last week of registration to be certain that their schedules will not be changed. Because students are better served, this delay is no longer advantageous.

Additional Benefits

In addition to the six direct benefits of the Guaranteed Annual Schedule, graduation rates, classroom and time management, and recruitment of part-time faculty have been positively influenced. Data on student retention are increasingly clear: students succeed and persevere when they pursue self-determined goals and demonstrate to themselves continued progress toward achieving those goals. The Guaranteed Annual Schedule and its associated program planning are designed to help students make and achieve goals and, thereby, to increase graduation rates.

Because the Guaranteed Annual Schedule is designed to provide a more stable process for the first week of classes, it can help improve the use of class time. The creation of the Guaranteed Annual Schedule, combined with the subsequent enhancements in entry placement, should greatly reduce the number of students forced to change course schedules during the all-important first week of classes. Students need not be subjected to last-minute cancellations, juggled schedules, and late entry into classes.

From an administrative efficiency standpoint, the Guaranteed Annual Schedule provides additional benefits. First, full-time faculty members know exactly which courses they will be teaching for the full academic year and, consequently, can moderate their sometimes stressful noninstructional responsibilities.

Second, the ability to retain, develop, and assign adjunct instructors is greatly enhanced. Each division head has the ability to meet once with most adjunct instructors and to make annual assignments. This provides both the adjunct instructor and the division head with a vastly improved efficiency in providing the best instruction for students. It is a powerful recruiting advantage in our competitive job market, as well.

Costs and Efficiencies

The Guaranteed Annual Schedule has resulted in several cost efficiencies: (1) students register for more courses, filling their schedules without fear of later disruptive changes; (2) students register early, saving the college the extraordinary costs in money and time associated with the rush during the final week of registration; (3) withdrawal rates decrease since students receive adequate advising and are less likely to be incorrectly placed; (4) faculty have optimal information and tools to use in advising and nurturing students; and (5) frustration and disturbances are reduced among faculty since their classes are not canceled, either.

Ultimately, we find that in addition to improving advising and enrollment processes and saving students, faculty, staff, and the college time and money, the Guaranteed Annual Schedule enhances Montgomery College's reputation among our constituents for keeping our word.

Bill Law is president of Montgomery College in the North Harris Montgomery Community College District (TX). He may be contacted at bill@nhmccd.edu.

Volume 12, Number 4
August 1999

lson, Senior Editor
bstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

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.

leadership abstracts

PRESERVE AND TRANSFORM: INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY INTO ACADEMIC LIFE

Steven W. Gilbert

The following "speech" is abstracted from the upcoming monograph, New Visions for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, *by Steven W. Gilbert, President, The TLT Group, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Affiliate of the American Association for Higher Education. Gilbert is the founder of the TLT Roundtable approach, which has been adopted by more than 400 colleges and universities to help coordinate and stimulate their uses of technology to improve teaching and learning. In this abstract, Gilbert's fictional president presents a plan for collaborative change that includes developing a local TLT Roundtable and a TLT Center for the college.*

Embracing Change and Integrating Technology

Thank you for coming to this special meeting of faculty, administrators, professional staff, and student leaders. I have just returned from an extraordinary two-day session with our board, the culmination of a year of planning in which many of you participated. We are grateful for your contributions and look forward to your continuing leadership as we implement decisions–based largely on your recommendations–that will recreate our college. In the next five years, we will multiply by a factor of ten our annual budget for academic use of technology and the improvement of teaching and learning. We will develop and implement policies and organizational structures to support the full integration of computing and telecommunications into the academic life of our college.

Our next task is to determine what we must preserve and what we must transform. The college is renewing its commitment to support your efforts to stay current in your areas of expertise, and we are adding support systems that enable faculty and students to use various combinations of emerging technology and pedagogy. In addition, we will provide new structures and resources for personnel who support the changing work of faculty and students. Our distinct resources–our traditions, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community–must be the foundation on which we build new programs.

Technology can fragment and diminish our lives, or it can enrich them. We are already using technology to bury each other in information, but we can achieve an integration of information, technology, teaching, and learning–a new kind of *connected* education–that can help us better manage our lives and interact more meaningfully with ideas and with each other. As educators, we have distinct opportunities and responsibilities to nurture sparks of the human spirit wherever we find them, however we can. We still have time to make the right choices.

We've Already Begun; We Must Continue

Computers and the Internet are just the beginning of what the future has to hold, and members of our board and advisory committees agree that we must prepare our students for careers in which computers are commonplace and change is frequent. We have some experience with technology, but we need to plan for our roles in an unpredictable future in which technology can make some kinds of learning more effective.

Some of our earlier fears about the impact of technology have so far been unfounded. We are not losing great numbers of students to institutions that use technology more than we do. In fact, faculty and students report that the quality of communication between them is better than ever, especially in courses where e-mail is commonplace.

Unfortunately, some of our earlier hopes for program expansion and profitability have been diminished by the realities of technology use. Distance education has not attracted throngs of additional fee-paying students to our continuing education and academic programs, nor has technology substantially reduced instructional costs. We have improved cost-effectiveness in administrative operations by integrating our information systems with online academic software, but this conversion is costing more than twice our original expectation and is over a year behind schedule.

Despite these realities, we cannot afford to ignore the increasing competition from new institutions and programs in our service area. Potential students often ask about our technology infrastructure and the use of advanced technology in classes. We have lost faculty members to higher paying jobs in high-tech companies, and grant application guidelines frequently favor institutions that can demonstrate consistent use of technology to support pedagogical innovation.

Perhaps the strongest argument for continuing our support of technology is that over 25 percent of our faculty already use it to improve teaching and learning. Although we have not found research that incontrovertibly identifies educational gains resulting from major investments in technology, we accept the cumulative judgment of our pioneering faculty. Your experience has persuaded me that well-planned instructional uses of technology allow you to teach topics and skills you have never taught before. Your use of technology helps our students pass through instructional bottlenecks more easily, and your use of e-mail and the Web improves communication between you and

your students. Our students are better prepared to deal with information technology in their academic or professional careers.

Supporting the Faculty

As pioneers at our college embrace change and accept risk, the institution must sustain their commitment to innovation while supporting mainstream use of technology to improve teaching and learning. Many of our faculty members who use technology in their courses have gained a new consciousness of pedagogical issues and have requested–and deserve–additional time and resources to learn, adapt, and implement new approaches to education.

We also must maintain respect for those who, reluctant to engage new technology and pedagogy options, continue to make traditional contributions. We recognize and support all faculty who search for the best combinations of educational goals, content, approaches, and technology applications–new or old–inside the classroom and beyond.

While some pioneer faculty and support services leaders enjoy their traditional independence, many recognize the need for greater collaboration. They are tired of the growing mismatch between their goals and the scarcity and disorganization of resources. Some applications of technology and approaches to teaching and learning serve students best when used repeatedly across several courses or within a coherent course sequence. Calls for greater collaboration and a coordinated curriculum must be balanced by the need to sustain academic freedom and integrity.

A Roundtable and a Center for Collaborative Change

Our response to these calls is the establishment of a roundtable for (1) collaborative planning and the exchange of expertise and experience; (2) focusing institutional resources on important educational approaches and technology application strategies; and (3) extending the ideals of academic freedom to our new environment. This roundtable process can also provide the kind of recommendations and academic vision our senior administrators need when making resource allocations, formulating new policies, and directing new funding streams.

The roundtable will lead the development of an institutional vision that goes beyond *distance* education toward *connected* education. Technology can allow our students to find valuable information or instruction whenever and wherever they need to perform specific tasks. It can support interactive, individualized, motivating, and humanized learning for those seeking to develop their values, understanding, and critical thinking skills. Finally, technology can help us make high quality education fully accessible to those at risk of being left behind in the digital economy. This roundtable, operating within a framework of online tools, advanced student technology assistants, staff and faculty development, and traditional support services, will promote our evolving vision.

The roundtable is also an ideal mechanism to oversee the creation and development of a campus Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center that houses representatives and materials from the library and other academic and technology support departments. The TLTC will help faculty with technology, pedagogy, and assessment and evaluation tools. It will also help faculty and staff access adaptive technologies that enable learners and teachers with disabilities to participate fully and effectively in our academic community.

New Costs, New Plans, New Value

We recognize that we are urging you to make changes that will increase costs in some courses and departments. However, we are convinced that the increase in the value of the education we provide will exceed the increase in cost. We must try to make expanded and technologically enhanced learning experiences fully accessible to our traditional students and to new constituencies we believe we can serve effectively.

As planning for our new initiative begins, keep in mind that substantial additional demands will be placed on our budget. While we do not want you to be particularly concerned with finances at this stage, we do ask that you try to avoid extraordinary budget increases.

Challenges and Next Steps

We have established seven work groups to address the key elements of the planning and transformation phases of our college initiative:

1. Organizing for Collaborative Change
2. Developing Our New Vision of Connected Education
3. Establishing a Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center
4. Institutionalizing Evaluation and Assessment
5. Increasing Accessibility and Information Literacy
6. Changing Faculty and Student Roles
7. Building a New Financial Base and Budgeting Process

Our Web page includes an explanation and a charge for each group and online activities that permit you to extend your conversations after today's meetings. Each group has a leader who, with help from the rest of you, will deliver a final report one month from today. After the group recommendations are synthesized by senior administrators and reviewed by the board, we will publish and implement a final plan for our college.

I am enthusiastic about our prospects and look forward to working with you today and in the months ahead. This is an exciting and somewhat daunting new challenge, but with our commitment, good will, insights, and professional capabilities, we can build a new kind of institution. We will succeed in preserving what we most cherish while we transform what must change. It will be hard work, but we will all be proud of the results.

Steven W. Gilbert is president of the TLT Group, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Affiliate of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C. He may be contacted at gilbert@tltgroup.org. The TLT Group Web site can be accessed at www.tltgroup.org.

Volume 12, Number 5
October 1999

Wilson, Senior Editor
p Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

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.

leadership abstracts

INSTRUCTIONAL REALIGNMENT BY CONSENSUS: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF DENVER EXPERIENCE

Barbara Bollmann

Faced with challenges brought about by a series of cuts in state funding, Colorado's Community College of Denver (CCD) was forced to ask serious questions about how it conducted the business of learning. Finding no easy answers, administrators, faculty, and staff at the college began a dialogue that became a process of realignment by consensus. This abstract presents a brief history of the reasons for change, an overview of the restructuring process, and a glimpse into the future of collaborative change at CCD.

The Background

In 1997, after three consecutive years of reduced funding, the Community College of Denver Instructional Team (I-Team)—six deans, the Faculty Council chairperson, and the Vice President for Instruction—considered many options for maximizing the college's increasingly limited resources. Although members of the I-Team considered reorganization at that time, they tabled the idea, opting for a different approach for 1997. By 1998, however, the need for a more effective solution had become apparent.

Facing questions of how to reduce overhead without compromising quality, participants at the January 1998 faculty retreat reported faculty interest in realigning the instruction unit to gain greater efficiency and effectiveness. A poll to determine the level of faculty interest was conducted among the entire full- and part-time teaching staff. The results were sparse, however, and instead of painting a picture of the realignment, respondents' suggestions generated even more questions.

Defining the Issues

That summer, CCD President Byron McClenney hosted two Administrative Council retreats. He charged participants with determining the key issues the college needed to address in order to maintain and build on its strengths in the 21st century. The group identified 11 key issues: accountability, alternative resources, customer service/communication, diversity, marketing, organizational issues, recognition/rewards, revitalization, student retention, team building, and technology.

At the 1998 fall convocation, McClenney emphasized that although the college was experiencing great success—even becoming a national model for developmental education, organizational planning, and professional development—it also was more vulnerable than it had been in a decade. He made clear CCD's need to address the 11 key issues if the college was to remain viable in current and future economic and political environments. The entire college faculty, staff, and administration ratified the 11 issues as college priorities.

The president invited volunteers from among the faculty, staff, and administration to visit 11 colleges across the country, each a leader in at least one of the issue areas: accountability, Midlands Technical College (SC); alternative resources, St. Petersburg Junior College and Valencia College (FL); customer service, Greenville Technical College (SC); diversity, Seattle Community College District (WA); marketing, Chattanooga State Technical Community College (TN); organizational issues, Santa Barbara City College (CA); recognition/rewards, Sinclair Community College (OH); revitalization, Metropolitan Community College (NE); student retention, William Rainey Harper College (IL); and team building, Lane Community College (OR). To cover the technology issue, a team of volunteers attended the League for Innovation's Conference on Information Technology.

During the 1999 spring convocation, the volunteers reported their findings and made recommendations to their colleagues. Two CCD teams visited colleges where reorganization was completed or under way, and these teams' findings played an instrumental role in CCD's reorganization. At the convocation, cross-functional teams responded to the findings, generating ideas and suggestions for next steps for CCD.

Taking the Next Steps

With information from the 11 teams, the I-Team held its annual retreat and agreed that its number one priority was realigning the instruction unit to meet the following objectives: (1) organize around learners' needs for quality learning opportunities; (2) align with Denver's economic growth areas and workforce skill needs; (3) provide a single point of contact for business and industry; (4) provide a wide variety of learning opportunities and delivery methods; (5) put the responsibility and authority for curriculum in the hands of faculty; (6) create a college culture that encourages entrepreneurial activities and collaboration; (7) strengthen program marketing efforts; and (8) streamline operations. As part of the realignment process, McClenney announced that CCD's satellite Technical Education Center system,

previously a separate college division, would be integrated into the instruction unit and reorganized as branch campuses.

In March 1999, all college personnel were invited to participate in a meeting held to achieve consensus around one of three models for realignment. At the meeting, each model was depicted graphically on an oversized poster board. Over a hundred participants reviewed the models, wrote suggestions for changes directly on the posters, and engaged in an open discussion of the pros and cons of each of the models and each of the suggested changes. By the end of the meeting, the group had reached consensus. The consensus model was distributed for written feedback and, at a second open meeting, the final version was unveiled.

Under this model, now in place, five new *centers of instruction* incorporate similar and supporting programs and prefixes, *center deans* manage faculty and curriculum across the main campus and the five branch campuses, *campus directors* provide daily management at the branch campuses, and *faculty* retain curriculum responsibility and authority.

Creating Beneficial Outcomes

The realignment of the instruction unit provides benefits for the entire college. In addition to addressing resource challenges by reducing the number of administrators and departments, the realignment continues to focus CCD's efforts on learning and the learner.

Learners benefit from the realignment through enhanced program identity, expanded learning community opportunities, and increased emphasis on anytime, anyplace, and anyway learning. With completion of a major overhaul of the college's computer systems, students can register at any CCD campus for any CCD course.

The realignment provides faculty with increased support for multidisciplinary work and multiple delivery options. Faculty also receive expanded entrepreneurial opportunities, and they may choose to work at more than one location. CCD's realignment allows greater flexibility for faculty and staff to work together in ad hoc groups across any perceived boundaries or barriers of centers, campuses, or disciplines. Groups form as they are needed, move the work forward, and then disband.

Changing Roles and Responsibilities

As the college fully integrated the branch campuses and moved from six instructional *divisions* to five instructional *centers*, job responsibilities and commensurate authority shifted. In some cases, positions now carry increased responsibility and authority; in others, staff have fewer responsibilities and less authority. *Deans, campus directors*, and *program/team coordinators* lead the learning process on the college's various campuses.

Deans of the centers are administrative staff who share curriculum, faculty, and budget responsibility with program/team coordinators, work with campus directors to ensure learners' needs are met relative to program development and scheduling, and work with faculty across campuses. *Campus directors* are faculty who provide the venue for instruction, hold responsibility for facilities management, implement their respective campus budgets, report to the dean for the Center for Learning Outreach for daily administration, and report to center deans for curriculum and faculty endeavors. *Program/team coordinators* are faculty who carry curriculum, part-time faculty, and cost center responsibility and authority, provide year-round coordination, participate in the Coordinators' Council, develop and maintain business and industry partnerships, and provide program/team coordination across campuses and centers.

Moving from Now to Beyond

The realignment of the instruction unit affected the entire college in unanticipated ways, especially during its first semester. For example, new codes were needed in the college's student information system to allow for the scheduling of classes at new centers, at newly renamed campuses, and in other campus buildings. Changes also needed to be made in CCD's accounting cost centers to reflect the new instructional centers and new cost center administrators. New tracking software programs were needed to allow for gathering and reporting enrollments by program, by prefix, by instructional center, by branch campus, and by individual faculty.

The realignment is a dynamic process, for although a new structure is in place and job descriptions have been developed, the actual implementation continues to provide CCD with new opportunities. The college persists in its efforts to discover and design innovative methods of communicating, of providing learning opportunities, of developing and retiring programs, of determining and providing professional development opportunities, and of improving the facilitation of learning across the college.

Words are important; they connote ideas, concepts, and feelings. CCD's change from *division* to *center* was purposeful: *division* divided us, but *center* denotes a place or a grouping of similar and supporting programs. With their more circular and integrative connotation, centers have helped move CCD from stand-alone silos to integrated circles of shared responsibility. At the same time, realignment by consensus has served as a reminder that, working together to develop models tailored to CCD's needs, members of the college can further the learning-centered approach to education to which they and the college are committed.

Focused on learning and on becoming an increasingly learner-centered institution, CCD's full- and part-time faculty, program/team coordinators, campus directors, and center deans, along with other staff and administrators on all campuses, will continue to implement the realignment by consensus for the 21st century.

Barbara Bollmann is Vice President, Instruction at the Community College of Denver. She may be contacted at cd_barbara@cccs.cccoes.edu.

Volume 12, Number 6
December 1999

Wilson, Senior Editor
ip Abstracts Web URL: www.league.org/leadabst.html

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)
National Library of Education (NLE)
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").