COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PREPARATION:
NEEDS, PERCEPTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Linda Brown

ABSTRACT

There is considerable discussion about the purpose, efficacy, and relevancy of higher education doctoral programs and the preparedness of future community college administrators (Hankin, 1996; Keim, 1994; Mason & Townsend, 1988; Palmer & Katsinas, 1996). Several questions surface when leadership needs and doctoral preparation programs are juxtapositioned.   Are the criteria for program development on which community college doctoral leadership programs were founded still relevant considering the multiple and varied skills required of current leaders? Is there a clear understanding of the skills necessary for effective community college leadership? Are doctoral students who will be assuming community college leadership positions learning those skills?

Results of a random survey, administered in 2001, of 128 community college instructional leaders, provide an assessment of the skills currently needed for effective community college instructional leadership and recommendations for community college leadership preparation. Community college instructional leaders (Instructional Vice Presidents and Chief Academic Officers) rated 48 skills and areas of expertise in terms of (a) the importance and need of each skill in effectively fulfilling their leadership roles (b) the emphasis of each skill in their doctoral programs of study, and (c) their recommendations regarding the inclusion of each leadership skill in doctoral coursework. The results of this survey of instructional leaders serve as a needs

assessment for (a) higher education leadership program professors and program developers, (b) community college administrators, hiring committees, and staff development coordinators, (c) leadership training academy and conference coordinators, and (d) prospective doctoral students.

Survey results suggest that respondents recommend a different emphasis in doctoral coursework than they experienced in their doctoral programs of study. Communication skills, for example, were consistently identified as needed for effective leadership and recommended for inclusion in doctoral coursework, yet underemphasized, in doctoral coursework.

Introduction

A doctoral degree is considered a passport to community college leadership (Townsend, 1996). In 1990, Townsend and Wiese reported that 38% of senior community college administrators had a doctorate in higher education. A survey of community college academic officers administered by Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo, in 1997, revealed that 49% of the respondents with a doctorate had one in higher education. Green (1988) notes that another factor that supports the need for quality doctoral program preparation is the fact that higher education institutions have a lack of interest in developing administrative leadership; institutions have paid little systematic attention to developing their own leaders.

While leadership training is clearly needed, a review of the literature reflects questions about the relevancy of a higher education degree and the preparedness of graduates of higher education programs of study (Green, 1988; Hankin, 1996; Keim,

1994; Mason & Townsend, 1988; Palmer & Katsinas, 1996). Young (1996) claimed that the challenge of providing administrative leadership for two-year colleges exists in a vastly different milieu than that of the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s and that it may be time for a thorough assessment of manpower supply and demand and of the attributes needed by effective two-year college leaders. He added that the types of persons and the skills required to maintain and improve an institution might be somewhat different from the skills required to establish and develop new institutions.

A review of literature reveals little documentation of research related to the specific responsibilities of community college instructional leaders. Additionally, although the literature reveals that the roles and responsibilities of community college leaders have changed over a period of 30 years, there is no documentation of the restructuring of university higher education leadership programs to prepare students for these new community college leadership positions. Furthermore, there is documentation of dissatisfaction on the part of graduate level education program alumni (Mason & Townsend, 1988).

Future college leaders need a multicultural perspective of leadership that includes a sensitivity to diverse sense-making and decision-making strategies, an understanding of organizations as cultures with symbolic dimensions (Gibson-Benninger, Ratcliff & Rhoads, 1996) and a balance between theory and practice that includes concept application, reflection, and how the past can provide an understanding of the future (Hankin, 1996). Leadership curriculum must include and reflect an awareness and acknowledgement of how race, ethnicity, gender, and social class affect

individuals' experiences and perceptions and that these factors also affect the perceptions of community college leaders (Townsend, 1996).

Professors in community college administration programs need to reexamine the leadership models they present, with sensitivity to cultural biases, and their programs need to reflect new management and leadership models that include the new scholarship about women and minorities, not only the "traditional models designed by and for white males" (Townsend, 1996, p. 61). Although traditional paternalistic leadership styles are outmoded, they may still be studied in university leadership programs (Chliwniak, 1997).

Community colleges are considered homogeneous in that they generally serve diverse populations and share a commitment to open access, comprehensiveness, and responsiveness to local needs. However, significant differences exist among and between colleges and these differences in size, governance, financial resources, specialized staffing, local involvement with business and industry, and student characteristics must be addressed in graduate leadership programs (Chliwniak, 1997; Katsinas, 1996).

Perceptions of Higher Education Leadership Programs

The perceptions of doctoral education programs are being scrutinized nationwide. A national study entitled Re-envisioning the Ph. D., is a two year project funded by the PEW Charitable Trusts, that has posed the question, "How can we re-envision the Ph.D. to meet the needs of the society of the 21st Century?" The re-envisioning project leader, via input from hundreds of participants, including college and university faculty and administrators, doctoral students, business representatives,

accrediting agencies, and national leaders, hopes to identify present concerns about doctoral education and attempts to redesign doctoral education (Re-envisioning the Ph. D., 2001).

According to Green (1988), the Education discipline has low prestige and a Ph. D. or Ed. D. in Education is not the most desirable credential for academic administrators in four-year institutions. Additionally, Kennedy (1995) claimed that the mentors that graduate students are modeling have little or no experience with the kinds of institutions in which students will be working and added that faculty often show little interest in student development other than in activities that relate to faculty research. Many new administrators bewail the fact that their graduate education programs have not adequately prepared them for the real world (Hankin, 1996). Palmer and Katsinas (1996) add,

> The literature on graduate preparation programs for community college education bespeaks an indistinct academic field, uncertain as to curriculum content and professorial roles. …the indeterminate nature of the field diminishes the intrinsic value of the degrees awarded by graduate preparation programs. Such degrees may serve a credentialing function only, providing aspirants to leadership positions with the required doctorate without signifying what the doctorate means intellectually. (p. 99)

In a study of four cohort groups of higher education doctoral recipients who graduated over a 15 year period, Mason and Townsend (1988) found that a high percentage of respondents would not select higher education as their major field of study if they were to pursue a doctorate again. Mason and Townsend stated that the criticisms regarding the lack of intellectual rigor may reflect curricular weaknesses in most higher education programs.

Keim (1994) claimed that community college preparation programs are not well defined and questioned which degree was most appropriate for community college practitioners—a Ph. D., Ed. D., M.S., Ed, or a Masters. She suggested that it might be time for minimum standards for community college education programs to be developed and implemented.

The lack of a coherent knowledge base in community college leadership needs presents a challenge for graduate leadership program developers. Without a knowledge base in leadership needs, university program developers cannot know if they are meeting student preparation needs. David Pierce, as president of the American Association of Community Colleges, stated that an important contribution to community colleges would be the identification of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and competencies needed for community college leadership in the next century (Campbell & Leverty, 1997). This study provides an identification of those skills and competencies.

Methodology and Survey Results

This study identifies current community college instructional leaders' perceptions of (a) the skills necessary for effective practice, (b) the skills emphasized in their doctoral programs of study, (c) recommendations for doctoral program coursework, and (4) the relationship between the skills and areas of expertise identified as emphasized in their doctoral programs of study and the skills and areas of expertise recommended for emphasis to prepare future community college leaders. Therefore, the results of this research reflect whether doctoral programs have emphasized the most relevant coursework, and we examine the relationship between what has been taught and what is recommended for inclusion in coursework. The focus of our study was on leadership

skills preparation and training and does not attempt to define or measure leadership or assess leadership in relation to intelligence quotients, psychological characteristics, physiological characteristics, or ethics and values.

Survey Instrument Development and Assessment

The survey instrument used in this study was designed to reflect both the skills learned in doctoral programs of study and the skills required of community college instructional leaders. Ten categories of Skills and Areas of Expertise and 48 skills were identified and included on the survey instrument. The skills included on the survey were determined based on (a) the leadership skills identified in a review of community college leadership literature, (b) a review of job announcements for community college instructional leaders in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* between December, 1999 and June, 2000, and (c) an online examination of coursework offered at eight universities that offer doctorates in higher education leadership. The survey used for this study is included in the Appendix.

Many university higher education doctoral programs were reviewed online in order to verify that the survey instrument would be inclusive of the skills emphasized in doctoral programs of study. Not all universities include a comprehensive, detailed overview of their doctoral coursework online; however, most higher education programs with a leadership focus reflected common coursework. The eight universities chosen for coursework review were selected because they included coursework descriptions online. The 10 categories of skills and areas of expertise identified on the survey include (a) leadership, (b) communication, (c) institutional planning and development,

(d) management, (e) policy, (f) research methodology and application (g) legal, (h) finance, (i) technology, and (j) faculty and staff development.

Each skill or area of expertise was analyzed independently; our aim was not to validate statistically each survey category and the skills it contained. Skills and areas of expertise were logically grouped using the literature review, the online review of coursework, and *The Chronicle of Higher Education* ads.

The 10 categories on the survey instrument included a total of 48 specific skills within those 10 categories. Survey participants were requested to rate each of the 48 specific skills and areas of expertise in 3 contexts—Needed Skills, Doctoral Emphasis (skills emphasized in their doctoral program), and Recommended Emphasis (skills recommended for doctoral emphasis to prepare future community college leaders). The rating scale for each skill ranged from 1 to 5.   Face validity of the survey was determined through a pilot test of the survey administered to community college instructional leaders in New Mexico in Fall 2000.

Population and Sample

The target population and unit of analysis of this study were officially designated community college instructional leaders who had completed a doctoral degree. Using a random number table generated with XLipStat software, a random sample of 300 instructional leaders in public, two-year, U.S. institutions who met the education criterion (doctoral degree) was identified using the Higher Education Directory (Rodenhouse, 2001). Each of the six regional accrediting associations were represented in the sample and the sample included instructional leaders in 46 states. A preliminary analysis, using the Higher Education Directory (Rodenhouse), was completed to estimate the total

population of the target audience. An analysis of the two states in each accrediting region with the greatest number of community colleges, except for the Western region where only California was included, was used in estimating the number of community college academic leaders in the population that would meet the criteria for inclusion in the survey. Based on a preliminary analysis of 446 public institutions in 11 states, it was estimated that two-thirds (675) of the 1023 US public two-year community colleges would meet the criteria for inclusion in this research in that (a) the institution would have a designated instructional leader (Chief Academic Officer-CAO) and (b) that the leader (CAO) would be a doctoral graduate. Given resource constraints, 300 instructional leaders with doctoral degrees were randomly identified and mailed survey instruments. The 300 recipients of the survey represented an estimated 45% of the target population. All recipients held a doctoral degree, but the doctoral program of study of each instructional leader could not be determined prior to receipt of each respondent's completed survey.

The following parameters were established for this study: (1) Recipients of the questionnaire were limited to doctoral graduates, (2) Recipients of the questionnaire were limited to Chief Academic Officers in accredited, public, two-year institutions identified and included in the Higher Education Directory (Rodenhouse, 2001), (3) Contextual factors at a respondent's institution such as a recent crisis, upheaval, or reorganization were not controlled for, (4) Maturity, experience, and leadership style preference were not controlled for in this research.

Demographics of Survey Participants

Responses were received from 131 instructional leaders who had completed doctoral degrees, resulting in a 42.5% response rate. Data from 128 respondents were used in the analysis.

A priori, it was determined that two sets of data would be developed, based on the type of doctoral program from which respondents had graduated. The survey instrument requested that respondents identify the title of their doctoral program. Individuals who identified a Curriculum and Instruction degree in Education or discipline-based degrees outside of Education such as Biology, English, or Philosophy were designated as Non-leadership Program Graduates. Although Curriculum and Instruction programs are housed in the College of Education, these programs were determined, a priori, based on program coursework, not to be defined as leadership programs of study. Individuals who identified higher education leadership programs as their graduate level program of study were designated as Leadership Program Graduates. Examples of titles of graduate programs included in this category of programs identified by respondents included Higher Education Administration, Community College Leadership, Educational Leadership, Institutional Management, Vocational and Technical Education, Educational Administration and Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, and Educational Policy and Administration. The majority of respondents (73%) were graduates of higher education leadership programs. Ninety-three respondents were identified as Leadership Program Graduates and 34 respondents were identified as Non-leadership Program Graduates. One respondent did not identify a program of study.

Total respondents included 83 males (65%) and 45 females (35%).

Leadership Program Graduates included 56 males (60%) and 37 females (40%). Mean

and standard deviation of age of respondents, number of years served in any

administrative position since receiving a doctoral degree, number of years at current

institution, and year that the doctoral degree was completed are included in Table 1.

Table 1

Respondent Demographics

Demographic Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	53	6.3
Years served in administrative position	13	7.9
Years served at current institution	7	6.9
Year doctoral degree completed	1984	13.4

Descriptive Data

The mean and standard deviation for each skill in the Needed, Emphasized, and

Recommended contexts were calculated and all skills were ranked based on the mean

score of each skill.   Skills in the Doctoral Emphasis context were rated by Leadership

Program Graduates only, since Non-leadership Program Graduates did not complete a

higher education leadership-based curriculum.

The ranked score of each skill in the Needed Skills and Recommended

Emphasis contexts are included in Table 2. This ranking is based on responses from all

respondents. The letter T in the Recommended Emphasis column indicates tie

rankings.   These results reflect community college instructional leaders' perceived

importance of each skill in effectively fulfilling their job responsibilities and their

recommendations for including each skill in doctoral coursework to prepare future community college leaders.

Table 2

Rank Order (1-48) of Needed Skills and Recommended Emphasis Skills:
All Respondents

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Context	
	Needed Skills	Recommended Emphasis in Doctoral programs
	Rank	Rank
LEADERSHIP		
Developing and communicating a vision	**3**	**4**
Understanding and application of "Change"	14	**7**
Understanding of organizational theory/culture	28	16
Motivation strategies	24	22
Incorporating ethics and values in workplace	23	12 (T)
Understanding of leadership theory/styles	37	18
Mentoring practices	42	41
Self-analysis/awareness	36	35
Understanding of the community college mission	**5**	**9**
Multicultural awareness	30	20
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	17	**8**
COMMUNICATION		
Perception and impression management	34	34
Networking skills	33	27
Understanding of interpersonal communication	**6**	**6**
Effective listening and feedback skills	**1**	**5**
Effective writing skills	**2**	**2**
Effective public speaking skills	**7**	**10**
Understanding of small group dynamics	26	19
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation skills	**4**	**1**
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT		
Knowledge of marketing & external public relations	38	39
Development of alumni relations & partnerships	43	45
Fundraising	46	47
Grant writing	45	46
Program development and implementation	15	12 (T)

Table 2 (continued)
Skills and Areas of Expertise   Content

	Needed Skills Rank	Recommended Emphasis Rank
Institutional effectiveness: assessment and analysis	**8**	**3**
Retention: documentation & initiatives	27	29
Student recruitment strategies	41	42
MANAGEMENT		
Delegating	13	25
Evaluation and recommendation of personnel	11	17
Organizing and time management skills	10	21
Enrollment management/schedule development	29	37 (T)
POLICY		
Accreditation processes and procedures	19	31 (T)
State governance policy and structure	22	31 (T)
Board/local governance, policy, and procedure	16	23 (T)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND APPLICATION		
Interpretation of surveys and research	40	26
Statistical research methodology	44	37 (T)
Statistical software application	48	44
LEGAL		
Understanding of legal issues	12	12 (T)
FINANCE		
Local, state, and federal policy and funding formulas	21	28
Long range budgeting & projections	18	23 (T)
Accounting skills	47	48
TECHNOLOGY		
Development of distance education mission	32	30
Administrative integration/application of technology	35	33
Computer proficiency: hardware/software	39	43
FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT		
Curriculum development	**9**	11
Teaching/learning styles and methodology	20	15
Adjunct faculty considerations	25	36
Customer service competencies	31	40

Skills and Areas or Expertise that fell into the bottom quartile in the Needed Skills

context include the following: all Research Methodology and Application skills; computer

proficiency: hardware and software; accounting skills; student recruitment strategies, marketing and external public relations; development of alumni relations and partnerships; fundraising; grant-writing; understanding of leadership theory and styles;

The top 10 ranked skills, based on mean scores in the Needed Skills (All Respondents) and Recommended Emphasis Contexts (All Respondents and Leadership Program Graduates) categories are included in Table 3. Congruence was found in the skills that respondents noted as Needed and Recommended for emphasis in doctoral study; 8 of the top10 Needed Skills were also identified as Recommended Skills by All Respondents and by Leadership Program Graduates.

Table 3

Top Ten Ranked Skills in Needed Skills (All Respondents) and Recommended Emphasis Contexts (All Respondents and Leadership Program Graduates)

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Needed: All respondents	Recommended: All Respondents	Recommended: Leadership Program Graduates
LEADERSHIP			
Developing and communicating a vision	3	4	8
Understanding and application of "Change"	(14)	7	3
Understanding of community college mission	5	9	4
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	(17)	8	6
COMMUNICATION			
Understanding of interpersonal communication	6	6	7
Effective listening and feedback skills	1	5	10
Effective writing skills	2	2	1
Effective public speaking skills	7	10	8
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation	4	1	2
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT			
Institutional effectiveness: assessment & analysis	8	3	4
MANAGEMENT			
Organizing and time management skills	10	(21)	(20)

FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT			
Curriculum development	9	(11)	(11)

The top ten skills identified for both the Needed and Recommended Emphasis

were included in 5 of the 10 categories identified on the survey. Although they were

ranked slightly differently, the same five skills included in the Communication category

in the Needed Skills context were also found in the top ten skills Recommended for

Emphasis in doctoral programs of study. These rankings clearly reflect the leadership

literature, which equates effective communication skills with effective leadership (Bass,

1998; Bennis, 1989; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Roe & Baker, 1989; Witherspoon, 1997).

Organizing and time management skills, although ranked number 10 in terms of

Needed Skills, was not ranked as highly in the Recommended Skills context.

Respondents may believe that a doctoral program of study is not the appropriate venue

to learn such skills although they are needed skills.

Binomial Analysis

Binomial variables were created and associated confidence intervals were created to

determine whether Leadership Program Graduates believed any of the 48 skills on the

survey were underemphasized in their doctoral programs. The difference between the

Doctoral Emphasis and Recommended Emphasis scores was calculated for each

respondent for each skill. The binomial variable was assigned a value of 1 if a

respondent's difference score was 1 or more (Recommended Emphasis > Doctoral

Emphasis) denoting the respondent's belief that the skill was underemphasized.

Otherwise, the binomial variable was assigned a value of 0 if the respondent's

difference score was 0 or less, denoting the respondent's belief that the skill was not

underemphasized. From this binomial variable, an exact (i.e., based on a binomial

distribution, not a normal approximation) 95% confidence interval (CI) was calculated for

the population proportion of individuals believing that the skill is underemphasized. If the lower limit of a 95% CI is greater than .5, we are 95% confident that a majority of the population believes that the skill is underemphasized. Thus, if the lower limit of a CI for a given skill fell above 0.5, the skill was labeled as underemphasized. Otherwise (in the case that the lower limit of a CI fell at or below 0.5), the skill was not labeled as underemphasized (noting that, statistically we cannot conclude much in this regard about the skills whose CI's bracket 0.5). A (two-sided) CI was used rather than a (one-sided) lower confidence limit because there was an initial interest in overemphasis of a skill.

Thirty-one skills were identified as underemphasized in doctoral programs. Table 4 includes the results of the binomial analysis, identifies the top 10 skills respondents perceived were emphasized in their doctoral program, and the top 10 skills respondents recommend for emphasis in doctoral programs of study. Skills that were identified as underemphasized in doctoral studies are denoted with a "U." This is different from asserting that the skill is sufficiently emphasized or overemphasized.

Table 4

Binomial Results and Rank Order of Top Ten Doctoral Emphasis Skills and
Recommended Emphasis Skills: Leadership Program Graduates

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Binomial Results U=Under-emphasized in doctoral studies	Doctoral Emphasis Rank	Recommended Emphasis Rank
LEADERSHIP			
Developing and communicating a vision	U	21	8 (T)
Understanding and application of "Change"		8	3
Understanding of organizational theory and culture		4	14

Understanding of leadership theory and styles		2	12
Understanding of community college mission		7	4 (T)
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	U	11	6
COMMUNICATION			
Understanding of interpersonal communication	U	15	7
Effective listening and feedback skills	U	25	10
Effective writing skills		5	1
Effective public speaking skills	U	13	8 (T)
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation skills	U	14	2
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING/DEVELOPMENT			
Institutional effectiveness: assessment and analysis	U	20	4 (T)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY & APPLICATION			
Interpretation of surveys and research		3	25
Statistical research methodology		1	34
Statistical software application		10	44
FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT			
Curriculum development		9	11
Teaching and learning styles and methodology		6	15

Note: (T) indicates a tie ranking. If two items were tied, the next ranking item would be ranked two places below the tied ranking items.

Respondents did not recommend for emphasis, at the same level, the same skills that were emphasized in their doctoral studies; 7 of the top 10 skills emphasized in doctoral studies were not recommended in the top 10 for emphasis for future doctoral students. All three skills in the Research and Methodology & Application category were highly emphasized in doctoral studies. These three skills are ranked much lower in the Recommended Emphasis category. The striking difference in rankings between the two categories suggests that these skills might be overemphasized in doctoral programs of study.

Respondents experienced a different emphasis in their programs of study than they recommend. Only 3 of the top 10 skills that respondents recommended for emphasis in leadership doctoral studies (Understanding and Application of Change, Understanding of the Community College Mission, and Effective Writing Skills) were

also identified in the top 10 skills that were emphasized in respondents' doctoral programs of study. These three skills were not identified as being underemphasized. Additionally, the remaining 7 out of the top 10 skills Recommended for Emphasis were perceived to be underemphasized in doctoral programs of study. Of these seven skills, two fell under the Leadership category, four under Communication, and one under Institutional Planning and Development.

Thirty-one of the 48 Skills and Areas of Expertise evaluated were identified as underemphasized. The 17 skills not identified as underemphasized in doctoral study include (a) understanding and application of "Change," (b) understanding of organizational theory and culture, (c) understanding of leadership theory and styles, (d) self-analysis and awareness, (e) understanding of community college mission, (f) effective writing skills, (g) understanding of small group dynamics, (h) grant-writing, (i) organizing and time management skills, (j) state governance, policy, and procedure, (k) interpretation of surveys and research, (l) statistical research methodology, (m) statistical software application, (n) local, state, and federal funding policy and funding (o) accounting skills, (p) curriculum development, and (q) teaching and learning styles and methodology. Skills not identified as underemphasized may have been perceived to be sufficiently emphasized (effective writing skills, understanding of leadership theory and styles, understanding of community college mission, understanding and application of "Change," understanding of organizational theory and culture), overemphasized (interpretation of surveys and research, statistical research methodology, statistical software application), unnecessary (accounting skills), or better taught and learned in

another venue (state governance, policy, and procedure; organizing and time management skills).

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is evident, as Townsend (1996) stated, that a doctoral degree is a passport to community college leadership. This research revealed that, in community college instructional leadership positions, a leadership doctoral degree is preferred over other degrees. Of the 128 respondents in this study, 93 respondents were Education Leadership Program Graduates and only 34 were graduates of other doctoral programs. When choosing a graduate institution, aspiring community college leaders will want to consider the fact that some higher education leadership programs are specifically designed to prepare *community college* leaders (rather than more broad-based education programs that are designed to prepare college, university and/or K-12 leaders) and that some community college leadership programs even target specific community college areas of leadership, i.e., student development, instruction, finance, the presidency, technology, etc.

As previously noted, researchers and graduates have questioned the relevancy of a higher education degree and the preparedness of future community college administrators (Green, 1988; Hankin, 1996; Keim, 1994; Mason & Townsend, 1988; Palmer & Katsinas, 1996). This research indicates that, for 65% of the skills surveyed, graduates recommend a greater emphasis in a leadership doctoral program coursework than the level of emphasis they received in their program of study, i.e., 31 of the 48 skills surveyed were identified as underemphasized by Leadership Program Graduates. As scholars suggest, the programs developed and implemented 30 years ago may not

adequately serve 21st century community college leaders (Hankin, 1996). Leadership is a fluid, dynamic process that is continuously being redefined (Rost, 1991; Stogdill, 1974). This, coupled with changing needs at the community college level, reflects a need to re-evaluate community college leadership programs. This is not to suggest that formal and informal evaluation is not taking place. The review of literature and this study, however, may suggest that program evaluation is not systematic and not research-based.

What is the best approach to determining leadership program coursework requirements? Scholars recommend collaboration among university faculty, graduate students and community college practitioners (Shapiro & Walters, 1992; Wendel, 1992). The involvement of students, graduates, and community college practitioners in an ongoing dialogue about the design and evaluation of graduate curricula will benefit all participants. Many students in doctoral leadership programs of study are already working in community colleges and may have a greater awareness than university faculty of the skills and areas of expertise necessary for effective community college leadership.

Leadership theory and practice, as they relate to community college leadership, are areas of expertise needed and recommended by community college practitioners. Community college practitioners who have the required credentials could be invited to teach community college related coursework at the university level. University and community college faculty and administrators might consider a faculty exchange program. This would expose university faculty to the very different culture found at the community college level. This could be one way of closing the gap between the skills

and areas of expertise needed and those emphasized in doctoral programs. A greater understanding and appreciation of the community college culture could be helpful to university faculty in designing course objectives

Respondents have clearly identified communication skills as the most important category of skills that community college instructional leaders deem necessary in effectively performing their jobs. Higher education program developers might consider collaborating with professors in university Communication departments in incorporating the communication skills needed to adequately prepare graduates for community college leadership positions. Based on survey results, the inclusion of Communication coursework in the core curriculum of leadership programs of study would benefit students.

Scholars implore community college leaders to develop their own leadership programs (Green, 1988; Roe & Baker, 1989), particularly in view of the fact that although community colleges are considered homogeneous, significant differences do exist among institutions (Katsinas, 1996). Onsite leadership training can take into consideration the characteristics and traits of the leader, characteristics of the led, context/situation, structure, goals, location, training and ability of subordinates, motivation, organizational culture, size of organization, communication patterns, economics, politics, and other external influences. Properly implemented onsite programs could compliment doctoral coursework by concentrating on coursework that has been identified as underemphasized at the doctoral level.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that over 350 definitions of leadership have been generated and Green (1988) added that 75 years of analysis and research have

produced no conclusions about what constitutes effective leadership.   Although leadership is difficult to define, community college instructional leaders who are graduates of higher education leadership programs and who participated in this research, indicate that there is a gap in the skills that were emphasized in their graduate programs of study and the skills they recommended for inclusion in leadership doctoral study. This research clearly identifies the skills that current community college practitioners perceive to be necessary for effective community college leadership. University leadership program professors and developers now have a clear list of the competencies demanded of and by higher education leadership program graduates. This data can be used to assess and market their leadership programs.

APPENDIX

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP NEEDS,
PREPARATION ASSESSMENT, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Instructions for completing the questionnaire:

Using a scale from 1 to 5, as described below, score each skill and area of expertise listed on the left of your questionnaire to reflect your perceptions in each of the three contexts: Needed Skills, Doctoral Emphasis, and Recommended Emphasis in a doctoral program**.**

NEEDED SKILLS: Skills needed to effectively perform your job.

This skill or area of expertise:
1 = is not important in performing my responsibilities as an instructional leader
2 = is somewhat important in performing my responsibilities as an instructional leader
3 = is important in performing my job responsibilities as an instructional leader
4 = is very important in performing my responsibilities as an instructional leader
5 = is essential in performing my responsibilities as an instructional leader

DOCTORAL EMPHASIS: Skills taught in your doctoral program of study

Learning this skill or area of expertise:
1 = was not included in my doctoral coursework
2 = was referenced in my doctoral coursework
3 = was moderately covered in my doctoral coursework
4 = was covered at length in my doctoral coursework
5 = was emphasized in my doctoral coursework

RECOMMENDED EMPHASIS: Skills you recommend for inclusion in doctoral programs of study to effectively prepare future community college instructional leaders.

Learning this skill or area of expertise:
1 = should not be included in doctoral program coursework
2 = should be referenced in doctoral program coursework
3 = should be moderately covered in doctoral program coursework
4 = should be covered at length in doctoral program coursework
5 = should be emphasized in doctoral program coursework

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M. (1998*). Transformational leadership:Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, D. F., & Leverty, L. H. (1997). Developing and selecting leaders for the 21st century. *Community College Journal, 67,* 34-36.

Chliwniak, L. (1997). *Analyzing the gender gap.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410846)

Cohen A, M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gibson-Benninger, B. S., Ratcliff, J. L., & Rhoads, R. A. (1996). Diversity, discourse, and democracy: Needed attributes in the next generation of community college leadership programs. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.) & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 65-75). *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, M. F. (1988). *Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education.* New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Hankin, J. N. (1996). The door that never closes: Continuing education needs of community college leaders. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.), & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 37-46). *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katsinas, S. G. (1996). Preparing leaders for diverse institutional settings. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.), & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 15-25). *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keim, M. C. (1994). Graduate preparation programs in community college education. *Community College Review, 22,* 53-61.

Kennedy, D. (1995). Another century's end, another revolution for higher education. *Change, 27,* 8-15.

Mason, S. O. & Townsend, B. K. (1988, November). *Graduates of doctoral programs in higher education: Demographics and career patterns*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO.

Palmer, J. C., & Katsinas, S. G. (1996). Sources of Information: Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.), & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 95-100). *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Re-envisioning the Ph.D. (January, 2001). Center for Instructional Development and Research University of Washington. http://depts.washington.edu/envision/index.html

Rodenhouse, M. P. (Ed.). (2001). *Higher education directory.* Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications.

Roe, M. A., & Baker, G. A. (1989). The development of community college leaders: A challenge for our future. *Community College Review, 16,* 5-16.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* New York: Praeger.

Shapiro, J. P. & Walters, D. L. (1992). In F. C. Wendel (Ed.) *Applications of Reflective Practice* (pp. 27-51). University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Townsend, B. K. (1996). The role of the professoriate in influencing future community college leadership. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.) & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 59-64). *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Townsend, B. K. & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1997). The effective community college academic administrator: Necessary competencies and attitudes. *Community College Review, 25,* 41-56.

Townsend, B. K., & Wiese, M. (1990). Value of the higher education doctorate for community college administrators. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 14,* 337-347.

Wendel, F. C. (Ed.). (1992). *Applications of reflective practice*. University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration.

Witherspoon, P. D. (1997). *Communicating leadership: An organizational perspective.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Young, R. J. (1996). Legacy of the post-WW II growth years for community college leadership programs. In A. M. Cohen (Series Ed.), & J. C. Palmer & S. G. Katsinas (Vol. Eds.), *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today (pp. 5-14). New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

  —

Table 1

Respondent Demographics

Demographic Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	53	6.3
Years served in administrative position	13	7.9
Years served at current institution	7	6.9
Year doctoral degree completed	1984	13.4

Table 2

Rank Order (1-48) of Needed Skills and Recommended Emphasis Skills:
All Respondents

_____

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Context	
	Needed Skills	Recommended Emphasis in Doctoral programs
	Rank	Rank
LEADERSHIP		
Developing and communicating a vision	**3**	**4**
Understanding and application of "Change"	14	**7**
Understanding of organizational theory/culture	28	16
Motivation strategies	24	22
Incorporating ethics and values in workplace	23	12 (T)
Understanding of leadership theory/styles	37	18
Mentoring practices	42	41
Self-analysis/awareness	36	35
Understanding of the community college mission	**5**	**9**
Multicultural awareness	30	20
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	17	**8**
COMMUNICATION		
Perception and impression management	34	34
Networking skills	33	27
Understanding of interpersonal communication	**6**	**6**
Effective listening and feedback skills	**1**	**5**
Effective writing skills	**2**	**2**
Effective public speaking skills	**7**	**10**
Understanding of small group dynamics	26	19
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation skills	**4**	**1**
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT		
Knowledge of marketing & external public relations	38	39
Development of alumni relations & partnerships	43	45
Fundraising	46	47
Grant writing	45	46
Program development and implementation	15	12 (T)

Table 2 (continued)

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Content	
	Needed Skills Rank	Recommended Emphasis Rank
Institutional effectiveness: assessment and analysis	**8**	**3**
Retention: documentation & initiatives	27	29
Student recruitment strategies	41	42
MANAGEMENT		
Delegating	13	25
Evaluation and recommendation of personnel	11	17
Organizing and time management skills	10	21
Enrollment management/schedule development	29	37 (T)
POLICY		
Accreditation processes and procedures	19	31 (T)
State governance policy and structure	22	31 (T)
Board/local governance, policy, and procedure	16	23 (T)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND APPLICATION		
Interpretation of surveys and research	40	26
Statistical research methodology	44	37 (T)
Statistical software application	48	44
LEGAL		
Understanding of legal issues	12	12 (T)
FINANCE		
Local, state, and federal policy and funding formulas	21	28
Long range budgeting & projections	18	23 (T)
Accounting skills	47	48
TECHNOLOGY		
Development of distance education mission	32	30
Administrative integration/application of technology	35	33
Computer proficiency: hardware/software	39	43
FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT		
Curriculum development	**9**	11
Teaching/learning styles and methodology	20	15
Adjunct faculty considerations	25	36
Customer service competencies	31	40

Table 3

Top Ten Ranked Skills in Needed Skills (All Respondents) and Recommended
Emphasis Contexts (All Respondents and Leadership Program Graduates)

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Needed: All respondents	Recommended: All Respondents	Recommended: Leadership Program Graduates
LEADERSHIP			
Developing and communicating a vision	3	4	8
Understanding and application of "Change"	(14)	7	3
Understanding of community college mission	5	9	4
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	(17)	8	6
COMMUNICATION			
Understanding of interpersonal communication	6	6	7
Effective listening and feedback skills	1	5	10
Effective writing skills	2	2	1
Effective public speaking skills	7	10	8
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation	4	1	2
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT			
Institutional effectiveness: assessment and analysis	8	3	4
MANAGEMENT			
Organizing and time management skills	10	(21)	(20)
FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT			
Curriculum development	9	(11)	(11)

Table 4

Binomial Results and Rank Order of Top Ten Doctoral Emphasis Skills and
Recommended Emphasis Skills: Leadership Program Graduates

Skills and Areas of Expertise	Binomial Results U=Under-emphasized in doctoral studies	Doctoral Emphasis Rank	Recommended Emphasis Rank
LEADERSHIP			
Developing and communicating a vision	U	21	8 (T)
Understanding and application of "Change"		8	3
Understanding of organizational theory and culture		4	14
Understanding of leadership theory and styles		2	12
Understanding of community college mission		7	4 (T)
Understanding of collaborative decision-making	U	11	6
COMMUNICATION			
Understanding of interpersonal communication	U	15	7
Effective listening and feedback skills	U	25	10
Effective writing skills		5	1
Effective public speaking skills	U	13	8 (T)
Conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation skills	U	14	2
INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING/DEVELOPMENT			
Institutional effectiveness: assessment and analysis	U	20	4 (T)
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY & APPLICATION			
Interpretation of surveys and research		3	25
Statistical research methodology		1	34
Statistical software application		10	44
FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT			
Curriculum development		9	11
Teaching and learning styles and methodology		6	15

Note: (T) indicates a tie ranking. If two items were tied, the next ranking item would be
ranked two places below the tied ranking items.