

2013

The community college president and the new norm: perceptions of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding

Gregory Thomas
Iowa State University

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

 Part of the [Community College Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thomas, Gregory, "The community college president and the new norm: perceptions of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding" (2013). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 13477.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/13477>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

The community college president and the new norm: Perceptions of preparedness to
take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding

by

Gregory A. Thomas

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:
Larry H. Ebbers, Co-Major Professor
Janice Friedel, Co-Major Professor
Daniel C. Robinson
Marisa Rivera
Mack Shelly

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2013

Copyright © Gregory A. Thomas, 2013.

All rights reserved

This dissertation is dedicated to GOD
Who has carried me through this process and life

My lovely wife and best friend, Kim
Who has been loyal and the source of inspiration throughout this entire journey

My mother, Jacqueline
Who taught me the value of a strong work ethic and sound integrity

My aunt, Catherine
The retired NYC Public School Teacher who sparked the my passion to be an educator
and always encouraged me to strive for excellence

My daughters, Amara & Maya
Who will always be daddy's little girls

And to my brothers, Michael & Grady
Grady, you passed away much too young and you are dearly missed
This dissertation is dedicated to your memory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER ONE. THE INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Conceptual Framework	5
Significance of the Study	8
Limitations and Delimitations	9
Definition of Terms	9
Summary	10
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
The History of Community College Funding	11
The New Norm	16
The Challenges of the New Norm	17
The New Norm and Community College Presidents' Preparation	23
The Exodus	28
Summary	31
CHAPTER THREE. DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY	33
Overview	33
Survey Instrument	34
Design and Sampling	35
Population	36
Data Collection Procedures	36
Survey Results	37
Data Analysis	39
Summary	40
CHAPTER FOUR. FINDINGS	42
Demands and Challenges	42
Challenging Issues	42
Meetings with Constituents	44
Serving on External Boards	45
Resource Management Competency	46
The Top Three Most Challenging Constituent Groups	48

Increased Importance of Resource Management	49
Transformational Leadership and Alternative Fundraising	50
Perception of Preparedness	51
Community College President Profile	58
Summary	60
CHAPTER FIVE. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
Resource Management Preparedness.....	65
Increased Importance of Resource Management	66
Future Research	76
Conclusion	78
APPENDICES	85
REFERENCES	102

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the public community college for opening its doors to me and assisting me to become the first member of my family to obtain a college degree and for the opportunity to serve as community college professional. I would like to recognize and thank my dissertation committee members: Dr. Larry Ebbers, Dr. Janice Friedel, Dr. Daniel Robinson, Dr. Marisa Rivera, and Dr. Mack Shelly. First, I must acknowledge Dr. Larry Ebbers who made all of this possible. I had abandoned the idea of pursuing a doctoral degree and a community college presidency. Yet, Dr. Ebbers was able to get me back on track. He serves not only as my dissertation chair but also as a mentor.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Janice Friedel, who I have had the pleasure of working closely with during the last 12 months. With her guidance and support I was able to produce my first published journal article. I must acknowledge my fellow New Yorker, Dr. Marisa Rivera for her consistent support and encouragement from the first moment I entered the program. As a man of color, Dr. Daniel Robinson, thank you for being a strong role model. I am extremely grateful for Dr. Mack Shelly's patience and support as I made my way through chapters three and four. Every time that I needed to meet with you in person or speak via phone, you consistently made yourself available.

ABSTRACT

The United States is currently enduring an economic downturn that has not been experienced since the great depression of the 1930s. The overall collapse of the economy has had an adverse impact on higher education. Arguably the public community college has faced greater fiscal hardship than any other branch of American higher education. The community college has encountered a complex assortment of challenges. In recent years the community college has experienced historical reductions in state appropriations, while at the same time experiencing record-breaking enrollment growth and increased performance expectations. Although enrollment numbers are beginning to level off, they still remain historically high. These combined factors have created unprecedented challenges for community college presidents.

Unfortunately many economists, political figures, higher education scholars, and community college leaders believe that the current fiscal conditions will persist for years to come and are referring to the current economic climate as the “new norm”. As a result of this new daunting fiscal paradigm, it projected that the role of the community college presidency will become increasingly more complex and demanding. The millennial community college presidency will demand a stronger competency in resource management and more specifically, a greater emphasis must be placed on the ability to identify and secure alternative funding in order to compensate for continuous reductions in state appropriations. The purpose of this dissertation is to better understand Community College Presidents’ perceptions of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding.

CHAPTER ONE

THE INTRODUCTION

According to the National Bureau of Economic Research the United States is currently enduring the longest economic downturn since the Great Depression of the 1930s (Temin, 2010). The overall decline of the US economy has had a negative impact on most higher education sectors. Yet, it is very evident that the public community college has been hit the hardest (Ashford, 2012; Asimov, 2012; Bailey, 2012; Choitz, 2010; D'Amico et al., 2012; Desrochers & Kirshstein, 2012; Gonzales, 2012; Martinez & Luz, 2012; Rivera, 2012; Whissemore, 2013).

The Delta Cost Project, a study conducted by the American Institute for Research examined the impact of the "Great Recession" on the various branches of higher education and reported that, "community colleges suffered the greatest financial hardship" (Desrochers & Kirshstein, 2012). In recent years many community colleges have experienced historical reductions in state funding, while accommodating historically high enrollment growth and mounting performance expectations (Sutin, et al., 2011; Whissemore, 2013).

It is evident that despite the significant loss of state funding the public community college is simultaneously facing mounting expectations, pressures and demands. It is this unrealistic paradox that has been particularly challenging for the public community college (Askin, 2007; Bailey, 2012; Choitz, 2010; D'Amico et al., 2012; Dougherty et al., 2011; Dowd & Grant, 2006; Fain, 2012a; Fernandez, 2011; Lanning, 2008; Mullins, 2010). The public community college has experienced significant reductions in funding, yet many public community colleges are still expected to effectively meet the needs of

first-generation students, academically underprepared students, displaced workers, provide the courses that students demand, increase student completions rates, keep pace with technological advances, while at the same time keeping student tuition and fees affordable.

The task of collectively addressing such a vast assortment of demands, expectations, and challenges with limited resources has created a unique scenario or “perfect storm” for public community colleges that other higher education institutions do not have to confront. Choitz (2010) suggest that, “community colleges across the nation appear to be facing a ‘perfect storm’ during which surging enrollment, tepid state funding, and strong accountability forces are colliding to severely threaten access to and completion of postsecondary education and credentials by lower-skilled and low-income students”. It is very apparent that the public community college is being asked to do much more, yet with much less.

Problem Statement

Unfortunately many economists, higher education scholars, community college leaders and political officials believe that the current economic conditions will persist for the unforeseeable future and some even predict that these current conditions will become permanent or the “new norm” (D’Amico’s et al., 2012; Choitz, 2010; Heller, 2008; Kelderman, 2012; Lanning, 2008; Motz, 2010).

One of the emerging and troubling trends is that student tuition and fees continue to increase as state funding continues to decrease, in an attempt to compensate for the severe loss of state appropriations (Bradley, 2013; Gonzales, 2012; Kelderman, 2011; Motz, 2010; Rivera, 2012). Needless to say, continuous increases in student tuition and

fees could potentially place community college access out of reach of many students (Bailey, 2012; Kelderman, 2011).

Historically, numerous non-traditional and low-income students have greatly relied upon the “open doors” of public community colleges in order to gain access into higher education and pursue social upward mobility (Boggs, 2011). Open access has been a traditional cornerstone of the two-year college and this hallmark tenet has distinguished the public community college as the democratizing institution of higher learning. Some believe that the public community college’s capacity to preserve open access is in jeopardy (AACC, 2012; Bailey, 2012; Choitz, 2010; Heller, 2008; Gonzales, 2012; Kelderman, 2011; Motz, 2010; Rivera, 2012).

If public community colleges are to keep tuition and fees affordable, meet the growing needs of students, and respond to mounting performance expectation despite rapidly dwindling state and federal funding support, then alternative sources of funding will be required (Chappell, 2009; Fain, 2012a; Fernandez, 2011; Gonzales, 2012; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Kenton et al., 2005; Lanning, 2008; Miller & Pope, 2003; Watkins, 2000). Consequently, public community college leaders will need to be prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding, in order to effectively compensate for the reduction of state appropriations.

Yet, it is imperative to acknowledge that fundraising is a particular skill that has to be learned and exercised. Traditionally, community college presidents have been able to rely primarily on generous state funding (Phillippe, 2012; Tollefson, 2009). As a result, the public community college president has not had a historical need to master this particular competency or an incentive to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical

alternative funding. Hence, community college CEOs may not be adequately prepared to engage in alternative fundraising.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that at this juncture the public community colleges have entered a new era in which presidents must have the ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding sources. Roueche (as cited in Ashford, 2011) offers the following timely insight, “today’s community college presidents need to be more entrepreneurial”. Furthermore, a mass exodus of seasoned community college presidents has already begun and many more will continue to retire during the next few years (AACC, 2012; Phillippe, 2012).

As a result, it is imperative that the next generation of community college presidents acquire a strong competency in resource management in general and more specifically, it is essential that millennial community college presidents are adequately prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to better understand community college presidents’ perceptions of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. This study will examine how community college presidents’ personal backgrounds, educational backgrounds, leadership preparation, leadership philosophy, and relationships with key stakeholders affect the rating of their perceived level of preparation to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding.

Research Questions

Based on the purpose this study the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the most significant internal and external time demands and most challenging issues that community college presidents encounter?
2. Are community college presidents well prepared to provide resource management leadership?
3. Do donors/benefactors present the greatest challenge as a constituent group to community college presidents?
4. Have community college presidents' perception of the importance of budgetary/financial management, entrepreneurship, and fundraising increased since their first presidency?
5. Do community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders have a more positive perception of their ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding sources?
6. Does the perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources differ by experience, race, gender, education background, and leadership preparation?
7. What is the profile of community college presidents by age, gender, and race?

Conceptual Framework

This study used transformational leadership theory as the theoretical framework. The theory was not initially developed as a higher education theory (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978). Nevertheless, the transformational leadership theory is relevant

given that higher education leaders encounter many of the same challenges that are universal to leadership (Fullan, 2001; Rouche, et al., 1989).

Transformational leadership is in the class of modern leadership theories that emphasize that leadership and management can be learned, instead of the “natural leader” and “great man” concepts of leadership, that suggest that leaders are born (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 1989; Bennis & Goldsmith, 2005; Burns, 1978; Fullan, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2001; Maxwell, 1998; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

It should be noted that Rouche, et al., (1989) modified transformational leadership as a theoretical framework for the purpose of specifically studying community college leadership. Rouche, et al., (1989) defined transformational leadership in context of the community college presidency as follows: “the ability of the community college CEO to influence the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of others by working with and through them in order to accomplish the college’s mission and purpose” (p.11).

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) recognized the value and relevance of transformational leadership theory in context to the community college presidency and in 2005 the AACC grounded a leadership competency framework in the transformational leadership theory for the next generation of community college presidents. The principles associated with transformational leadership were embedded into six specific AACC leadership competencies for community college presidents.

These competencies were identified by the AACC in the *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (AACC, 2005). The six AACC competencies consisted of the following: resources management, organizational strategy, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005). The

American Association of Community Colleges reported that future community college presidents would need to exhibit a strong degree of competency in each of the six leadership domains in order to be an effective CEO in the 21st century.

The six competencies promote the following concepts: leadership can be learned; various members of the community college can lead; management and vision are key components of effective leadership; and the pending community college leadership retirement exodus can be effectively addressed with an assortment of strategies, to include mentoring, grow-your-own programs, university community college leadership doctoral programs, and formal community college leadership academies offered by community college professional organizations (AACC, 2005).

It can be posited that transformational leadership is the ideal leadership model for responding to the challenges resulting from the “Great Recession” (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Roueche, et al., 1989). Tierney (1991) through his research revealed that transformational leadership was the best leadership model suited for moving higher education beyond the status quo and leading constituents to embrace a new vision. The funding challenges presented by the “new norm” will undoubtedly require public community colleges to move beyond the status quo and embrace a new vision and a new way of doing things.

The transformational president will be challenged to “transform” the public community college into an institution that is capable of responding effectively to the demands and realities of the “new norm”. Consistent with the tenets of transformational leadership, community college presidents will need to transform their college by motivating their constituents to do more than normally required; to do more with less; to

sacrifice for the benefit the whole; to endure departmental cuts; to work collaboratively; and, to transcend their own self-interests for the greater good of institution.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. The information ascertained from this study could potentially provide valuable insight for various agencies that are charged with preparing the next generation of community college presidents. First, if it is found that community college presidents do not perceive that they are adequately prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding, then university community college leadership doctoral programs will need to better integrate fundraising strategies into the curricula.

Second, professional organizations that provide leadership development programs for future community college presidents, such as the American Association of Community Colleges, the Association for Community College Trustees (ACCT) and the League of Innovation in the Community College will need to enhance alternative fundraising training. Third, community colleges that offer Grow-Your-Own-Leaders (GYOL) programs will need to emphasize developing the future leaders' fundraising competency and those who are serving as mentors to aspiring presidents or novice presidents will need to reinforce the importance of having the capacity to produce alternative funding. The ability of all of the above efforts to adequately support the preparation of the next cadre of community college presidents is critical.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study is limited in several ways. First, the information that was gathered from the community college presidents was totally self-recalled and self-reported, thus subject to personal bias and opinions. Further, the study was solely based on the perceptions of community college presidents serving at the time of the survey. It should also be noted that acting and interim presidents were not included in the survey. In addition, the collected data were limited to the aggregated results generated exclusively from the presidents that responded to the survey; approximately 60% of the presidents did not respond to the survey.

Therefore, the input of the non-respondents was not analyzed and the lack of this additional information may have had an effect on the outcomes of the study. The study had the following delimitations: the CEOs who participated in the survey consisted of presidents who were only presiding at not-for-profit/public community college located in the United States; the survey items pertaining to competencies were framed in context of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (2005); and, the study was not intended to evaluate the performance of any participating public community college president, nor any particular community college leadership development program.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used for this study:

1. *State Appropriation*: Revenue a community college receives through acts of the state legislature for operating expenses (Hudson, 2008).
2. *Alternative Funding*: Additional financial resources that are not provided as state or federal appropriations.

3. *Entrepreneurial Stance*: Willingness to take a risk in order to identify and secure alternative funding sources.
4. *New Norm*: The belief that current structural deficits in state budgets will permanently restrict or completely eliminate state appropriations to public community colleges, thus creating a new financial paradigm that will continue to persist even if the United States climbs out of the recession (D'Amico, Katsinas, & Friedel, 2012).
5. *Community College*: A two-year public, not-for-profit, institution with regional accreditation that most commonly awards associate degrees to students.
6. *Competency*: Fundamental knowledge or expertise in a specific area or skill set.
7. *President*: For this study, any person who has assumed the role of Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for a public community college.
8. *Transformational Leadership*: For this study, transformational leadership will be described as “the ability of the community college CEO to influence the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of others by working with and through them in order to accomplish the college’s mission and purpose” (Rouche, et al., 1989, p.11).

Summary

This dissertation consisted of five chapters. The first chapter provided an introduction to the study. Chapter two will consist of a current review of the literature. Chapter three will provide a description of the methodology that was used to conduct this study. Chapter four will discuss the research findings, survey results, and statistical analysis. Chapter five will provide a conclusion and offer recommendations for application and future studies.

“Serving diverse purposes, a budget can be many things: a political act, a plan of work, a prediction, a source of enlightenment, a means of obfuscation, a mechanism of control, an escape from restrictions, a means to action, a brake on progress, even a prayer that the powers that be will deal gently with the best aspirations of fallible men.”

Aaron Wildavsky, The Politics of the Budgetary Process, 1964

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The History of Community College Funding

The genesis of the community college in the United States is generally attributed to the establishment of Joliet Junior College in 1901 (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The funding pattern of the original public two-year college during the early 1900s is significantly different from that of the modern public community college (Mullin & Honeyman, 2008). At that time, public junior colleges did not receive state appropriations, federal funding, or any alternative funding in the form of donations, private gifts, or grants (Medsker, 1956). Rather, funding for public junior colleges was generated primarily through local property taxes and students’ tuition and fees (Mullin & Honeyman, 2008; Pederson, 2005).

Although student tuition and local property tax were the two primary funding sources for early junior colleges the majority of the funding was generated from property tax. More specifically, 95% of the support came from local taxes and student tuition only contributed 5% (Cohen & Brawer, 2009). In fact, in some states during the early 1900s, such as California, students were not charged any tuition or fees. The heavy contribution of local tax dollars and the sparse contribution of student tuition and fees is an illustration of the strong connection between the early public junior college and public secondary

education, which was also supported by local tax revenue (Mullin & Honeyman, 2008). The initial connection between the early public junior college and K-12 education was not solely restricted to just sharing a funding model, however the bond was very literal (Piland & Wolf, 2003).

Tollefson (2009) explained that, “most of the earliest public junior colleges began as extensions of high schools. The students took classes in high school buildings from high school teachers, and the incremental funding cost were very low” (p. 394). In addition to sharing facilities, funding models, and academic resources with public secondary schools, the early junior college also shared the K-12 governance model. Governance was exercised exclusively via locally elected school boards and local property taxes were allocated to junior colleges based on student enrollment (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Medsker, 1956). The early public junior colleges were funded and governed as extensions of secondary education for several years.

Eventually, junior colleges developed their own identities and were funded as stand-alone higher education institutions. The state of California led this movement. In 1907, the California General Assembly adopted the Caminetti Act, the first legislation that would have authorized state appropriations specifically to junior colleges; however, the act was vetoed by the state’s governor and failed to become a law (Witt et al., 1994). Yet a decade later, in 1917, California adopted the Ballard Act and it became the first state to pass a law designating state appropriations to public junior colleges (Witt et al., 1994).

The Ballard Act granted junior colleges in California their own autonomy and the authority to award degrees (Myer et al., 1989). As a result, California provided a new

and alternative funding model for public two-year colleges in the U.S, and eventually, the model was adopted by every state. With a new identity and new funding model, this innovative form of higher education experienced a rapid expansion and within 40 years, 250 junior colleges were established (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). This period of transition and growth continued for nearly a century. The first states to follow California's lead were Kansas and Michigan, which authorized two-year colleges to award degrees in 1917, and the last state to do this was South Dakota in 1988 (Witt et al., 1994).

The Ballard Act marked the beginning of a funding shift from budgets largely generated from local tax dollars (and to a far lesser extent, student tuition) to state appropriations as the primary funding sources, which spawned a significant funding paradigm change. The gradual increase in state funding and decrease in local funding would continue from the early 1900 to the modern era. By 2007, local property taxes accounted for only 7% of community college budgets, versus 95% a century earlier, and the average state contributed nearly 50% of all community colleges' operational costs (Katsinas & Tollefson, 2008).

It could be argued that the need to secure state funding was necessary in order to keep pace with enrollment growth and the expansion of two-year colleges (Mullin & Honeyman, 2008). Inevitably, the rapid growth of the two-year college would have placed tremendous and overwhelming financial strains on local taxpayers and students, had the funding model not changed. Local tax funding and student tuition were reaching the point at which they could no longer support larger and more complex two-year colleges. Cohen and Brawer remind us "when the colleges were small, they made modest

demands on the public funds” (2008, p. 137). Yet these colleges were destined to evolve and become more complex, as a result their operational cost would expand.

Another key event that would solidify public two-year colleges’ needs for state funding, was the advent of World War II (WWII). Following the war, community colleges were charged with the role of meeting the educational needs of returning veterans (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Consequently, public community colleges experienced significant enrollment surges. Tollefson (2009) explained that “those dramatic enrollment increases, along with many other postwar needs, put considerable pressure on local property tax, and so local governments began to seek state funding for the community college” (p. 396).

Help would come in the form of a report issued by the 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy* (Mullin & Honeyman, 2008). As a result of President Truman’s initiative, the community college experienced increased state appropriations. The report directed state governments to provide larger portions of the operational costs for two-year colleges. This additional source of state funding, coupled with the post-WWII enrollment influx, fostered an unparalleled age of expansion for the community college.

Again, the pre- and post-WWII state appropriation levels for public community colleges are very different. The pre-WWII state funding of two-year colleges was 0%; by 1942, public two-year colleges received 28% of their operational budgets from state appropriations. By 1965, overall states contributed 34% of community colleges’ budgets, and the sizes of the states’ contributions increased each decade until state appropriations for community colleges hit a zenith of 60% in the 1980s (Tollefson, 2009). Nevertheless,

since the 1980s, the percentage of the states' contributions has steadily decreased, and in recent years the rate of decline has gained alarming momentum (Choitz, 2012; Gonzales, 2012; Sutin, et al., 2011; Whissemore, 2013).

According to Kelderman (2012), state-level "higher education support is at a 25 year low, lawmakers are considering some policy changes that have been off-limits in the past" and the trend of cutting community college state funding does not appear to be reversing. The Grapevine Project reported that between fiscal years 2010 and 2011, only six states experienced increases in higher education funding (Palmer, 2012). Of those six states, only two received increases in state appropriation greater than 3.9%. In contrast, Grapevine observed that the majority of states (44) suffered moderate to large reductions in state appropriations, some as high as 25% (Palmer, 2012).

In 2011, the *Funding and Access Issues in U.S. Community Colleges Survey* was issued to state directors of community colleges to learn what funding and access issues public community colleges throughout the U.S. encountered; the number one concern expressed was the steady decline of state appropriations (Katsinas, Friedel, & D'Amico, 2012). If this pattern persists, it is conceivable that many states will completely end their financial support of community colleges. In fact, some scholars forecast that state funding for public community colleges could reach 0% within the next 45 years (Mortenson as cited in D'Amico et al., 2012). Needless to say, the complete or partial loss of state appropriations presents a very serious threat to public community colleges' abilities to effectively meet the needs of students.

Many scholars believe that the community college has entered a new era in which "normal" funding support is undergoing profound shifts; consequently the public

community college could potentially be redefined (Ashford, 2012; Choitz, 2010; D'Amico et al., 2012; Gonzales, 2012; Martinez & Luz, 2012; Rivera, 2012; Whissemore, 2013). In essence, this is an era in which a “new normal” or a “new norm” has emerged. Given the potential gravity of the impact of this new paradigm, one must ponder whether the community college is prepared to meet the demands and challenges of the “new norm” (D'Amico et al., 2012).

The New Norm

The U.S. is experiencing the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression of the 1930s and the impact of this “Great Recession” has been extremely difficult for all sectors of higher education. Yet, as Whissemore reminds us “Among postsecondary institutions, community colleges were the hardest hit by the recession” (2013, p. 10). What has set the public community college apart from other institutions is that it has been simultaneously confronted by a vast assortment of complex challenges.

As noted, Choitz (2010) observed that the community college is uniquely facing the “perfect storm” of multi-faceted challenges. Unfortunately, economists, political figures, higher education scholars, and community college leaders believe that the loss of state funding and fiscal hardship will persist for years to come or become permanent. Gonzales predicts that, “it is unlikely that the funds community colleges have lost through state-budget cuts will be restored” (2012). Similarly, D'Amico et al. (2012) suggest that: “the concern is that these and other related findings demonstrate a situation that may not improve as the nation climbs out of recession, thus creating a ‘new norm’ in community college funding” (p.626).

The potential permanency of the “new norm” is supported by the fact that state leaders and legislators are intentionally targeting public higher education funding as a primary fiscal resource to help address state deficits. Kelderman (2012) reported that “for nearly four years, governors and state legislators have focused on little else in higher education but cutting budgets to deal with historic gaps in revenue...Such proposals reflect that, in most states, money for higher education will be constrained for the foreseeable future”. Given the long-term implications of the “new norm” it is imperative that public community colleges are prepared to face the challenges and consequences of this new financial paradigm.

The Challenges of the New Norm

The challenges presented by the “new norm” are numerous, complex, and potentially permanent. Among the many challenges that the “new norm” presents, it is the loss of state financial support that is potentially the most devastating. The lack of state appropriations could negatively impact public community colleges’ abilities to be “all things to all people” and potentially alter their roles, missions, purpose, and their very nature (Bailey, 2012; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Watkins, 2000). Historically, the community college has served as a beacon of access for students from every facet of American society.

Nevertheless, this long-standing tradition is in jeopardy. Ashford (2012) observes that, “community college have long stressed the open-door concept, but budgetary pressures, along with the need to better management enrollment growth and ensure students are on the path to completion have forced some colleges to puts limits on access”. This important and unique role has greatly benefited many, especially

disenfranchised low-income students, students of color, first-generation students, and other non-traditional students who have greatly relied on the community college's commitment to open access as a vital pathway to the American dream (Boggs, 2011).

Affordability is paramount for many students that seek access to a public community college. The public community college has historically been affordable, thus placing higher education within the grasp of the masses. One of the troubling consequences of the "new norm" is the trend among many community colleges of routinely increasing student tuition and fees as a means of compensating for the loss of state appropriations. The College Board's *Trends in College Pricing and Trends in Student Aid* report found that community colleges have begun to regularly increase student tuition and fees (2012).

Gonzales (2012) explained that, "as less federal, state, and local money flows to community-college coffers, institutions are becoming more dependent than ever on tuition and fees". Again, the *Funding and Access Issues in U.S. Community Colleges Survey* revealed that the number one concern expressed by state directors of community colleges was the decline of state support (Katsinas et al., 2011). Further, these same community college leaders were also extremely troubled by the fact that increasingly tuition and fees are being used to supplement significant budget shortfalls. In another study by Katsinas and Tollefson (2009), it was reported that most community college leaders felt that community college access was directly threaten by state funding reductions.

It should also be noted that as tuition and fees continue to increase it will become more difficult for federal, state, and local student aid programs to keep pace with the

rising cost of higher education. D'Amico et al. adds, "...state revenue is down, tuition is increasing, and in many places student aid is on the decline" (2012, p.629). Further, the rising cost of tuition and fees will progressively limit Pell's capacity to cover the higher education expenses. Currently, the maximum Pell Grant only covers about only 30% of the cost of college on average, however in 1976 it covered approximately 75% (Bradley, 2013).

In addition to rising cost of student tuition, the Pell Grant has also been strained by the historical growth in enrollment. Consequently, the demands on the Pell Grant program have dramatically increased. Ten years ago there were 9.5 million applicants for the Pell Grant program and in 2012 there were 19.4 million applicants (Bradley, 2013). This expansion of the program has resulted in the Pell Grant accumulating a \$1.3 billion budget shortfall. Congress recently eliminated the summer Pell Grant program in an attempt to cover the \$1.3 billion budget shortfall. The loss of summer Pell negatively impacted community college student access.

Fiscal constraints are leading Congress to also ponder increasing the number of the minimum credits that a student must have in order to qualify for Pell and restricting the number of remedial courses a student can use Pell to cover. Bradley (2013) makes the case that such proposed changes to the Pell Program are the type of modifications, "that would deny some of the most vulnerable students the chance to finish college".

The combination of declining student aid and the rising cost of tuition and fees places open access in jeopardy. In some states, community college leaders are directly stating that open access is no longer financially feasible. Paul Fiest, Vice Chancellor of the California Community College System asserted that, "the state can no longer afford to

have open access in community colleges” (Ashford, 2012). Further, Scott Himmelstein, President of the California Community Colleges Board, voiced that the state’s public “community colleges can no longer afford to be all things to all people” (Rivera, 2012).

In addition to the rising cost of tuition and fees, other elements stemming from the “new norm” threaten student access. Some community colleges have literally closed their doors to students—doors that have traditionally been open to all. In the state of California for example, since 2009, course offerings in the community colleges have been slashed by nearly 25%. As a result, \$809 million was cut from the state’s community college budget, which represented a historic 12% cut in public community college funding (Ashford, 2012; Rivera, 2012). It should also be noted that the 25% course reduction came at a time in which record numbers of students were seeking enrollment in the state’s community colleges.

As a result of the reduction in course offerings, approximately 500,000 students were denied access to the state’s community colleges, which resulted in nearly a 20% decline in enrollment, despite a record high demand for access (Rivera, 2012). These students were denied access solely because the public community college system could not afford to accommodate them. Furthermore, of the 2.4 million students enrolled in the state’s 112 community colleges, at least 472,000 were placed on waiting lists for classes in Fall 2012 (Martinez & Luz, 2012).

It should be noted that the 500,000 California students denied access to the state’s public community colleges was greater than the total number of students enrolled at all of the California State University campuses combined (Ashford, 2012). Reducing the

course selection by one-fourth created challenges for students. The reduction of course offerings and the increased demand for access has caused an enrollment bottleneck.

In an attempt to address this issue the governing board of California's community colleges in 2012 approved a controversial registration policy that gave registration priority to academically successful students. Consequently, academically at-risk students have a decreased probability of gaining access to the state's community colleges. The notion of public community colleges granting priority access to higher-achieving students and secondary access to lower-performing students has overtones of a selective admissions process typically utilized by selective universities.

Some members of the higher education community are making the case that the "public" community college is beginning to look a little less "public" and lot more "private": "I fear that the uncertain funding environment is forcing open access institutions toward a private benefits model" (Katsinas, as cited in Moltz, 2010, p. 1). Yet, it appears that the privatization model has already taken root. In fact, according to the findings of D'Amico et al., 60% of community college state directors reported that, "their states are moving towards a privatized model of higher education with a greater reliance of on tuition" (2012, p.629).

If the movement towards "privatization" persists this could cause a radical departure from the community college's historical commitment to providing academically under-prepared and socio-economically disenfranchised students with a critical pipeline into higher education. Gonzales (2012) argued that, "this shift toward privatization could fundamentally change how community colleges operate, and raises

concerns about access and the sector's commitment to serving low-income and minority students”.

A selective admission process and increasing student tuition are not the only two characteristics associated with the privatized model; other characteristics of privatization consist of treating students as clients, expanding private fundraising out of necessity, and having greater autonomy from the government (Gonzales, 2012). Some argue that not all facets of privatization are negative. Such individuals advocate that some or perhaps all characteristics of privatization may greatly benefit public community colleges long-term (Ashford, 2012; Harmon & MacAllum, 2003).

Ashford (2012) suggests that a privatized model could enhance academic performance at community colleges. More specifically, Ashford predicts that priority registration would encourage desired academic student behavior by rewarding academic success. Further, Ashford indicated that a privatized community college model would potentially provide improved customer service, enhanced pedagogy and student services, as a result of the institution's need to be competitive and survive in an open market. Such improvements would be a consequence of treating students as customers.

Advocates also suggest that under a privatization model, the community college would be more in tune to commercial market demands. As a result, community colleges would do a better job of responding quicker to workforce training needs and opportunities (Harmon & MacAllum, 2003). Furthermore, privatized community college could potentially gain greater autonomy from state government agencies with respect to regulations, policies, and reporting (Gonzales, 2012). Advocates of privatized community colleges argue that students would pay more in tuition and fees, but

ultimately they would get a far superior educational product in return (Romano, 2005a; 2005b).

For some the loss of student access and reduction of state appropriations may be too big of a sacrifice to pay for the perceived benefits offered by privatization. While the concept of the public community college becoming more privatized may be disheartening for some; the literature and current economic realities suggest that the public community college is already on this path and that the “new norm” has arrived and is here to stay. Therefore, we must ask whether community college leaders are adequately prepared to lead their institutions during the challenging era of the “new norm”.

The New Norm and Community College Presidents’ Preparation

As noted, community colleges have endured significant reductions in state appropriations while also experiencing historic enrollment growth, higher performance expectations, greater student needs and a growing number of two-year institutions routinely increasing student tuition and fees as a means of compensating for the loss of state appropriations (Bailey, 2012; Dougherty et al., 2011; Fain, 2011a; Lanning, 2008).

As public two-year colleges are being asked to do more with less, many recognize that community college presidents must begin to identify alternative funding sources in order to compensate for the loss of state appropriations (Chappell, 2009; Fernandez, 2011; Gonzales, 2011; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Kenton et al., 2005; Miller & Pope, 2003; Lanning, 2008; Watkins, 2000). Such actions could play a critical role in reversing the trend of increasing tuition and fees as a means of compensating for the loss of state appropriations.

If community colleges are to effectively address the fiscal demands of the “new norm” and preserve student access, they will be forced to generate alternative sources of funding. Undoubtedly, the role of the community college president has become increasingly more complex and the current budgetary challenges warrant a strong competency in overall resource management (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hockaday & Puyear, 2000; Kenton et al., 2005; Miller & Pope, 2003; McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011; Lanning, 2008; Stanley, 2008).

More specifically, millennial community college presidents must be prepared to adopt an entrepreneurial approach in seeking alternative funding (Amy, 2006; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Kenton et al., 2005). Chappell (2009) emphasized the following: “as public funds become more unreliable in the current economy, fundraising is becoming even more critical for community colleges”. It is imperative that community college presidents are adequately prepared to identify and secure alternative funding sources (Harmon & MacAllum, 2003; Glass & Jackson, 1998; Lanning, 2008).

Nevertheless, several studies have clearly demonstrated that many community college presidents do not feel adequately prepared to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking alternative funding. In a 2005 *Chronicle of Higher Education* survey of 764 community college presidents, the majority of CEOs indicated that they were not adequately prepared to ascertain alternative funds. Similarly, Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found that for public community college presidents, the most pressing issue they faced was the lack of state appropriations and the corresponding need to fundraise.

Glass and Jackson (1998) reported that community college presidents were not adequately prepared to fundraise, and that many two-year college presidents perceive

fundraising as a threat. They also suggested that eventually, public community college presidents' success would depend on their capacity to fundraise. Further, Vaughan (2000) also predicted that the lack of perceived preparedness to fundraise could be a precursor for an unsuccessful presidency.

Miller and Pope (2003) claimed that future public community college presidents must become more "business centered". Similarly, Fulton-Calkins and Milling (2005) observed that public community college presidents must improve their connections to the business and industry community, as such relationships could improve the intake of donations and gifts. Stanley (2008) observed that community college presidents are not adequately prepared to identify and secure alternative funding, but he claimed that the next generation of CEOs must begin to look beyond conventional sources of funding and pursue non-traditional funding.

Lanning (2008) indicated that for today's community college presidents, fundraising is no longer an option, it has become a necessity and it is vital to the community college's future vitality. Chappell (2009) added that community college presidents have not been adequately prepared to fundraise but the time has come for them to begin "stepping up their fundraising efforts".

McNair, Duree, & Ebbers (2011) also reported that community college presidents lacked sufficient training in fundraising. Unlike university presidents, community college presidents have been able to rely primarily on state and/or local funding historically (Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Hunt, 2012; Kenton et al., 2005). Consequently, there has not been significant expectation or pressure on community college CEOs to identify and secure alternative funding.

A longitudinal study of community college financing demonstrated that “fundraising long has been an important activity for 4-year institutions; however, fundraising efforts by community colleges has been sporadic and lacking” (Kenton et al., 2005, p. 110). The lack of community colleges pursuing donations, gifts and other forms of alternative funding can be traced back to the early stages of the public two-year college.

According to Tollefson, “Private gifts and grants are shown as nonexistent from 1918 through 1959, and 1% thereafter” (2009, p. 393). Unfortunately, Bradley (2013b) illustrates in table 2.1 that currently the amount of voluntary financial support donated to public community colleges has actually declined since Tollefson reported 1% in 2009. As demonstrated below the most current rate has dropped to a disappointing -1.1%.

Table 2.1

Voluntary Support by Type of Institution: 2011 (In Thousands)

Type of Institution	Number of Schools	Amount	Average per Institution	% Change in Average
Research/Doctoral	214	\$19,333,899	\$90,345	6.6%
Master’s	332	\$2,257,764	\$6,800	6.8%
Baccalaureate	250	\$2,566,124	\$10,264	12.7%
Specialized	49	\$1,351,161	\$27,575	27.7%
Associate’s	164	\$193,334	\$1,179	-1.1%
TOTAL	1,009	\$25,702,282*	\$25,743*	8.0%

Although community college presidents have not traditionally engaged in fundraising, the “new norm” has created fiscal conditions that dictate that alternative fundraising is no longer an option. Fernandez (2011) offers the following:

The whole notion of fundraising is no longer just a concept of something that would be nice to do from time to time. It’s become quite important. That’s not necessarily good news for community colleges, many of which have for years leaned heavily on state funding.

It is very evident that a new approach is required. Fernandez’s comments illustrate that the “new norm” has propelled the public community college president into the role of fundraiser. Economic and political conditions have dramatically changed, and the time has come in which this particular competency is embraced by current community college presidents and taught to future presidents. University community college leadership programs, formal community college leadership programs, and grow-your-own leadership programs will need to emphasize and better integrate alternative fundraising training into curricula (Boggs, 2003; Lanning, 2008).

The university community college leadership doctoral programs are especially important given that the vast majority of community college presidents have a doctoral degree in education (Friedel, 2010; Romano et al., 2009). As a result, university community college leadership programs must assume a pivotal role in assuring that the next cadre of presidents are adequately prepared to face the fiscal challenges of the “new norm”. If such programs are not effectively providing students with the essential competencies, then these programs must make revisions to their curricula. Friedel provides the following insight: “the need for a new generation of community college

leaders converges with a number of factors affecting the design and substance of doctoral leadership programs, including the major trends having an impact on community colleges” (2010, p. 52).

AACC claimed in its 2012 report “Reclaiming the American Dream: Community Colleges and the Nation’s Future”, that community college leadership programs can no longer continue to produce presidents who merely seek to maintain the status quo. The report acknowledged that, “Community colleges have been developing leaders to maintain the inherited design. They need now to develop leaders to transform the design” (AACC, 2012). The push to modify leadership preparation programs has come at the very time in which a mass exodus of community college presidents is looming.

AACC’s “Reclaiming the American Dream: Community Colleges and the Nation’s Future” report also observed that majority of seasoned community college presidents will retire during the next 10 years (AACC, 2012). The task of identifying and preparing highly skilled professionals to replace the vast number of retirees will be daunting, yet it also offers a rare opportunity to introduce a new generation of community college leaders who have been adequately trained to secure alternative funding sources and transform the design (Kezar et al., 2006). Walter Bumphus, President and CEO of AACC states that “in the end, it all comes down to dedicated and effective leadership, and it is here that community colleges face perhaps the biggest challenge and the greatest opportunity of all” (Bumphus, 2012).

The Exodus

During the past several years, many higher education insiders have predicted the greatly anticipated wave of community college president retirements. Shults (2001)

forecasted that 45% of community college presidents planned to retire by 2007. Weisman and Vaughan (2002) predicted that 79% of community college presidents would retire by 2012. Weisman and Vaughan updated their prediction in 2007 and stated that 84% of community college presidents would retire by 2016. There is no doubt that the harsh economy has prompted some CEOs to postpone retirement (Phillippe, 2012).

Nevertheless, the most recent AACC survey of community college presidents informed us that 75% of community college CEOs plan to retire within the next 10 years and another 15% are scheduled to retire in 11 to 15 years (Phillippe, 2012). These figures are astounding, but they do not come as a surprise when one considers factors, such as the age of most current presidents: the AACC study highlighted that the average age of community college presidents in the U.S. is 60 years.

It appears that finding the next generation of community college presidents may be more difficult than imagined (Bumphus, 2012). It is startling to note that despite such strong efforts to publicize the many vacancies and opportunities available at the community college presidential level, only a very limited number of future candidates are interested in pursuing the community college presidency (Phillippe, 2012). Unfortunately the AACC is reporting that, “there doesn’t appear to be a robust pipeline of candidates to move into those leadership positions. In fact, the pool of potential presidents is shrinking” (Phillippe, 2012).

This may be due in part to the fact prospective replacements, including community college vice presidents of academic affairs, student affairs, and business affairs are also aging and are ready for retirement (Shults, 2001). Faculty members are aging in a similar fashion; consequently, a mass retirement of community college faculty

is also anticipated. The mass retirement of faculty also represents a critical loss of potential community college presidents. The faculty ranks has served as an important pipeline to the community college presidency. Faculty members often rise through the academic administrative ranks from department chair to academic dean to academic vice president and ultimately assuming the role president (Shults, 2001).

Other factors have also contributed to the limited pool of potential replacements of community college presidents. Locke and Guglielmino (2006) suggested that an ever-mounting plethora of frustrations and challenges await community college presidents. This daunting reality has helped to discourage many from pursuing the presidency. Vaughan (2000) indicated that community college leaders are inherently “at risk” on a consistent basis and unforeseen situations can topple even the most prepared presidents. Such factors are contributing to the community college presidency being less attractive career path. In addition, the community college presidency typically demands long hours, and the position can be extremely stressful (Zirkle & Cotton, 2001).

Weisman and Vaughan (2007) reported that the average community college president spends nearly 60 hours per week on work-related activities. These hours often include evening or weekend commitments. Also, presidents only used 60% of their allotted annual leave and roughly 80% claimed that they conducted college-related work while on vacation (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The presidency is an all-encompassing and demanding 24- hour position that lacks privacy. The role also tends to negatively impact family life and physical and psychological health (Guthrie, 2001). These overwhelming demands, combined with new and daunting budgetary challenges, serve to discourage many from seeking the community college presidency (Paneitz, 2005).

Despite the many negative facets associated with being a community college president, many CEOs have indicated they would do it all again. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* (2005) survey of community college CEOs reported that approximately 95% of respondents would become presidents again despite the negative professional and personal impact. Other CEOs have claimed that the community college presidency is the most exhilarating experience one can have (Paneitz, 2005).

The majority of community college presidents have indicated that the number one reason they have remained in their positions is due to the belief that they could truly make a difference in others' lives (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Kubala & Bailey, 2001). Nevertheless, the literature makes it very evident that the role of the community college presidency has become more complex and budgetary conditions have become much more difficult. As a result, finding qualified individuals to fill the leadership gap in America's public community colleges will continue to be of national concern.

Summary

The literature clearly illustrates that the "Great Recession" has ushered in the era of the "new norm" and public community colleges has been adversely impacted more than any other branch of higher education. Nationally most public community colleges are experiencing historic reductions in state funding while enduring record enrollment growth, greater performance expectations and a growing need to protect student access. Increasingly the public community college is being asked to do much more with much less. Consequently, community college presidents will need to identify and secure alternatives sources of funding.

Yet, the literature indicates that most community college presidents do not feel that they have been adequately prepared to do this. Given the great importance of this particular resource management competency, the literature dictates that it is imperative that current and future community college presidents develop the ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

CHAPTER THREE

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

This quantitative study will be embedded in resource management, which is one of the American Association of Community Colleges' (AACC) six *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of community college presidents' perceptions of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

Based on the purpose of this study the following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the most significant internal and external time demands and most challenging issues that community college presidents encounter?
2. Are community college presidents well prepared to provide resource management leadership?
3. Do donors/benefactors present the greatest challenge as a constituent group to community college presidents?
4. Have community college presidents' perception of the importance of budgetary/financial management, entrepreneurship, and fundraising increased since their first presidency?
5. Do community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders have a more positive perception of their ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding sources?

6. Does the perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources differ by experience, race, gender, educational background, and leadership preparation?
7. What is the profile of community college presidents by age, gender, and race?

Survey Instrument

For the purpose of addressing the research questions, the researcher was granted permission to use a database developed by the Office of Community College Research and Policy at Iowa State University. The Office of Community College Research and Policy developed *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey*. In 2007, an electronic questionnaire was used as the instrument to survey the target population by several investigators from the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University. The principal investigators consisted of several Iowa State University doctoral students working under the guidance of Drs. Larry Ebbers, University Professor, and Frankie Santos Laanan, Associate Professor.

The objective in administering the survey was to analyze a representative sample of presidents of community colleges to draw inferences relating to their career paths; background characteristics; professional development; faculty, staff, and public relations; educational and leadership preparation; and the six competencies as delineated by the AACC. The research team contracted the services of Iowa State University's Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM) to implement the data collection for the survey and the principal investigators consulted with the CSSM to finalize the design.

Design and Sampling

To develop the survey instrument the principal investigators conducted a review of the literature and examined instruments that were used previously to survey community college presidents' perceptions and beliefs. The *Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey* consisted of forty items that were classified into the following seven major sections: (1) professional and personal information; (2) career pathways; (3) educational background; (4) leadership preparation; (5) faculty, staff, and public relations; (6) research and publications; and (7) competencies for community college leaders (see Appendix A). In addition, presidents were also asked to state what in retrospect they would do differently in preparing for the community college presidency, to identify three excellent community college presidents in their state, and to rate the level of preparation concerning their first presidency.

The principal investigators arranged for the survey to be reviewed by several respected external community college leadership scholars. These scholars made several recommendations for improving the survey and the research team incorporated the suggested modifications to the instrument. In addition, the principal investigators also pilot-tested the survey with the assistance of seven community college presidents. The presidents estimated the amount of time needed to complete the survey and provided feedback regarding the survey's format, effectiveness, and validity. Overall, the piloted presidents indicated that the instrument was valid. Further, the survey instrument received the full endorsement of the AACC (see Appendix B-1).

The principal investigators applied for and were granted project approval from the ISU Institutional Review Board (see Appendix B-2). Iowa State University's Office of

Community College Research and Policy completed the project design in conjunction with the principal investigators. The project was finalized as a web-based survey. The research team also sent an email notification and a hardcopy of the survey to the participants.

Population

The AACC supplied the nation-wide population of community college presidents for the study. The information received by the CSSM consisted of 1,309 individuals, of which 197 were deemed ineligible. The 197 ineligible individuals consisted of the following: (a) individuals from K-12 school districts, (b) Department of Education administrators, (c) individuals from four-year colleges and universities, and (d) duplicate listings. Community colleges with interim administrators were also classified as ineligible, as per the recommendation of the principal investigators. The final sample consisted of 1,112 potentially eligible community college presidents serving in the 2006–2007 academic year.

Data Collection Procedures

The principal investigators developed the survey questions under the guidance of Drs. Larry Ebberts and Frankie Laanan. As noted, the research team made the survey accessible on-line and the investigators tested the web-based survey instrument before implementation. Specific username and passwords were given to every community college president participating in the project and the data were securely stored on a server to assure for integrity of the survey's results.

Letters printed on Educational Leadership and Policy Studies letterhead containing the signatures of Drs. Ebbers and Laanan were sent to the 1,112 individual community college presidents as an invitation to participate and to inform them of the survey. This notification was sent on July 13, 2007. This initial communication was followed up on July 16th, with an email containing the same information that was expressed in the letter sent on July 13th.

The email provided the instructions for gaining access to the web-based survey. It also contained a live link to the survey and the designated password and username. Further, the email and letter provided a toll-free telephone number and email contact in case the participant had any questions or concerns. Following the notification sent on July 13, 2007 additional communication was sent on July 24th, August 2nd, and August 10th to non-respondents.

A total of 415 surveys were received between July 17th and August 21st. Out of the total amount of collected surveys, 24 were partially completed and 391 were totally completed. The research team cleaned up the data and placed them into an Excel spreadsheet and created a separate file for the respondents who were selected as outstanding community college presidents. The research team submitted the information on September 7, 2007.

Survey Results

A total of 1,112 colleges were identified in the sample. Of the 1,112 institutions, 26 were deemed as ineligible, thus there was an eligible sample size of 1,086. Of the 26 ineligible colleges, seven indicated that they were not community colleges and the remaining institutions were being led by interim presidents. In addition, eight CEOs

were scheduled to be out of the office for a significant time period and 12 community colleges informed the principal investigators that the institutions would not participate in the survey.

Further, 635 institutions did not respond to the invitations to participate in the survey. Sixteen colleges provided partially completed surveys that did not contain enough information to warrant their participation in the dataset; nevertheless, 24 partially completed surveys that did contain enough information to be included as part of the dataset.

Again, 391 community colleges did provide completed surveys. In total, 415 completed surveys were eligible for participation. As a result, the response rate was 38.2% (415 colleges) of the total eligible sample (1,086 colleges). Table 3.1 gives an overview of the response rate of 38.2% as based on the eligible sample of 1,086.

Table 3.1

Eligible Sample and Response Rate for the Community College Presidency:

Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey

	Cases
Sample	1,112
Not Eligible	26
Eligible Sample	1,086
Unreachable	8
No Response/Refused	647
Partial – Not included	16
Completed Surveys	415
Response Rate	38.2 %

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

The reported sample percentages are statistically valid within $\pm 4.9\%$ at the 95% confidence level. Hence, if 50% of the respondents answer a certain question affirmatively, the true percentage in the overall population has a 95% chance to be between 45.1% and 54.9%.

Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

For this study, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the research questions. The computer software program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences® (SPSS) for Macs® was used to conduct the statistical analyses for this research. To analyze research question number one descriptive statistics analysis was conducted to examine time demands and challenging issues as encountered by community college leaders.

To answer question number two descriptive statistics were used followed by Spearman correlations to look for causal attributes. It was appropriate to utilize a Spearman correlation because it is a nonparametric measure of statistical dependence of two variables that assesses how well the relationship between two variables can be described using a monotonic function (Siegel, 1996). To analyze question number three descriptive statistics were used followed by Spearman correlations to look for causal attributes. Question number four was answered using descriptive statistics. For the purpose of answering question number five a two-way analysis of relative frequency was conducted and cross-tabulations of survey question number 8 and question number 9 with survey question number 32D were conducted.

To address research question number six it was necessary to utilize the Kruskal-Wallis test, which is a nonparametric test appropriate for ordinal data, and the Mann-Whitney U test for significant difference between two groups (Norusis, 2005). The Kruskal-Wallis test is used to compare three or more sets of scores that come from different groups (Siegel, 1996). It was appropriate to use the Kruskal-Wallis test because the two following essential assumptions associated with the Kruskal-Wallis test were met: the dependent variable was measured at the ordinal or interval/ratio level and the independent variable(s) consisted of two or more independent groups (Siegel, 1996). The Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U test were conducted on each category (race, age, gender, education background, and leadership preparation). To answer question number seven, descriptive statistics analysis was conducted to examine community college presidents' demographic profile information.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to better understand community college presidents' perceptions of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. The methodology and statistical analysis chosen for this study will help to understand and determine if community college presidents perceive that they are adequately prepared to identify and secure alternate sources of funding needed to compensate for historical reductions in state appropriations.

Finally, this study also seeks to provide valuable insight for those who lead and develop programs designed to produce future community college presidents (grow-your-own programs, graduate level community college leadership programs, AACCC & League of Innovation's Leadership Programs, etc.). Such leadership programs will need to

assure that future community college CEOs are adequately prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This chapter provides an overview of the findings resulting from the study's research questions. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of Community College presidents' perception of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. Through the analysis of the data each of the study's research questions were answered.

Demands and Challenges

1. What are the most significant internal and external time demands and most challenging issues that community college presidents encounter?

This question sought to understand what the most significant internal and external time demands are and the most challenging issues that community college presidents encounter on a daily basis. The tables provided in this section depict the degree to which key constituent groups demand the time and attention of community college presidents. The tables also display the degree to which specific issues challenge community college presidents.

Challenging Issues

The surveyed community college presidents were asked to rate the level of challenges that confront them on a daily basis. Table 4.1 provides a detailed profile of the most challenging issues facing these community college presidents. The survey results revealed that among the multiple challenging issues confronting community college CEOs, the presidents identified fundraising as the most challenging issue by the

greatest percentage. The survey results demonstrated that 85% of community college presidents rated fundraising as an issue that is either challenging or very challenging.

Fundraising was followed by another budget-related challenging issue; 80% of the surveyed community college presidents selected enrollment as being challenging or very challenging. Needless to say, enrollment numbers directly impact the budgets of many public community colleges. Further, 75.6% of the respondents reported legislative advocacy as challenging or very challenging and 73.1% reported community involvement as challenging or very challenging. In addition, 71.6% of presidents rated economic and workforce development as challenging or very challenging.

Among the surveyed CEOs, 62.9% rated faculty relations and 62.2% rated diversity as challenging or very challenging. Further, 51.1% of the surveyed community college presidents rated board relations as not challenging or somewhat challenging and 48.4% stated that board relations were challenging or very challenging. In addition, 46.5% of the presidents rated community involvement as not challenging or somewhat challenging.

Table 4.1
Challenging Issues for Community College Presidents (N=415)

	%Not/Somewhat Challenging	%Challenging/ Very Challenging
Fundraising	14.3	85
Enrollment	19.7	80
Legislative Advocacy	24.3	75.6
Community Involvement	26.9	73.1
Economic and Workforce Dev.	28.5	71.6
Faculty Relations	36.8	62.9
Diversity	37.6	62.2
Board Relations	51.1	48.4

Meetings with Constituents

Community college presidents were asked about the number of meetings they routinely conduct with key constituent groups. Table 4.2 provides an overview of the time demands that various constituents groups command of the community college presidents. The survey findings revealed that presidents met with cabinet-level administrators most frequently. Nearly one out of two presidents reported having conversations with cabinet-level staff members five or more times a week. Approximately 35% of the presidents met with other college staff members five or more times per week and nearly half (48.7%) reported having discussions with other staff members two to five times a week.

About one-fourth of the respondents (25.1%) reported having discussions with business and industry officials five or more times a week and more than half of the community college presidents indicated they conduct discussions with these constituents two to five times per week. Approximately half of the presidents (49.9%) reported conducting discussions with faculty members two to five times per week. In addition, more than half of the presidents reported having conversations with other community college presidents, board members, and other education officials once or less per week.

Table 4.2
Meetings with Constituent Groups (N=415)

Constituent Groups	Once or Less Per Week	2-5 Times Per Week	5+Times Per Week
Cabinet-Level Administrators	7.7	41.2	50.8
Other College Staff	15.4	48.7	25.9
Business/Industry Officials		53.3	25.1
Faculty	32.3	49.8	17.9
Students		42.7	12.3
College Board Members		32.8	7.7
Local, State, or National Elected Officials		34.9	6.5
Other Education Officials		36.4	5.1
Other Community College Presidents		31.3	2.2

Serving on External Boards

Community college presidents were asked about the amount of time that they commit to external corporate boards, college boards, and nonprofit organizations. Table 4.3 highlights the types of external boards on which the surveyed community college presidents participate. The findings illustrated that the majority of community college presidents serve as a member of a board that is external to their college. More specifically, 35.2% of the two-year college presidents serve on a corporate board and 23.6% serve on a college/university board. Among the surveyed presidents 94% reported that they served on external non-profit organizations' boards.

Table 4.3
External Boards Commitments (N= 415)

Variables	Percent
Serve on External Boards	
Other Non-Profit Organizations	94
Corporate	35.2
College or University	23.6

Resource Management Competency

2. Are community college presidents well prepared to provide resource management leadership?

This section examines community college presidents' perceptions of their resource management competencies. Table 4.4 illustrates how the surveyed presidents perceived their preparedness with regards to resource management. The resource management competency consisted of following eight specific skill-sets to: (1) ensure accountability in reporting; (2) support operational decisions by managing information resources; (3) develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan; (4) take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources; (5) implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities; (6) implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff; (7) employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills; and (8) manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.

It should be noted that among the eight resource management competency skills, community college presidents felt least prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking alternative funding. More specifically, only 61% of the respondents perceived

that they were prepared or well prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding.

In contrast, nearly 84% of the surveyed community college presidents felt that they were prepared or well prepared to manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization. Similarly, 82.9% felt that they were prepared or well prepared to employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills, and 83% of the presidents reported that they were prepared or well prepared to ensure accountability in reporting.

Nearly 80% of the respondents believed that they were prepared or well prepared to develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan (79.3%). Approximately 75% of community college presidents reported that they were prepared or well prepared to implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities (77.4%). With regards to implementing a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff, nearly 75% of the participating community college presidents reported that they were prepared or well prepared.

Table 4.4

Perceptions of Resource Management Preparation (N= 415)

Variables	Percent Prepared/ Well-Prepared
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.	83.6
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	82.9
Ensure accountability in reporting.	80.3
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan.	79.3
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.	77.4
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.	74.4
Support operational decisions by managing information resources.	71.4
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.	61.4

The Top Three Most Challenging Constituent Groups

Question 3: Do donors/benefactors present the greatest challenge as a constituent group to community college presidents?

When asked to select the top three constituent groups that present the greatest challenge, the presidents identified legislators/policymakers as the most challenging group (19.7%); faculty were identified as the second-most challenging group (18%); and, donors/benefactors were identified as the third-most challenging group (16.6%). The presidents ranked the remaining constituent groups in the following order: governing board (11.9%), administration/staff (9.6%), media (8.1%), community leaders (7.7%), and students (3.5%). Table 4.5 shows the results in detail.

Table 4.5

Most Challenging Constituent Groups (N= 415)

Constituent Groups that Present Greatest Challenge	Frequency	Percent
Legislator	245	19.7
Faculty	234	18.8
Donor	206	16.6
Governing Board	148	11.9
Administration	119	9.6
Media	101	8.1
Community	96	7.7
Did not respond	50	4
Student	43	3.5

Increased Importance of Resource Management

Question 4: Have community college presidents' perception of the importance of budgetary/financial management, entrepreneurship, and fundraising increased since their first presidency?

Community college presidents were asked to identify the top three areas that have increased in importance since their first presidency. Table 4.6 depicts the areas that have increased the most in importance since the first presidency. The surveyed community college presidents selected from among the following thirteen areas of increased importance since their presidency: board relationships, fundraising, strategic planning, entrepreneurship, accountability, budgetary/financial management, enrollment management, personnel issues, public relations, academic issues, crisis management, diversity, and athletics.

Fundraising was selected by the community college presidents, as the issue that has increased most significantly in importance since their first presidency (16.3%). The

presidents reported accountability as the second area that has increased most significantly in importance (15.5%). Budgetary/financial management was selected as the third area that has increased most significantly in importance (15.5%). The remaining areas of increased importance as identified by the presidents consisted of the following in the order of importance: enrollment management (11.9%), strategic planning (10.1%), crisis management (6.7%), personnel issues (6.0%), board relationships (5.8%), diversity (3.8), public relations (2.0%), academic issues (3.5%), and athletics (1.1%).

Table 4.6

Increased Importance (N= 415)

Increased Level of Importance	Frequency	Percent
Fundraising	203	16.3
Accountability	193	15.5
Budget	166	13.4
Enrollment Management	148	11.9
Strategic Planning	125	10.1
Crisis Management	83	6.7
Personnel Issues	74	6
Governing Board	72	5.8
Entrepreneurship	49	3.9
Diversity	47	3.8
Academic Issues	43	3.5
Public Relations	25	2
Athletics	14	1.1

Transformational Leadership and Alternative Fundraising

Question 5: Do community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders have a more positive perception of their ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources?

This section sought to understand if there is a relationship between community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders and their perceived ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding. Table 4.7 profiles the presidents' perception of their preparation with respect to resource management in relationship to transformational leadership. To answer this research question it was necessary to do a two-way analysis of relative frequency. A cross-tabulation of the ISU *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey* question number 28 with question number 32d as a grouping variable was conducted. The findings indicated that 340 (82.1%) of the 415 respondents consider themselves to be transformational leaders and 68 (17.9%) reported that they do not consider themselves to be transformational leaders.

Of those community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders, 63.8% indicated that they were prepared or very well prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking funding. Only 9.7% did not feel prepared. It should be noted that the 68 presidents who did not identify themselves as transformational leaders have a low perception of their ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

Perception of Preparedness

Question 6: Does the perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources differ by experience, race, age, gender, education background, and leadership preparation?

This question was designed to ascertain if community college presidents' perception of their preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical

alternative funding sources differs by experience, race, gender, education background, and leadership preparation.

Experience

To examine whether community college presidents' perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance differs by the level of experience, a Kruskal-Wallis test was undertaken of responses to the ISU *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey's* question number 32d with question number 4 as a grouping variable. See table 4.8 for detailed findings. The Kruskal-Wallis test is the nonparametric equivalent of a parametric analysis of variance. Using the significance level of .05 ($\alpha=.05$), the traditional value used in educational research, as the criterion for establishing significant difference, the null and alternative hypotheses for this test are as follows:

Ho: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources does not differ by experience.

Ha: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding differs by experience.

The Kruskal-Wallis test statistic is $H= 2.924$. The p -value associated with this statistic is $p=.404$. Since $p > \alpha$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis (we conclude that there are not differences) and conclude there are no statistically significant differences between any two of the groups.

Table 4.8

Experience & Perception of Preparedness to take an Entrepreneurial Stance

	Ranks		Mean Rank
	Q4	N	
Entrepreneurial Stance	1	69	185.08
	2	88	214.91
	3	103	203.86
	4	148	207.81
	Total	408	
Test Statistics ^{a,b}			Q32DP
Chi-Square			2.924
df			3
Asymp. Sig.			0.404

Race

To examine whether community college presidents' perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance differs by race, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted of the ISU *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey's* question number 32d with question number 7 as the grouping variable. Table 4.9 provides an overview of race. The null and alternative hypotheses for this test are as follows:

Ho: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources does not differ by race.

Ha: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding differs by race.

The Kruskal-Wallis test statistic is $H = 16.318$. The p -value associated with this statistic is $p = .006$. Since $p < \alpha$, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude there are

statistically significant differences between at least two of the groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test only tells us that pairwise significant differences exist. Post hoc tests were conducted to determine what pairs are significantly different.

In this case, the appropriate post hoc test is the Mann-Whitney U test with Bonferroni adjustment (Norusis, 2005). The Bonferroni adjustment procedure adjusts the observed significance level by multiplying it by the number of comparisons made. The Bonferroni adjustment means, in this case, that the p -value must be smaller than .0167 to be significantly different.

This test demonstrated the following significant differences. There is a statistically significant difference between Whites and Hispanics ($p = 0.011$). White community college presidents had a greater level of perceived preparedness than Hispanic community college presidents. Yet, the difference between White community college presidents and African American community college presidents was not significant with regard to the level of perceived preparedness. There was a significant difference between American Indians and Blacks ($p = .0160$) and American Indians and Hispanics ($p = .008$).

Table 4.9

Race & Perception of Preparedness to take an Entrepreneurial Stance

Rank			
	Q7	N	Mean Rank
Entrepreneurial Stance	1	9	283
	2	8	143.88
	3	34	178.71
	4	24	154.5
	5	329	208.55
	6	3	311
	Total	407	

Test Statistics ^{a,b}	
	Q32DP
Chi-Square	16.318
<i>df</i>	5
Asymp. Sig.	0.006

Gender

To answer the question, “Does perception of preparedness to take entrepreneurial stance differ by gender?” a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted of the ISU *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey’s* question number 32d with question number 6 as a grouping variable. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to answer this question because it is the nonparametric equivalent of a *t*-test. See Table 4.10 for further details. This test is appropriate for use with ordinal data when testing for significant differences between two groups (Norusis, 2005).

The null and alternative hypotheses for this test are as follows:

Ho: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources does not differ by gender.

Ha: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding differs by gender.

The Mann-Whitney U test statistic is $Z = -1.125$. The p -value associated with this statistic is $p = .261$. Since $p > \alpha$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude there is not a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents.

Table 4.10
Gender & Perception of Preparedness to take an Entrepreneurial Stance

Ranks				
	Q6	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Entrepreneurial Stance	1	274	207.85	56951.5
	2	132	194.47	25669.5
	Total	406		
Test Statistics				
				Q32DP
			Mann-Whitney U	16892
			Wilcoxon W	25670
			Z	-1.125
			Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.261

Leadership Preparation

To examine whether community college presidents' perception of preparedness to take entrepreneurial stance differs by leadership preparation (as defined by whether they participated in a formalized leadership preparation program or not), a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted of the ISU *The Community College Presidency: Demographic and Leadership Preparation Factor Survey's* question number 32d with question number 16 as a grouping variable.

The null and alternative hypotheses for this test are as follows:

H₀: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources does not differ by leadership preparation.

H_a: The perception of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding differs by leadership preparation.

The Mann-Whitney U test statistic is $Z = -1.032$. The p -value associated with this statistic is $p = .302$. Since $p > \alpha$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude there is not a statistically significant difference related to leadership preparation. Overall, an analysis of the data demonstrated that community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders have a more positive perception of their ability to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. Table 4.11 provides a detailed overview.

The data analysis revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference with respect to the perception of community college presidents' preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources by age, gender, education background, and leadership preparation. Yet with the category of race, there appeared to be a significant difference between White and Hispanics community college presidents.

As noted, White community college presidents had a greater level of perceived preparedness than Hispanic community college presidents. In contrast, the difference between White community college presidents and African American community college presidents was not significant concerning the level of perceived preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding.

Table 4.11

Leadership Preparation & Perception of Preparedness to take an Entrepreneurial Stance

Ranks				
	Q16	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Entrepreneurial Stance	1	233	198.55	46261.5
	2	173	210.17	36359.5
	Total	406		

Test Statistics ^a		Q32DP
Mann-Whitney U		19000.5
Wilcoxon W		46261.5
Z		-1.032
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		0.302

Community College President Profile**Question 7: What is the profile of community college presidents by age, gender, and race?**

This question is designed to better understand the general profile of community college presidents with respect to the following demographics: age, gender, and race. Table 4.12 presents a detailed description of the results. Among the surveyed community college presidents, the vast majority were White/Caucasian (80.7%). Black/African American presidents had the second-largest percentage, at a very distant 8.2%, and Hispanic/Latino presidents represented the third-largest percentage, at 5.8% of the respondents. Native Americans constituted 2.2% and Asian/Pacific Islanders constituted 1.9% of the overall total number of community college presidents.

The average age of the surveyed community college presidents was 58 years old. Among the community college presidents 46% were between 50-59 years old and 44% were between 60-69 years old. Overall, the overwhelming majority (90%) of community college presidents in the study sample were between ages 50 and 69 years old.

In terms of gender, the findings demonstrated that of the 415 community college presidents surveyed most (nearly 68%) were males. Female community college presidents represented approximately 32% of the surveyed presidents. The average age of community college presidents when compared by gender differed very little. The average age was 58 years old for both male and female community college presidents.

Table 4.12

Demographics of Community College Presidents (N = 415)

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Current Age</i>	
39 and Under	1
40 - 49	8
50 - 59	46
60 - 69	44
70 and Over	1
<i>Gender</i>	
Female	32
Male	68
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	
Native American	2.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.9
Black/African American	8.2
Hispanic/Latino	5.8
White	80.7
Other	0.7

Summary

Overall, the surveyed community college presidents perceived that they were prepared to provide resource management leadership. However, among the eight resource management sub-competency categories, community college presidents perceived that they were least prepared to identify and secure alternative funding. Many of the public community college presidents perceived that they were not prepared or well prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

Similarly, an analysis of the data identified fundraising as the most challenging issue facing community college presidents. Consistent with this theme, the presidents selected fundraising as the issue that has increased most significantly in importance since their first presidency. Also consistent with this fiscal theme, budgetary/financial management was selected by the community college presidents as the third issue that has increased most significantly in importance.

Furthermore, the presidents selected donors/benefactors as one of the top three constituent groups that present the greatest challenge. The above findings demonstrated that fundraising and budgetary issues are commanding the attention of many of the surveyed public community college presidents.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents key findings, conclusions, implications for policy and practice, relationships to other studies, and implications for future research. The purpose of this study was to better understand community college presidents' perceptions of their preparedness to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding. The results and conclusions of this study are intended to provide useful information for a wide range of individuals, including those who direct university-based community college leadership programs, who coordinate mentoring programs, who have oversight of leader development programs in professional organizations, and who are in charge of grow-your-own leadership programs at community colleges. Such individuals could benefit from this study's findings and insight pertaining to alternative fundraising as a critical competency and vital skill that warrants more attention in leadership curricula.

The results and conclusions of this study are also intended to provide useful information to future and current community college presidents. Future community college presidents can use this study to become better informed and prepared with respect to the necessity of fundraising and the demands of the new fiscal paradigm. Current community college presidents who are not adequately prepared in this domain can use this information as motivation to enhance their alternative fundraising competencies with additional training. Further, they can use this information to better mentor future community college leaders. Governing boards of community colleges can use the results of this study to assure that presidents are encouraged and supported in the process of identifying and securing alternative funding sources. Overall, the findings from this study

provide new insight regarding the necessity of leaders to possess strong competencies in alternative fundraising in the age of the “new norm”.

Demands and Challenges

In order to better understand the issues that confront community college presidents, the first research question that guided this study examined the most significant challenges that community college presidents encounter. The results clearly revealed a fiscal theme. Specifically, the survey results demonstrated that the vast majority of community college presidents identified fundraising as the most difficult issue they face and a challenge they feel unprepared to address. More specifically, identifying and obtaining alternative fundraising was rated as the top concern for community college presidents, as 85% noted that it is challenging or very challenging.

Fundraising was followed by another budget related concern. Among the surveyed community college CEOs 80% indicated that enrollment is challenging or very challenging. This finding is noteworthy because enrollment directly affects the budgets of most public community colleges. Fundraising and enrollment challenges were followed by legislative advocacy as a top challenge, which is also budget-related. Community college presidents’ focus on legislative advocacy speaks to the necessity of advocating for additional state funding and resources. The above findings reveal a funding and fiscal theme with respect to president’s perceived top challenges and concerns.

This study’s findings are consistent with the findings of other studies that examined the most difficult challenges community college presidents encounter. Vaughan and Weisman (1998) identified funding as the paramount challenge confronting

community college presidents. Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) discovered that declining funding support is a paramount challenge for community college presidents. Inside Higher Ed conducted surveys of college presidents in 2011 and 2012. In the most recent Presidential Perspectives Report, community college presidents identified declines in state support, budgetary shortfalls, increased tuition/decreased affordability, and potential cuts in federal student aid as top challenges (Green, 2012).

Each of the above studies consistently illustrates that community college leaders perceive funding to be a paramount challenge and the most important issue that they are facing. The findings of these studies are consistent with the findings of this dissertation. The results of this dissertation contributes to the literature that strongly indicates that future community college presidents must be capable of effectively addressing issues related to declining state appropriations, fiscal management, and alternative fundraising.

Community college leaders need to be equipped with thorough understandings of the various fiscal challenges and alternative funding strategies in order to address the budgetary challenges their campuses face. Aspiring presidents should be aware of these findings and include community college fiscal management and fundraising as areas of focus in their overall professional development plans.

Leadership development programs should include curricula that ensure that future leaders develop working knowledge of community college finance, and that they acquire the abilities to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. Mentors should seek opportunities to directly involve protégés in finance-related work. Furthermore, grow-your-own programs should firmly ensure that future community college presidents have very strong working knowledge of community college finance.

Meetings with Constituents

Community college presidents were asked about the numbers of meetings they routinely conduct with key constituent groups. The majority of presidents reported that they meet most frequently with cabinet-level administrators; these individuals are presidents' first points of contact with regard to institutions' day-to-day operations. Approximately one-third of the presidents indicated that they meet with other college staff members five or more times per week, and roughly half reported having discussions with other staff members two-to-five times per week.

Approximately half of the presidents reported engaging in discussions with faculty members two-to-five times per week. In addition, more than half of the presidents reported having conversations with other community college presidents, board members, and education officials once or less per week. About one-fourth of the presidents reported having discussions with business and industry officials five or more times a week, and more than half of the community college presidents indicated they conduct discussions with these constituents two-to-five times per week.

The above findings demonstrate that the surveyed community college presidents devote most of their time to internal constituent groups. It would appear that as more community college presidents embrace the demands of fundraising, their time spent with business and industry leaders will increase, given that such partnerships can lead to donations, grants, and other forms of alternative funding opportunities. Inevitably, this will reduce the amount of time that the president can devote to managing the day-to-day operations of the campus. Hence, there may be a greater need for a strong secondary

leader to guide the daily operations of the college in the absence of the president.

Typically, the provost occupies such a role at the university level.

Resource Management Preparedness

The second research question that guided this study examined the extent to which community college presidents perceive that they are prepared to provide resource management leadership. The resource management competency consisted of the following eight distinct skill sets (American Association of Community Colleges, 2005): (1) ensure accountability in reporting; (2) support operational decisions by managing information resources; (3) develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan; (4) take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources; (5) implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities; (6) implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff; (7) employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills; and (8) manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.

Overall, the findings indicated that presidents perceived that they were well-prepared to provide leadership for seven of the eight resource management competencies; the one exception was seeking alternative funding sources. Many presidents reported that they did not believe that they were prepared or well-prepared to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. This finding is consistent with the literature and illustrates the fact that historically, the public community college has not engaged in alternative funding. Lanning (as cited in Besikof, 2012) reported that “when

it comes to benefiting from dollars that are raised from donors for postsecondary school, community colleges generate only 2% of the total funds that are raised”.

It is evident that seeking and securing alternative funding will become a larger aspect of community college presidents’ jobs as state and federal funds become more elusive. Consequently, formal community college leadership institutes, community college leadership doctoral programs, mentor programs, and grow-your-own programs need to enhance curricula to include finance and related topics in order to ensure that current and future presidents have opportunities to develop the abilities necessary to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

Increased Importance of Resource Management

The third research question that guided this study examined the extent to which community college presidents perceive that key issues have increased in importance. The surveyed CEOs were asked to consider the 13 key issues and identify the top three areas that have increased in importance the most since their first presidencies: (1) board relationships, (2) crisis management, (3) diversity, (4) fundraising, (5) strategic planning, (6) accountability, (7) budgetary/financial management, (8) enrollment management, (9) personnel issues, (10) public relations, (11) academic issues, (12) entrepreneurship, and (13) athletics.

The majority of college presidents identified fundraising as the issue that has increased most significantly in importance since their first presidencies. This finding is consistent with the fundraising and budgetary theme discussed previously and with other studies (Amey and VanDerLinden, 2002; Chappell, 2009; Fulton-Calkins and Milling, 2005; Glass & Jackson, 1998; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Kenton et al., 2005; Lanning,

2008; McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011; Miller and Pope, 2003; Stanley, 2008). Again, as state funding for community colleges decreases, the importance of fundraising increases, especially as the effects of the “Great Recession” continue to further restrict state support (Fain, 2012a; Fernandez, 2011; Temin, 2010).

Community college presidents identified accountability as the second key issue that has increased in importance since their first presidencies. Accountability has budgetary overtones, given that it is often associated with performance, and performance is often connected to funding in performance-based funding models. As many states’ financial resources continue to dwindle, some legislators appear compelled to link performance/accountability to funding models in order to justify the use of taxpayers’ money.

The presidents selected budgetary/financial management as the third area of increased importance since their first presidencies. This finding is consistent with the fiscal/budgetary theme and demonstrates a growing concern about challenges resulting from historical reductions in state appropriations. This reinforces the fact that those who seek presidencies in the era of the “new norm” must have the skills to generate alternative funding and competently address challenges stemming from budgetary constraints.

Transformational Leadership and Alternative Fundraising

The fourth research question that guided this study was designed to better understand if community college presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders had more positive perceptions of their abilities to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources than presidents who do not view themselves as transformational leaders. The findings illustrated that among the community college

presidents who view themselves as transformational leaders, they had more positive perceptions of their abilities to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. More specifically, those individuals indicated that they were prepared or very well-prepared to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking alternative funding sources.

In contrast, the presidents who do not identify as transformational leaders reported low perceptions of their abilities to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. These findings suggest that there is compatibility between transformational leadership and exhibiting competency in taking entrepreneurial stances in seeking alternative funding. These findings are also consistent with the literature that posits that transformational leadership is the ideal leadership model to confront the demands and challenges of “new norm” (Kent, 2012; Rouche, et al., 1989). AACC (2005) recognized the relevance and value of the transformational leadership model and grounded its six community college leadership competencies in the framework of transformational leadership as defined by Rouche, et al. (1989).

Preparedness and Background

The fifth research question that guided this study sought to determine if perceptions of preparedness among community college presidents to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources differed by experience, race, gender, educational background, and/or leadership preparation. The findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between any of the groups in terms of experience, gender, or leadership preparation. However, with regard to race, there was

a statistically significant difference between White and Hispanic community college presidents.

White presidents had greater levels of perceived preparedness than Hispanic presidents. There were no significant differences between White and African American presidents. Yet there was a significant difference between American Indian and African American presidents, and between American Indian and Hispanic presidents, albeit the numbers are relatively small. These findings are beneficial to formal leadership academies, grow-your-own programs, mentors, and graduate-level community college leadership programs that prepare future community college CEOs. Such programs can use this information as an incentive to provide additional alternative funding training to various groups, as needed.

Community College President Profile

The sixth research question that guided this study established a general demographic profile of community college presidents by age, gender, and race.

Age

The average age of the surveyed community college presidents was 58 years. Forty-six percent of the community college presidents were between 50-59 years old and 44% were between ages 60-69 years old of age. Overall, 90% of community college CEOs in the study sample were between ages 50-69 years old. The average age of community college presidents when compared by gender differed very little. The average age was 58 years old for both male and female community college presidents. The average age among the white presidents was 58 years old. Presidents of color were

slightly younger. The average age of the minority presidents who participated in the study was 55 years old.

It should be noted, that other studies show that the average age of community college presidents has consistently increased during the past several decades. In 1984 the average age of community college presidents was 51 years old. In 1996 the average age of a community college president was 54 years old. By 2006 the average age of community college presidents was 56 years old (Weisman and Vaughan, 2007). Currently, AACC (2013) is reporting that the average age of community college presidents has increased to 60.

Furthermore, AACC (2013) has reported that currently the majority of community college presidents are between ages 55-59. The second largest percentage of community college presidents is between ages 60 – 64. The third largest percentage of community college presidents is between ages 50-54. The fourth largest percentage of community college presidents is 65 years of age or older and the smallest population is 50 of age or younger. Given the consistent aging of CEOs for several decades, it is not surprising that a massive exodus of seasoned community college is imminent.

Gender

With respect to gender, males constituted the vast majority of the community college presidents surveyed, at 70%. Nevertheless, during the past several years the number of women community college presidents has increased. From 1991 to 2006, the rate of women community college presidents grew from 11% - 29% (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007).

There was approximately a 20% increase in the number of female community college presidents between the years 1991-2006. Yet, the growth in the number of female community college presidents has slowed considerably since 2006 and it appears that the gender balance progression may have reached a peak. In fact, the most current AACC's figures show a decline by 1% in the number of female community college presidents since 2006 (AACC, 2013).

The flat-line of the number of female presidents is disappointing given that the public community college's has fostered an image of being a "democratizing" higher education institution that embraces and promotes diversity. Yet, the number of females that occupy the chief executive officer position does not remotely reflect the predominantly female student population. Female community college students make up over 60% of the entire student body (AACC, 2013; Knapp, et al., 2007).

Consequently, leadership programs need to improve their recruitment of potential female presidents and foster their development. Such organizations should seek to create opportunities that will assist with the advancement of qualified female applicants to the presidency. In addition, community college advocates need to actively promote the elimination of gender-biased barriers.

Race

The overwhelming majority of community college presidents that responded to the survey were White/Caucasian (80.7%). The remaining 19.3% of community college presidents consisted of the following race/ethnicity groups: 8.2% were Black/African American, 5.8% were Hispanic/Latino, 2.2% were Native American, and 1.9% were Asian/Pacific Islander. These findings are consistent with other studies.

In 1998 Vaughan and Weisman reported the race/ethnicity profile of community college president as 85.6% Caucasian, 5.2% African American, 4.9% Hispanic, 1.9% Native American, and 1.5% Asian American. Currently, AACC is reporting that White/Caucasians constitute 81%, African Americans make up 8%, Hispanic Americans constitute 6%, Native Americans make up 3% and Asian Americans consist of 1% of the community college presidents (AACC, 2013).

Since 1998 the number of White community college presidents has declined by 4.6 % and the number of African American presidents has increased by 2.8%. The number of Hispanic American presidents has increased by 4.1% and both Native American and Asian American presidents have increased by 2%. While there have been some advances in the number of community college presidents of colors, these numbers represent only meager growth. This lack of significant increase with regards to the number of minority presidents should be of concern, given that the lack of diversity at the president level is not representative of the race/ethnicity makeup of the community college student population.

According to the AACC (2013) more than one-third of all community college students are students of color, yet less than 20% of the community college presidents are of color. Rendon (1999) argued that adding diversity to the community college presidency would provide positive role models for underrepresented students, thus enhancing their self-image and reinforcing the premise that they too can achieve. Rendon, also posited that one of the indicators that a higher education institution is truly committed to diversity is when its faculty, staff and senior administration are

representative of various cultures, races and ethnicities that make-up the student body (1999).

It is imperative that America's community college presidents begin to better reflect the student body and the changing demographics of the nation. Further, community college systems, professional organizations, formal leadership academies, grow-your-own leadership programs, and graduate level community college leadership programs need to improve their recruitment of potential minority presidents and foster their development. Such groups should seek to diligently create and advocate for opportunities that advance qualified minorities to the community college presidency.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Several studies and recommendations have been developed based on the results of *The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey* completed by 415 community college presidents. Duree (2007) recommended that future community college presidents complete terminal degrees before attempting to pursue the presidency. Duree also recommended that aspiring presidents participate in leadership academies outside of formal education and in conferences and seminars specifically intended to prepare future leaders in the AACC competencies.

Stubbe (2008) and Schmitz (2008) recommended that aspiring community college presidents complete doctoral degrees with emphases on community college leadership. Findings from this study contribute to the previous studies resulting from *The Community College Presidency: Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey* and emphasize the necessity for formal leadership programs, grow-your-own leadership programs, and university community college leadership programs to place greater

emphasis on preparing future community college presidents to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding.

As a result, leadership programs need to expose current and aspiring community college presidents to specific alternative funding strategies, such as bond campaigns, local bond measures, donor-based funding, planned giving, capital and comprehensive campaign planning, innovative finance, entrepreneurial opportunities, tax payer-based funding, employee giving, alumni giving, public/private partnerships donor cultivation and stewardship, alumni relations, college foundations, international education, corporate training partnerships, auxiliary services, establishing development and grant offices, and differential tuition and fees (Carroll & de los Santos, 2010; Friedel & Thomas, 2013).

Again, such strategies are needed to generate alternative funding in order to compensate for reductions in state support. It should be noted that this study also recommends that current and future community college presidents seek to preserve student access. The literature highlights that many public community college rely primarily on increasing student tuition and fees in order to compensate for reductions in state appropriations (Ashford, 2012; Bradley, 2013; Choitz, 2010; D'Amico et al., 2012; Fain, 2011a; Gonzales, 2011; Martinez & Luz, 2012; Mitchell, 2008; Rivera, 2012; Whissemore, 2013). Ultimately, this practice threatens access for students who depend on public community colleges as their sole points of entry into higher education. Consequently, the necessity of community college presidents to identify and secure alternative funding is more important than ever before.

This study also recommends that future community college presidents do not exclusively rely on formal leadership programs, grow-your-own leadership programs,

mentorships, or community college leadership doctoral programs to provide all the necessary skills required of effective presidents. Individuals must recognize that leadership and essential competencies can be learned and refined. As a result, aspiring CEOs should embrace a commitment to lifelong learning and seek professional development opportunities.

Another recommendation resulting from this study is that community college presidents become more representative of community college students. The community college's historical commitment to open access attracts a wide variety of students, especially students of color. As the number of minorities living in the U.S. continues to increase, the public community college can anticipate that the more minority students will seek access. Students of color currently make up 36% of all community college students yet only 20% of the community college presidents are persons of color (AACC, 2013). Closing this gap should be a priority for current community college leaders, including boards of trustees and hiring committees, as well as formal leadership programs, grow-your-own leadership programs, mentorships, and graduate level community college leadership programs.

Similarly, females constitute nearly 60% of community college student enrollments, yet only 32% of community college presidents are female. This is also a large gap of disparity that needs to be addressed. Romano, Townsend, and Mamiseishvili (2009) discovered that more than 60% of graduate students enrolled in community college leadership programs were female. The number of females in higher education doctoral programs is encouraging, and should eventually help to increase the number of female presidents (Moore, Martorana, & Twombly, 2006).

Romano et al. (2009) found that the overwhelming majority (70%) of students enrolled in graduate programs emphasizing community college leadership were White. Romano et al. also reported that Hispanics make up 36% of community college student enrollment but only account for 9% of the students enrolled in graduate programs preparing the next generation of community college leaders. Hence, while the community college presidential pipeline looks somewhat encouraging for females, it is not as encouraging for persons of color. Consequently, efforts to enroll more minorities into community college leadership doctoral programs should be emphasized. Based on the findings of previous studies and this study, it is very apparent that community college advocates and leaders need to be proactive with respect to eliminating racial and gender disparity and barriers and creating opportunities to increase the number of female and minority community college presidents.

Future Research

This study emphasizes that alternative fundraising is the most challenging issue facing community college presidents. Community college presidents reported that they were not adequately prepared to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding sources. Further studies could examine why community college presidents reported that they were not adequately prepared to function as a fundraiser. In addition, research should be conducted on graduates of higher education programs that specialize in preparing community college presidents. In a study of doctoral students enrolled in community college leadership programs, Romano et al. (2009) discovered that 51.7% of the respondents said that they were not aware of the AACC *Competencies for Community College Leaders*.

Follow-up studies on graduates of community college-focused doctoral programs would help determine if program curricula effectively address the leadership skills and competencies required of aspiring community college leaders. Since the majority of students in university community college leadership programs want to seek administrative positions, it is imperative that these programs teach the critical skills needed to become successful community college presidents. As noted, university community college leadership programs are especially important given that 70% of community college presidents have a doctoral degree in education (Friedel, 2010).

Consequently, university community college leadership doctoral programs must play a pivotal role in adequately preparing the next generation of presidents to effectively respond to the major trends currently having an impact on public community colleges (Friedel, 2010). Furthermore, research that examines the characteristics that constitute successful graduate community college leadership programs would be beneficial given the important role that such programs play in preparing the next generation of community college presidents.

Similar research should be conducted on formal leadership programs sponsored by professional organizations (AACC, League of Innovation, etc.) to determine how effectively these programs are preparing the next cadre of community college presidents. In addition, some community colleges are currently utilizing alternative fundraising strategies. There is a need to research the various types of strategies currently being used by public community colleges and determine which of these strategies are proving to be most and least effective for community college leaders. Such insight would be extremely

beneficial to community colleges that are pondering utilizing alternative funding strategies (Fain, 2012b; Friedel & Thomas, 2013).

Public community colleges that are exploring potential alternative funding models could learn from the “trials and errors” experiences of other community colleges. Also, research should be conducted specifically on community colleges’ utilization or lack of utilization of development offices, grant offices, and foundation boards. More specifically, research should examine various models of foundation boards, such as college-based and statewide foundation boards, as found in California and Kentucky.

In addition, future research should closely examine how alternative funding challenges vary among urban, suburban, and rural community colleges. Needless to say, the rural public community colleges encounter a very unique set of budgetary challenges (Katsinas et al., 2011). Further, research should also be conducted on women and persons of color pursuing the community college presidency. As noted, the majority of graduate students enrolled in community college leadership doctoral programs are White.

Therefore, the prospects increasing the future representation of minorities in the role of community college presidents is currently limited and although females have a stronger presence in graduate programs, they still represent a relatively small percentage of the current community college presidents. Additional research needs to be conducted on identifying the various barriers that prohibit women and minorities from obtaining the community college presidency.

Conclusion

In many cases community colleges will continue to be the only opportunity for higher education obtainment for numerous students. Nevertheless, the public community

college capacity to meet the needs of such students is being challenged. The overall collapse of the economy has had an adverse impact on the community college's ability to be all things to all people. It is very evident that the public community college has faced a greater degree of fiscal hardship than any other branch of American higher education. The community college has encountered a complex assortment of challenges.

During the last decade the community college has endured historical reductions in state appropriations, while at the same time experiencing record-breaking enrollment growth and increased performance expectations. These combined factors have created unprecedented challenges for community college presidents. As noted previously many economist, political figures, higher education scholars, and community college leaders believe that the current challenging fiscal conditions will persist for many years to come and some even predict that these economic conditions are permanent or the "new norm". As a result of this new daunting fiscal paradigm, it projected that the role of the community college president will become increasingly more complex and demanding.

The millennial community college presidency will require a stronger competency in resource management. More specifically, the modern community college presidency must place greater emphasis on the ability to identify and secure alternative funding in order to compensate for continuous reductions in state appropriations. Yet, this dissertation and other studies have illustrated that presently most community college presidents do not perceive that they are adequately prepared to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking and securing alternative funding sources. Consequently, many community colleges have opted to routinely increase tuition and/or fees in order to compensate for the consistent loss of state appropriations.

As a result, formal leadership programs, grow-your-own leadership programs, and university community college leadership doctoral programs must place greater focus on adequately preparing future community college presidents to take entrepreneurial stances in seeking ethical alternative funding. Such skills are now required for public community college presidents to effectively lead and transform their institutions during the era of the “new norm”.

APPENDIX A

American Association of Community Colleges:
Competencies for Community College Leaders (2005)

Organizational Strategy

- Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to improve the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.
- Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders to solve problems, make decisions, and plan strategically.
- Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization, to changing demographics, and to the economic, political, and public health needs of students and the community.
- Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.
- Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources.
- Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.

Resource Management

- Ensure accountability in reporting.
- Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of supporting systems and databases.
- Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies.
- Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.

- Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.
- Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.
- Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegations skills.
- Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long term viability of the organization.

Communication

- Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences, appropriately matching message to audience.
- Disseminate and support policies and strategies.
- Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.
- Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies.
- Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, and act.
- Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.

Collaboration

- Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.
- Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.
- Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.

- Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance mission, vision, and goals of the community college.
- Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.
- Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.
- Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.
- Facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.

Community College Advocacy

- Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.
- Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college, seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.
- Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.
- Advance lifelong learning and support a learner-centered environment.
- Represent the community college in the local community, in the broader educational community, at various levels of government, and as a model of higher education that can be replicated in international settings.

Professionalism

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

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

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

The Community College Presidency:
Demographics and Leadership Preparation Factors Survey

Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey.

- Please use the User name and Password that appear in the letter and/or e-mail that you received from Iowa State University to enter the survey.
- Click on the **Continue** button at the end of each section to proceed. You may have to scroll down to see the continue button on some screens.
- Click on the **Final Submit** button at the end of the survey to submit your final answers.

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

Click on the Start button to start the survey.

Start

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

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

Your Professional and Personal Information

1. Current position/leadership title:

- President
- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor
- Other

If other, please explain below.



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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

3. Number of years in your present position:

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

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

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

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

5b. Current age: _____

6. Gender: Male
 Female

7. Race/Ethnicity:

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

8. Current marital status:

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

Your Career Pathways

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

11. Have you ever taught in a community college?

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

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

- Community College
- Other higher education
- Not currently teaching
- Other

If other, please explain below.

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

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

If other reasons, please explain below.

Your Educational Background

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

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

If other, please explain below.

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

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

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

Leadership Preparation

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

Yes

No

If yes, please list these formal leadership preparation programs below.

--

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

Yes

No

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

	Not Important			Very Important
a. Graduate program cohort	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Graduate program faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Previous co-workers at community colleges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Social networks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Business networks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Yes

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

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

During undergraduate studies

During graduate studies

During first 5 years of career

During second 5 years of career

Other

- 19c. Was your mentor-protégé relationship formal or informal?
- Formal
 - Informal
- 19d. Did you approach your mentor or did your mentor approach you to establish the mentor-protégé relationship?
- Approached mentor
 - Was approached by mentor
- 19e. Was your mentor-protégé relationship developed within the academic setting of a graduate program or within the professional setting of community college employment?
- During graduate program
 - During Community College employment
 - Both
 - Somewhere else
- 19f. Did you participate in more than one mentor-protégé relationship as a protégé?
- Yes
 - No
- 19g. Please indicate the number of mentors you have had by gender.
- _____Female mentors
_____Male mentors
- 20a. Have you or are you mentoring a potential community college leader?
- Yes, informally mentoring
 - Yes, formally mentoring
 - No
- 20b. Please indicate the number of persons you have mentored by gender.
- _____Females mentored
_____Males mentored
21. **After** assuming your first presidency, did you participate in any formalized leadership preparation programs?
- Yes
 - No
- If yes, please list these formal leadership preparation programs below.
-
- 22a. Does your community college participate in a “grow your own leadership” (GYOL) program?

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

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

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

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

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

Faculty, Staff, & Public Relations

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

- _____ Corporate
- _____ College or university
- _____ Other nonprofit organizations

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

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

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

	Not Challenging			Very Challenging
--	------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

Faculty Relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Board relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fundraising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Legislative Advocacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Economic & workforce development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

28. Do you consider yourself a transformational leader?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

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

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Research and Publications

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

Book reviews published

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

Articles published

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

Monographs or books published

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

Chapters contributed

Competencies for Community College Leaders

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

31. Organizational Strategy

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

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

32. Resource Management

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

Ensure accountability in reporting.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Support operational decisions by managing information resources.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Develop and manage resources consistent with the college master plan.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Implement a human resources system that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0

33. Communication

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

Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Disseminate and support policies and strategies.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Create and maintain open communication regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Effectively convey ideas and information to all constituents.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Listen actively to understand, analyze, engage, and act.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0

34. Collaboration

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

Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Demonstrate cultural competence in a global society.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Involve students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Establish networks and partnerships to advance the mission of the community college.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Work effectively and diplomatically with legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0

35. Community College Advocacy

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

Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Demonstrate commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Advance lifelong learning and support a learning-centered environment.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Represent the community college in a variety of settings as a model of higher education.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0

36. Professionalism

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

Demonstrate transformational leadership.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Demonstrate an understanding of the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Regularly self assess one's own performance using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Support lifelong learning for self and others.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0
Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publications.	Preparation	0	0	0	0
	Importance	0	0	0	0

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

- Very well prepared
- Moderately well prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Unprepared

38. How would you rate your current job satisfaction?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

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

Leader A: _____ Institution:

Leader B: _____ Institution:

Leader C: _____ Institution:

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

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

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies for community college leaders*. [Brochure]. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2012). *Reclaiming the American dream: Community colleges and the nation's future*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/aboutcc/21stcenturyreport/21stCenturyReport.pdf>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2013). *American association of community colleges facts 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx>
- American Council on Education. (2007). *The American college president (20th anniversary)*. Washington, DC.
- Amey, M. J. (2006). *Breaking tradition: New community college leadership programs meet 21st century needs*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *The institutional context of community college administration*. Research Brief Leadership Series, No. 4, AACC-RB-02-3. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. F. (2002). Perspectives on community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of Leadership and Practice*, 26, 573–589.
- Asford, E. (2012). *Some community colleges are prioritizing enrollment*. *The Community College Times*. Retrieved from <http://choronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10b02801.htm>.

- Asimov, N. (2012). *Budget cuts hit community colleges hard*. *The Community College Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/Budget-cuts-hit-community-colleges-hard-3826137.php#ixzz26eoz4fBv>
- Askin, J. A. (2007). Community college mission: Resources make a difference. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 977-997.
- Bailey, T. (2012). *Equity and community colleges*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/EquityCommunity-Colleges/132643/>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231-272.
- Bennis, W. (1989). Why leaders can't lead. *Training and Development Journal*, 43(4), 35-39.
- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (2003). *Learning to lead* (3rd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Besikof, R. (2012). *The role of the community college president in fundraising: A best practices study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Boggs, G. R. (2003). *Leadership context for the twenty-first century*. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (123), 15-25.
- Boggs, G. R. (2011). *The American community college: From access to success*. *About Campus*, May-June.

- Bradley, P. (2013a). *Shut out: New federal rules excluding cc students from pell grant program. Community College Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccweek.com/news/templates/template.aspx?articleid=3410&zoneid=7>
- Bradley, P. (2013b). *Foundation building: Colleges look to voluntary giving to fill funding gaps. Community College Week*.
- Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review*, 30(1).
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Rowe.
- Bumphus, W. (2012). *Best still ahead for colleges after challenging 2012. Community College Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccweek.com/news/articlefiles/3357-CCW122412-AllPages2.pdf>
- Carroll, C. & de los Santos, G. (2010). *Alternative funding for community colleges*. Phoenix: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Chappell, C. (2009). *Fundraising challenges in a down economy. Community College Times*. Retrieved from, <http://aacc.modernsignal.net/article.cfm?ArticleId=1628>
- Choitz, V. (2010) *State community college funding strategies that benefit low income, lower skilled students. Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)*. Retrieved from <http://www.clasp.org/postsecondary/publication?id=0829&list=publications>
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- College Board (2012). *Trends in student aid*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from, <http://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/student-aid-2012-full-report-130201.pdf>
- D'Amico, M., Katsinas, S. & Friedel, J. (2012). The new norm: community colleges to deal with recessionary fallout. *Journal of Community College Research and Practice (C CJRP)*, 36(8), 626-631.
- Desrochers, D. M., & Kirshstein, R. (2012). *College spending in a turbulent decade: Findings from the delta cost project*. Washington, DC: Delta Project on Postsecondary Education Costs, Productivity, and Accountability. Retrieved from <http://www.deltacostproject.org>
- Dowd, A. C., & Grant, J. L. (2006). Equity and efficiency of community college appropriations: The role of local financing. *Review of Higher Education*, 29(2), 167-194.
- Dougherty, K., Rebecca S. N; Rachel, Bork, Sosanya M. Jones, & Blanca E. Vega. (2011). *The politics of performance funding in eight states: Origins, demise, and change. Final report to Lumina foundation*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from, <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=875>
- Duree, C. (2007). *The challenges of the community college presidency in the new millennium: Pathways, preparation, competencies, and leadership programs needed to survive*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames.

- Fain, P. (2012a). *State budget cuts make completion goals difficult for community colleges. Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/12/08/state-budget-cuts-make-completion-goals-difficult-community-colleges>
- Fain, P. (2012b). *Tuition model quietly spreading. Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/04/09/differential-tuition-grows-popularity-even-community-colleges#ixzz1rYIncFn0>
- Fernandez, K. (2011). *Finding new funding streams in hard times. Community College Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.communitycollegetimes.com/Pages/Funding/Finding-new-funding-streams-in-the-face-of-budget-cuts.aspx>
- Friedel, J. (2010). University-based community college leadership programs: where future community college leaders are prepared. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 149,51-58.
- Friedel, J. & Thomas, G. (2013). Differential tuition: A community college budgetary strategy. *Journal of Community College Research and Practice*, Special Issue, 37(3), 147-152. (Peer-reviewed). Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/P7iHfR3ErlevqffyQwtk/full>
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2006). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 233–250.

- Glass, J. C. Jr., & Jackson, K. L. (1998). A new role for community college presidents: Private fundraiser and development team leader. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 22(6), 575.
- Gonzalez, J. (2012). *As government support shrinks, community colleges may start looking more like private institutions. The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Community-Colleges-May/131636/>
- Green, K. (2012). *Presidential perspectives: The 2012 Inside higher ed survey of college and university presidents. Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/download/?file=2012IHEpresidentssurvey.pdf
- Guthrie, J. (2001). Been there; done that: Life after the presidency. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 243-250.
- Harmon, R., & MacAllum, K. (2003). *Documented characteristics of labor market-responsive community colleges and a review of supporting literature.* U.S. Department of Education – Office of Vocational and Adult Education. Rockville, MD: Westat & Washington, DC: The Academy of Educational Development.
- Heller, D. E. (2006). *State support of higher education: Past, past, and future.* In D.M. Priest & E.P. St. John (Eds.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press
- Hockaday, J., & Puyear, D. (2000). *Community college leadership in the new millennium.* New Expeditions Issues Paper No. 8. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Hudson, D. (2008). *A policy analysis of community college funding in Texas.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Austin.

- Hunt, P.C. (2012). *Development for academic leaders: A practical guide for fundraising success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics & Methodology. (2007). *A survey of community college presidents methodology report*.
- Jenkins, L.W. & Glass, J.E., Jr. (1999). Inception, growth, and development of a community college foundation: Lessons to be learned. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23(6), 593-612.
- Katsinas, S. G., D'Amico, M. M., & Friedel, J. N. (2011). *Access and funding in public higher education—the 2011 national survey* (Research Report). Tuscaloosa, AL: Education Policy Center, University of Alabama.
- Katsinas, S., & Tollefson, T., (February 2008). *State funding for community colleges: Perceptions from the field*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Kelderman, E. (2011). *As states funds dry up, many community colleges rely more on tuition than on taxes to get by*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/As-State-Funds-Dry-Up/126240/>
- Kelderman, E. (2012). *States push even further to cut spending on colleges*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://choronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10b02801.htm>.
- Kenton, C., Huba, M., Schuh, J., & Shelley, M., (2005). Financing community colleges: A longitudinal study of 11 states. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 109-122.

- Kezar, A., Carducci, R. & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the “L” word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 31(6). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Academic administrator’s guide to exemplary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., Whitmore, R. W., & Miller, E. (2007). *Enrollment in postsecondary institutions, fall 2005: graduation rates, 1999 and 2002 cohorts; and financial statistics, fiscal year 2005* (NCES 2007-154). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007154>.
- Kubala, T. S., & Bailey, G. M. (2001). A new perspective on community college presidents: Results of a national study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 793–804.
- Lanning, P. (2008). *Community colleges must step up their fund raising*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10b02801.htm>.
- Locke, M. G., & Guglielmino, L. (2006). The influence of subcultures on planned change in a community college. *Community College Review*, 34(2), 108–126.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- McFarlin, C. H., Crittenden, B. J., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). Background factors common among outstanding community college presidents. *Community College Review*, 27(3), 19–31.

- McNair, D.E., Duree, C., & Ebbers, L.H. (2011). If I knew then what I know now: using the leadership competencies developed by the American association of community colleges to prepare community college presidents. *Community College Review*. January 2011 39: 3-25.
- Martinez, K. & Luz, J. (2012). *Survey of California's community colleges reveals harmful impact of budget cuts*. World Socialist Web Site. Retrieved from, <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2012/09/cali-s14.html>.
- Medsker, L.L. (1956). *Financing public junior college operations*. In N.B. Henry (Ed.), *The public junior college*. The Fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, M. T., & Pope, M. C. (2003). Faculty senate leadership as a presidential pathway: Clear passage or caught in the maze? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 119–129.
- Moore, K., Martorana, S., and Twombly, S. 1985. *Today's academic leaders: A national study of administrators in two-year colleges*. University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education.
- Moltz, D. (2010). *The new community college tuition hike*. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/10/26/tuition#ixzz1wNr89DYw>
- Mullin, C. M. (2010). *Doing more with less: The inequitable funding of community colleges* (Policy Brief 2010-03PBL). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

- Mullin, C. M. & Honeyman, D. (2008). *The funding of community college: Formula & Governance. Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32 (9–10), 512–524.
- Myers, L.M., Fountain, B.E., & Tollefson, T.A. (Eds). (1989). *Community colleges in the United States: Forty-nine state systems (pp. 18-28)*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Norusis, M.J. (2005), *SPSS 13.0 guide to data analysis*, New Jersey Prentice Hall.
- Palmer, J. C. (Ed.). (2012). *Grapevine: An annual compilation of data on state fiscal support for higher education, fiscal year 2011-2012*. Normal, IL: Center for the Study of Education Policy, Illinois State University. Retrieved from <http://grapevine.illinoisstate.edu/>
- Paneitz, B. (2005). *Observations from a new president: Year two. League for Innovation Leadership Abstracts*, 18(9). Retrieved from www.league.org/publications/leadership
- Pederson, R. (2005). *Conflicting interests in the funding of early two-year college. New Directions for Community Colleges*, 132, 5-17.
- Phillippe, K. (2012). *Most community college CEOs to retire within a decade. The Community College Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.communitycollegetimes.com/Pages/Campus-Issues/Most-community-college-CEOs-to-retire-within-a-decade.aspx>
- Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, Fall(123), 93-99

- Rendon, L. I. (1999). *Toward a new vision of the multicultural community college for the next century*. In K. M. Shaw, J. R. Valadez, & R. A. Rhoads (Eds.), *Community colleges as cultural texts: Qualitative explorations of organizational and student culture*. (pp.195-204).
- Rivera, C. (2012). *Community colleges chief decries budget cuts take toll on students*. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/25/local/la-me-college-chancellor-20120325>
- Romano, R. M. (2005a). Privatizing the community college. *Community College Journal*, 75(5), 22-26.
- Romano, R. M. (2005b). Seeking the proper balance between tuition, state support, and local revenues: An economic perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 132, 33-42.
- Romano, R. M., Townsend, B., & Mamiseishvili, K. (2009). Leaders in the making: Profile and perceptions of students in community college doctoral programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(3), 309–320.
- Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community colleges*. Washington DC: Community College Press.
- Schmitz, G. R. (2008). *Leadership preparation and career pathways of community college presidents*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames.
- Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. American Association of Community Colleges, Washington, DC.

- Siegel, A. M. (1996). *Statistics and data analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Stanley, P. (2008, October). *Lessons from a 2 year college 'master class*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://choronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10b02301.htm>
- Stubbe, A. F. (2008). *The community college presidency in the new millennium: Gender differences in leadership preparation*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames, IA.
- Sutin, S. E., Derrico, D., Raby, R.L., & Valeau, E.J. (2011). *Increasing effectiveness of the community college financial model: A global perspective for the global economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Temin, P. (2010). *The Great Recession and the Great Depression*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15645>
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. U.S.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tierney, W.G. (1991). *Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials*. In M.W. Peterson (Eds.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (4th ed.) (pp. 126-139). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Tollefson, T. A. (2009). Community college governance, funding, and accountability: A century of issues and trends. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33: 386–402.
- Vaughan, G. B., & Weisman, I. M. (1998). *The community college presidency at the millennium*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

- Vaughan, G. B. (2000). *Balancing the presidential seesaw: Case studies in community college leadership*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Watkins, T. C. (2000). Public community college revenues, 1989-1994. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24(2), 95–106.
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2002). *The community college presidency, 2001*. (Report No. AACC-RB-02-1; AACC Ser-3) American Association of Community Colleges, Washington, DC: Author.
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2007). A profile of community college presidents. [Special issue]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Oct 27, 2006, p. B16.
- Whissemore, T., (2013). Delta cost project says community colleges among the hardest hit by the recession. *Community College Journal*.
- Wildavsky, A. (1964). *The politics of the budgetary process*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Witt, A.F., Wattenbarger, J.L., Gollattscheck, J.F., & Suppiger, J.E. (1994). *America's community colleges: The first century*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Zirkle, C., & Cotton, S. (2001). Where will future leadership come from? On the status of career and technical education administration. *Technology Education*. Dec., 15–18.