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ABSTRACT

Begun in 2001, the Leadership Development Institute (LDI) was created by the Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) as a means of improving the leadership abilities of faculty, staff, and administrative personnel throughout the system, a “grow your own” leadership program (Leadership Development, 2006). LDI has evolved into a nine-month program of presentations, lectures, mentoring, self-exploration activities, and internships. The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine the impact of participation in LDI on the career and educational goals of former cohort members. Phase One of this research project, the qualitative portion of the study, was composed of individual interviews with 5% of located former LDI cohort members. The interviews were completed over the phone so as to allow for participation by former LDI participants located throughout the state of Louisiana. The qualitative portion of the research and a thorough review of the literature provided the basis for the Leadership Development Long-term Impact Survey (LDLIS) that was developed by the researcher. The second phase of the research, the quantitative phase, was the administration of the LDLIS to all identified LDI former cohort members. The survey results were tabulated and indicate that LDI participation does significantly impact the career goals of former cohort members. Although the results for educational goals were not significant, a positive impact was noted. The following information could be used to develop new or improve existing leadership programs for community college or university leaders.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

There are many leadership development options available to potential community college leaders. Program formats include professional development, internet based courses, doctoral and master's degrees, specialty options, and mentoring (Bagnato; Friedel, 2010; Shults, 2001). Programs range from a few hours to two years, but regardless of the length of the program, it is important to begin leadership development (Bagnato). In this study, the researcher explored one Louisiana community college leadership development option.

Louisiana Higher Education

Louisiana is unique in its approach to the organization of public higher education. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) is one of the four public higher education systems along with the Louisiana State University (LSU) System, the Southern University (SU) System, and the University of Louisiana (ULL) System. Each system board has the responsibility for the colleges and/or universities it governs. All four of the Louisiana public higher education systems are governed by the Louisiana Board of Regents.

The oldest of the four Louisiana higher education systems, the LSU system began with a federal land grant in 1806 (“History of LSU,” 2010); however, no institutions were opened until 1860 (“History of LSU,” 2010). There would be several openings and closings of institutions for the system related to the American Civil War, invasions, and fires. There also would be name changes throughout the system’s evolution (“History of LSU,” 2010). The system’s current flagship institution, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College – Baton Rouge opened in 1869 (“History of LSU,” 2010). To date, the LSU system encompasses 10 institutions including LSU Eunice (“History of LSU”) which is one of only 2 two-year institutions in Louisiana not part of the LCTCS. LSU-Alexandra had also been a two-year school at the time
the LCTCS was created; however, it since has been reclassified as a four-year institution (Dyer, 1998; History of LSU).

The SU system, "the only historically black university system in [the United States]," was established in 1880 ("About Us: Southern"). The five SU campuses are renowned for diverse student populations in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Included as a SU school is Southern University Shreveport which is the other two-year school not included in the LCTCS ("About Us: Southern," Dyer, 1998).

The UL system was established in 1974 and is one of the largest public higher education systems in the United States ("About the System"). After establishment, the UL system was given governance over eight pre-existing universities. All UL schools which originated as two-year institutions had been reclassified long before the LCTCS was established.

**The Louisiana Community and Technical College System**

The Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) was established in 1999. The LCTCS was given governance over most of Louisiana's community colleges and all of Louisiana's technical colleges; later two technical community colleges were established from former technical colleges and remained under the governance of the LCTCS. Originally, the idea of creating a board to govern the community colleges in Louisiana met with some opposition. The administrations of many four-year institutions feared losing students if the open enrollment policies were changed while the vocational school administrators feared losing their independence (Manning, 2004). Eventually, in a special legislative session and after a Louisiana constitutional amendment, the LCTCS was created (Manning).

Today, the LCTCS encompasses seven community colleges, two technical community colleges, and seven regional technical colleges. The community colleges are primarily academic institutions; however, many do include a partial array of technical programs ("System
The technical community colleges were originally established as part of the K-12 system as vocational/technical schools, but after moving to the LCTCS were granted permission to develop major academic units; the technical community colleges offer academic degrees and a full array of technical certificates, diplomas and degrees (“System Orientation”). The technical colleges are multi-campus regional institutions that offer primarily technical and workforce development programs; however, many do offer a limited number of general education courses often in conjunction with either LCTCS online or one of the other community or technical community colleges. The technical colleges offer technical degrees, diplomas and certificates (“System Orientation”). A listing of the LCTCS institutions by type is given in Figure 1.1.

“When the Louisiana Community and Technical College System was created in 1999, white males dominated the environment. The system’s chief administrator and the chairman of its governing board were white men, as were seven of its eight chancellors” meaning the administration did not reflect the population of Louisiana and specifically the administration did not reflect the student populations of the LCTCS institutions (Dyer, 2005, p. 22). Although 1999 statistics were unavailable, according to the Southern Region Education Board (2011) by 2009 approximately 43% of African-American college students, 60% of women college students, 34% of Hispanic-American college students, and 28% of white college students in Louisiana were enrolled in community colleges. Better representing the student populations by 2005, the system president and board chairperson as well as three chancellors were African-Americans and three chancellors and the board chairperson were women (Dyer). Also as of 2005, 3 of the systems 10 school chancellors were women. As stated by Dyer in the above reference article, Dr. Walter Bumphus assured that not only were chancellors from diverse backgrounds in place, but they were excellent administrators.
In 2000, the LCTCS Board recognized a need to develop up and coming leaders in Louisiana community colleges ("The system to launch," 2001). At that time, Louisiana had no formal community college leadership programs ("The system to launch"). As such, the LCTCS Board charged Dr. Walter Bumphus, LCTCS President, with the responsibility of developing a leadership academy for community college leaders in Louisiana ("The system to launch"). The
LCTCS’s LDI was to be the first community college leadership development program implemented in Louisiana (“LCTCS provides inaugural,” 2002). “The purpose of the LDI [was] to build and reinforce the organizational and leadership skills that employees need to foster student success in the community and technical colleges.” (“Leadership Development,” 2011).

In February 2002, the LCTCS initiated the newly developed program with the goal to develop leadership skills in many of the system's faculty, staff, and administrators and named the program the Leadership Development Institute (“The system to launch,” 2001). The LDI program was originally envisioned as a three-day program of guest speakers and learning opportunities designed to foster self examination and discovery (“The system to launch”). From the initial three-day event, LDI would grow into a nine-month long, leadership, professional development program organized around presentations, lectures, mentoring, self-exploration activities, internships, and related activities. Killacky and Wells (2004, p. 486) provide a thorough explanation of the purpose of the LDI program;

> Designed to strengthen organizational and critical thinking skills that emerging leaders need to assess their own practice and foster student success, the LDI also assists Fellows in understanding areas like organizational change, program evaluation, strategic planning, institutional advancement, resource development, workforce development, and the political climate, to name a few.

Figure 1.2 provides an overview of the LDI program components as the program would later evolve. To date, there have been nine LDI cohorts. The last LDI class was held during the 2009/2010 academic year.
LDI Applicants

The LDI program was designed to improve participants’ understanding of financial issues, political climates, educational change leadership, effective program implementation, planning, and life-long learning (“Leadership Development,” 2011). Participants are further given the opportunity to discover themselves as leaders in the various roles associated with community colleges. Programs such as LDI may also give women and minorities a unique opportunity to develop the leadership skills necessary to earn and hold higher level administrative positions.
with the LCTCS. A review of LDI cohort graduate materials indicates that women and minorities are well represented among LDI participants.

In order to be considered for an LDI cohort, applicants must be employed full time at either an LCTCS institution or with the LCTCS office. Applicants must also have been with the LCTCS for a minimum of six months. Applicants may hold positions as administrators, faculty members, or unclassified staff. Classified staff members, civil service employees, are not eligible to apply for the LDI program.

The first step to enrollment in the LDI program is an application; therefore, enrollment is part of a self-selection process. Each potential participant must complete an application for admission and submit the application to his or her home institution. Following the application deadline, senior administrators from each institution determine whom to enroll from that institution in the LDI for the academic year. During some years, institutions have been allowed to enroll two participants while during other years only one applicant has been accepted directly from each institution. During the years when only one application is accepted directly from the institutions, applications for potential participants not initially selected were forwarded to the LCTCS where several other applicants were selected for admission during a second-round process.

LDI Program Design

Once accepted into the program, each new cohort member is welcomed with a letter of congratulations for being selected. This acceptance letter is accompanied by a large packet of information about the program and participant expectations. The material includes an assignment letter, roster of cohort members, dress code information, a welcome letter from the President of the LCTCS, and a chancellor/nominee checklist. Applicants are also provided with guidelines for the mentoring program so that brainstorming can begin as to whom the
participant would like to select as his or her mentor for the academic year; however, applicants are not allowed to select or contact the potential mentors until after the first LDI session so that further information about the mentoring program can be provided in advance of contact. Since “staff development is more likely to be successful and effective if it is supported with release time to carry out the daily activities of study and learning” (Wood, Killian, McQuarrie, & Thompson, 1993, p. 15), each LDI cohort member and his or her chancellor must agree that the participant will be provided with release time in order to complete the assignments required in the program.

LDI Sessions

LDI sessions are typically held during a nine-month period. There were two exceptions to the nine-month model. The initial 2001-2002 cohort met for only a single session, and the 2005-2006 cohort had an abbreviated program due to the damages caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. During the 2005-2006 academic year the LDI program did not begin until December 2005 and ended in June 2006 as opposed to the traditional September to May format.

In advance of each LDI session, participants must submit any assignments:

- biographical information – first session only,
- monthly mentor report,
- monthly feedback report,
- book summaries – three or four as assigned per year,
- leadership plan – one assigned per year,
- scholarly paper or alternate book report,
- internship presentations, and
- reflection paper.
Table 1.1
Former LDI Presenters

### National Presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/ Organization</th>
<th>Position Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Roueche</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Professor and Director of the Community College Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Law</td>
<td>Tallahassee Community College</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine McPhail</td>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Professor and Coordinator, Community College Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brumbach</td>
<td>Dallas County Community College District</td>
<td>Executive District Director of Strategic Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Sue Thornton</td>
<td>Cuyaboga Community College in Cleveland</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Dubois</td>
<td>Virginia Community College System</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Bumphus</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Chair of the Community College Leadership Program; President and CEO of the American Association of Community Colleges; and former President of the LCTCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/ Organization</th>
<th>Position Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Brown</td>
<td>LCTCS</td>
<td>Director, Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Braxton</td>
<td>Southern Strategy Group- Louisiana</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Koury</td>
<td>Louisiana Board of Regents</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Barfield</td>
<td>Louisiana Workforce Commission</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Clausen</td>
<td>Louisiana Board of Regents</td>
<td>Commissioner of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Robins</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay McDaniel</td>
<td>Louisiana Technical College</td>
<td>Regional Director, Region 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the sessions, participants reflect on their practice and share ideas, complete self-inventories to determine leadership strengths, attend sessions with nationally recognized
leaders in the area of community college leadership, attend presentations by state officials, participate in networking opportunities, discuss reading assignments, and other opportunities as determined by the program director. In Table 1.1, the researcher has provided information about several of the LDI presenters as an example of the caliber of information to which participants are exposed. This table does not provide an inclusive list of former presenters.

In addition to presentations, each cohort is given a list of reading assignments for the duration of the course. Books used during various cohorts for reading assignments have included: *Who Moved My Cheese* by Spencer Johnson, *Good to Great* by Jim Collins, *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership* by John Maxwell, and *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team* by Patrick Lencioni among various other works. Cohort members engage in lively discussions about the books and the implications for practice.

During the LDI program, participants are encouraged to build relationships. As the literature suggests, cohorts can be drawn together by separating the members from family, friends, work and other distractions at the beginning of the program through a residential learning experience (Lawrence, 2002). LDI cohort members are provided accommodations in hotels in the area of the session to facilitate after-hour gatherings, networking, and cohort cohesion. Participants often share meals, socialize after hours, and share rides to and from the LCTCS offices or other meeting locations. This networking within each cohort has been shown to develop strong bonds that often last many years regardless of the distance between institutions and the infrequent face-to-face meetings following the completion of the program.

**Study Rationale**

Previous participation in the LDI program is a contributing factor in this author’s interest in studying the program. In 2005, I left a senior coordinator position with Nicholls State University, a school in the UL system, and accepted a position as an instructor with Fletcher
Technical Community College (FTCC) which is part of the LCTCS. At that time, I knew very little about the LCTCS, its institutions, policies, and structure. Approximately 6 months after joining the faculty of FTCC, I was promoted to the brand new position of General Education Division Chair. Since I still knew very little about the LCTCS, I decided that I would apply to become a member of the 2005/2006 LDI class because I thought it would be helpful to learn more about the system, network with participants from other institutions, and improve my leadership skills.

Beyond learning more about the LCTCS, the LDI program had a significant impact on my career and educational goals. After graduating from the program, I was promoted to Dean of Arts and Sciences and later Dean of Student Affairs at FTCC. During LDI was also the first time I ever considered pursuing a doctorate, and in January 2007 I enrolled at LSU for that purpose.

Anecdotal evidence was provided to LDI cohort members as to the impact of participation on their careers; however, prior to this study, no research had been performed to confirm or refute the declarations made by LCTCS officials. My career goals changed significantly following LDI participation as did my educational goals. This research project was designed to determine whether my results were typical or atypical. Specifically, the goal was to determine the impact of LDI participation on former cohort members’ career and educational goals as well as determine opinions about the LDI program and grouping students into cohorts for leadership development programs.

Beyond the scope of this project, it is believed the information gathered in this study will be significant to the broader audience of community college leaders across the nation. There are many studies available in the literature documenting the long-term impact of leadership development in the areas of medicine, management, K-12 education, nursing, and business administration. Although several studies concerning leadership development models are included in the literature, this author was unable to uncover any detailed information concerning
the long-term impact on career or educational goals of community college leaders involved in leadership development activities. The lack of research concerning the long-term effect on the participants of community college leadership programs represents a significant gap in the literature that this work is intended to help fill.

As indicative of a need for this study, Twombly and Townsend (2008) discussed a lack of research on community colleges and community college faculty members. “There is also a real and compelling need to study college administrators specifically and how they effectively perform their roles and expect, and are expected, to behave,” according to Bray (2010, p. 285). “Community colleges, in which the role of the dean is often vastly different [from that of university administrators], might be a completely different finding, and as [community colleges] represent 43% of the institutions in the United States, they are worthy of much attention in this regard,” Bray (2010, p. 311). In yet another article, Bray commented that, “more work needs to be done to evaluate the responses of deans and compare them with faculty, to see if the proposed administrative culture truly varies as much as has been proposed from faculty culture,” (2008, p. 716).

There are many concepts included in this study which have ambiguous definitions. In order to clarify the meaning as used by the researcher, these definitions are provided in Table 1.2. Many of the items for which definitions were provided were used as grouping factors during the analysis of data collected during the survey portion of this research.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to expand upon the research that exists concerning community college leadership. Towards that purpose, the researcher studied graduates of the LDI program. Specifically, the focus of this research study was to gather information regarding the impact of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Goals</td>
<td>Goals set by the participant for positions or promotions with the current institution, current system, or with other institutions or systems in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Goals</td>
<td>Goals set by the participant to further his/her education by earning additional degrees, diplomas, certificates, or specializations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>A grouping factor for the institution type of the participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• technical college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• technical community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• system office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree/Certificate Earned</td>
<td>A classification variable:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• associates degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• masters degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>A grouping factor for the relative position level of the participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• executive-level administration: chancellor, vice chancellor, campus dean, executive dean, or executive director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• mid-level administration: academic dean, associate dean, assistant dean, division chair, director, department head, or manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• faculty: professor, associate professor, instructors, lecturer, or librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unclassified staff: analyst, registrar, coordinator, workforce officer, financial aid officer, or internet administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>A cohort is a group of students who are enrolled in a sequence of courses, workshops, or development opportunities in the pursuit of a common goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of Success</td>
<td>• Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarification of Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational Enhancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participation in the Leadership Development Institute on the career and educational goals of program graduates.

Research questions for this study were:

1. How has LDI participation impacted the participants’ ability to achieve his/her career goals?
2. How has LDI participation impacted the educational goals of former cohort members?
3. What are the participant’s impressions of the various components of the LDI program?
4. How are aspects of the LDI cohort model effective or not effective for leadership development?

Limitations

The study will be limited by the dissimilarity of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System to other community college systems of the United States and beyond. The author recognizes the limited scope of the project; however, data was collected from 75 participants, a nearly 60% survey response rate, which is a robust sample of the population.

A second limitation involves the lack of an anticipated current LDI class. Several key survey questions involve the subjects’ opinions prior to LDI participation. With no current class, the researcher was limited to relying on the members of previous cohorts as to their pre-LDI perceptions. The scope of this study was further limited by the time and resources that could be dedicated to the project. Expanding the study to other states and regions of the United States or to foreign countries is left to further research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Community Colleges

Originally known as junior colleges (Bragg, 2001; Morgan, 2000), community colleges are a unique part of the American educational system (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Shults, 2001). Although suggestions for junior institutions to teach lower level courses were offered as early as the mid 19th Century (Cohen & Brawer), the first community college, Joliet Junior College, was founded in 1901 in Illinois where it provided transfer opportunities to the University of Chicago (Bragg; Evelyn, 2001a; Hines, 2011). Initially established to provide first and second year coursework for students interested in transferring to four-year institutions, most early community college students were traditional age, white males (Bragg).

By the 1920s, there were 207 junior colleges located in 37 states with an average enrollment of approximately 150 students (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). By 1930, the average enrollment had risen to 160 students with 440 junior colleges located in 43 states (Cohen & Brawer). The term community college was made popular by the 1947 report from the Truman Commission, also known as The President's Commission on Higher Education for Democracy, which heralded community colleges as a means of providing vocational education (Bragg, 2001; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Morgan, 2000). The Commission report tasked community colleges with providing equal opportunity in education (Morgan; Townsend, 2009). Cohen and Brawer (p. 5) define community colleges as “… any institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degree.” The majority of community colleges in the United States are rural institutions (Cejda & Leist, 2006).

In the 1960s and 1970s, there was a tremendous increase in the number of community colleges (Bragg, 2001; Bumphus & Neal, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Evelyn, 2001a; Morgan,
2000; Shults, 2001). At one point in the 1960’s, a new community college was being opened an average of every six days (Evelyn, 2001a). The number of community colleges in the United States continued to grow until the late 1970s when it peaked at around 1,200 (Bragg; Cohen & Brawer). As of 2011, the number of community colleges was till approximately 1, 200; however larger numbers of students are attending community colleges (Hines, 2011). Also by the 1970s, community colleges were enrolling approximately 37% of all undergraduates in the United States (Bragg). These percentages were significantly higher in Texas, California, and Illinois, states with very large community college systems (Bragg).

By 2003, approximately 40% of traditional American college students began their higher education in community colleges (Miller & Mupinga, 2006). Cejda and Leist (2006) quote studies that claim community colleges have provided approximately 75% of all U.S. employees a portion of their education. Faculty members at community colleges teach approximately 37% of all undergraduates in the United States and approximately 50% of all freshman and sophomores with these percentages expected to continue to rise (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). According to Cohen and Brawer approximately 50% of students earning a bachelor's degree from a public university have transcripts from a community college.

As of 2009, 37% percent of all undergraduate students in Louisiana were enrolled in community colleges. With the enrollment in college of nearly 70% of high school graduates as of the class of 2005, community colleges are helping to offer opportunities for students unable to or uninterested in enrolling in four-year institutions (Kalogrides & Grodsky, 2011). Students in community colleges are more likely to be female, older, and a member of a minority when compared to counterparts at a university; community college students are also more likely to be part-time because of employment and family responsibilities (Bragg, 2001).
Mission of Community Colleges

Early Mission

In the early part of the 20th Century, high school graduation rates began to climb increasing the demand for access to higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). With the increased demand for higher education came the recommendation that universities allow junior colleges to take over the function of teaching freshman and sophomore level classes so the universities could concentrate on research (Cohen & Brawer). Community colleges where looked at as the “intermediate step” between high school and the university (Kalogrides & Grodsky, 2011). However, a contributing factor to the stilted development of the community colleges in the United States was the fact that most universities did not relinquish the instruction of freshman and sophomore classes to the community colleges but instead left those institutions on the fringe of the mainstream educational system (Cohen & Brawer).

Prior to WWII, junior colleges typically did not house adult education programs (Morgan, 2000). After WWII, the mission of community colleges was expanded to include vocational programs. In the 1990s, community colleges were faced with dwindling financial support during a time when many adult learners were returning to school in order to improve work skills for the changing global market (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006). Some experts argue that changing the mission to include vocational education negatively impacted the academic effectiveness of the community college (Bailey & Averianova, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). This argument, which really became an issue in the 1960’s, is held as the reason for static transfer rates of community college students to four-year institutions (Bailey & Averianova); however, Cohen and Brawer argue that transfer rates can be misleading because they are narrowed to only a limited period when they should actually be determined based on whether a student transfers credits into a four-year institution at any point before he or she dies.
Current Mission

Discussions about the mission of community colleges must first take into account the incredible differences in these institutions based on geographical location, in and among states, location relative to four-year institutions, regional business and industry, and other factors (Dougherty & Townsend, 2006). Many of today’s community colleges began as part of the K-12 system (Cohen & Brawer, 2008); some of these same schools are now at the other end of the spectrum hosting programs for four-year colleges and universities (Romero, 2004). The mission of community colleges has changed and continues to change (Bailey & Averianova, 1998; Dougherty & Townsend).

The mission of community colleges now includes vocational, developmental, and adult education; however, providing transfer opportunities remains a large part of the mission (Anderson, 1996; Bailey & Averianova, 1998; Bragg, 2001; Cejda & Leist, 2006; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Miller & Mupinga, 2006; Morgan, 2000; Stanley, 2007; Watts & Hammons, 2002b). A newer mission that has arisen is the community college as an institution for students leaving four-year colleges and universities, reverse transfer, which has increased from 4% in 1972 to 11% in 1996 (Kalogrides & Grodsky, 2011). In some states, the mission of community colleges is also being expanded to include the offering of bachelor’s degrees (Cohen & Brawer; Townsend, 2009).

The multiple missions of community colleges do create some administrative difficulties. “A general conflict between multiple missions lies in the simple fact that community colleges – like all organizations – have limited amounts of money, time, and energy; serving one mission may thus entail cutting into the resources available for others,” according to Dougherty and Townsend (2006, p. 9). These institutions are often forced to adopt vocational programs in
order to secure state funding (Bailey & Averianova, 1998). Originally, vocational track options in community colleges were offered as an alternative to traditional higher education (Bragg, 2001).

By the early part of the 21st Century, the negative impact of the conflicting missions was considered a problem because many leaders of vocational/technical schools did not want to see their schools become community colleges for fear that technical programs would lose ground to academic programs and where leaders of existing community colleges were hesitant to adopt technical programs for fear of diluting the academic environment (Bailey & Averianova, 1998; Dougherty & Townsend, 2006). Regardless of fears and apprehension about the changing mission, the inclusion of various programs in community colleges appears to be the wave of the future as lawmakers see community colleges as the vehicle to a better educated workforce (Bailey & Averianova).

Presently, the mission of community colleges includes providing higher education that is both affordable and accessible for all students (Bailey & Averianova, 1998; Stanley, 2007). Community colleges are the typical entry point for higher education for minority and low-income students (Bragg, 2001; Cejda & Leist, 2006). However, Dougherty and Townsend (2006) indicate that many community colleges now offer honors programs which may lead the institution to seek out more qualified students to the exclusion of lower-income or less-prepared students.

Bragg (2001, p. 111) considered community colleges “... a most important segment of America’s higher education system...” Cejda and Leist (2006) predict that community colleges will continue to see larger and more diverse student populations. Community colleges are tasked with providing quality education to large numbers of students as opposed to the four-year institutions which cater to students from better educational backgrounds and higher socio-economic situations (Bragg).
State-level funding cutbacks in higher education and the consequent rise in tuition at public institutions have led to soaring community college enrollments in many states, and many families see community colleges as the best financial bargain for the first two years of college, according to Dougherty and Townsend (2006, p. 5).

The preferred method of scholars for determining a community college's mission continues to be through an examination of the school’s programs, procedures, and enrollments; whereas, critics of community colleges typically evaluate the institution’s mission based on outcomes claiming that mission statements do not always give a true portrayal of the institution’s purpose (Dougherty & Townsend, 2006). Although a narrowing of mission has been recommended in some circles, it is unlikely institutions will follow that approach due to political pressures, loss of economic incentives, and community forces (Dougherty & Townsend).

**Uniqueness of Community Colleges**

As mentioned before, community colleges are a unique part of the American educational system. The term community college typically refers to regionally accredited institutions which award an associate’s degree, either associate in science (AS) or associate in arts (AA), as the highest degree (Miller & Mupinga, 2006). In Louisiana, many institutions also award an associate of applied science (AAS) in designated technical areas.

According to Katsinas and Kempner (2005), an accurate count of the community colleges in the United States is not possible because some areas accredit each institution while other areas accredit an entire region as a unit. The LCTCS accredits regions for the technical colleges each of which has a host of local campuses; alternately, the community colleges and technical community colleges in the LCTCS are accredited individually. Most community colleges are open enrollment institutions that provide services for students with wide-ranging abilities across a
variety of programs and degree options (Romero, 2004). Open enrollment and additional services are large reasons for the increasing diversity found in community colleges (Bragg, 2001; Lial, 2009; The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2009).

Community colleges, already a bastion for diverse populations, are educating ever more diverse groups of students (Friedel, 2010; Lial, 2009). Community colleges typically have support services beyond what is offered at colleges and universities because students are often less well prepared or are non-traditional students (Romero, 2004; Stanley, 2007; The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 2009). Community colleges have been heralded for being adaptive and for being responsive to the needs of students and the communities in which they are housed (Cejda & Leist, 2006). Across the United States, the average age of a community college student in 2007 was 29 due largely to a population of working adults (Stanley, 2007).

On average, community college students work more hours per week than their peers at four-year colleges, and community college students are more likely to be attending classes in the same community as their family; increasingly, community college students are responsible for families of their own, as stated in a report by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2009, p. 9).

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in the 2002 President’s Report on Strategic Action Areas and Initiatives considers community colleges to be “... essential institutions to resolve the current economic downturn and meet workforce retraining needs” (pp. 3-4). Community colleges often create new career training programs in order to secure additional funding (Bailey & Averianova, 1998). Community college leaders face more pressure to work with local business leaders than does their university peers because of technical programs which update the skills of America’s workforce (Miller & Mupinga, 2006; Shults, 2001). Although community colleges typically include transfer, vocational, and developmental
education programs, the mission of community colleges are typically as unique as the communities in which they are located (Miller & Mupinga). Community colleges typically focus on teaching; whereas, universities often focus on research activities (Romero, 2004).

**Educational Leadership**

“One of the most important aspects of organizational functioning has always been the role of leaders and leadership” (Amey, 2005, p. 701). Leadership has been defined differently by many different experts. John C. Maxwell in his *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership* (1998, p. 11) states, “The true meaning of leadership is influence – nothing more, nothing less.” Malm (2008) makes a very similar statement after studying community college presidents. Effective leaders exhibit integrity, ingenuity, and commitment (Perrin, 2010). Additionally, administrators are expected to “serve the collective good requiring them to measure and weigh a multitude of interests,” (Del Favero & Bray, 2005, p. 53). In summary, leaders are expected to “relate and inspire others” if the institution is to flourish (Hines, 2011, p. 74).

A vital component of effective leadership is caring about the people and institutions involved (Kouzes, 1999). In order to lead, one has to develop trusting relationships (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Leadership is grounded in social interaction and no longer guaranteed to people who hold a certain position or role in the organization (Amey, 2005; Phillips, 2005). Yet Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) report that in a survey of 910 community college administrators, a large number of the respondents indicated they see themselves as leaders because of the position they hold within the institution.

Given the dynamic nature of schools, Quong and Walker (2010) recommend for educational leaders a form of strategic leadership. Strategic leadership is defined as, “... more than having a vision about an ideal future. [Strategic leadership] is about acknowledging the complex and unpredictable nature of the future and developing strategies to ‘prepare for the
unexpected’ rather than just to ‘plan for the known,’” (Quong & Walker, 2010, p. 23). The most effective leaders don’t try to dominate others but instead allow them the freedom needed to make a difference (Drumm, 2004; Kouzes, 1999).

A key to the functioning of any institution is the quality of the leadership (Amey, 2006). Yet many academic leaders enter administration with little or no training, as stated by Gmelch (2003) when referring to academic deans. Educational leadership involves much more than just influencing people, and developing new leaders in American higher education has reached a critical point (Gmelch). The process of developing leadership skills is an ongoing journey (Bumphus & Neal, 2008). “The transformation from faculty to academic leadership takes time and dedication, and not all academics successfully make the complete transition to leadership” (Gmelch, p. 9).

While faculty members “… highly value autonomy and the direction of their work is largely self-determined” (Del Favero & Bray, 2005, p. 53), they expect administrators to solicit and value their opinion about institutional issues and to serve as a “boundary spanner” as the need arises (Bray, 2008). Faculty members often assume that deans, and other administrators, will understand the strengths and weaknesses of the campus; yet, faculty members, who may not be interested in administrative positions, “… find it almost impossible to conceive of by-passing their research and teaching interests for such a role” (Bray, p. 718). Administrators must evaluate impact on the entire institution or unit; whereas, faculty members are often only concerned with their particular area and may be unable to make hard decisions that negatively impact their own units (Del Favero & Bray, 2005). “Knowledge of the expectations placed upon them may help not only current deans but also those faculty or prospective deans considering the role” (Bray, p. 718).
Community college leaders have traditionally come from within the institution (Katsinas & Kempner, 2005). According to Cohen and Brawer in agreement with Stone (1995), leaders in community colleges are often provided little or no training upon assuming a leadership role or responsibility; yet, according to Frawley (2009) continued progress in education requires highly qualified educational leaders.

The American Association of Community Colleges (2006, pp. 4 - 6) recognized six competencies important for community college leaders: “organizational strategy”, “resource management”, “communication”, “collaboration”, “community college advocacy”, and “professionalism.” These competencies overlap the challenges identified in the Malm (2008) study of community college presidents. Listed challenges included fiscal issues, recruiting and retention of employees, planning, and community and business partnerships. Although the American Association of Community Colleges and Malm give a list of competencies, McNair, Duree, and Ebbers (2011) indicate that the dynamic nature of community colleges precludes determining an inclusive list of skills needed for leadership. Additionally, community college leadership involves a unique set of skills that is very different from that of traditional higher education administration (Romero, 2004). “Administrators require ever more specialized training and skill in regard to budget and finance, facility design and construction, the organization of student support services and the coordination of the offerings in the curriculum,” according to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2009, p. 26).

Community college administrators must lead institutions to maintain academic rigor and the integrity of the institution, but they must also meet the needs of the community in which they are located by providing the programs requested by local business and industry all while offering
services for students from diverse backgrounds (Romero, 2004). The truly unique issues faced by community college personnel may be the impetus for developing leadership degrees and professional development opportunities designed specifically for community college challenges. Further community college leadership should not be limited to key positions but must be shared throughout the institution (Amey, 2005).

Unfortunately, community college leadership has not kept pace with the student body when it comes to becoming diverse (Kelly, 2002). This lack of diversity may be another reason for starting or maintaining leadership development programs because these programs afford members of the diverse populations of community college personnel the opportunity to prepare for leadership roles (Kelly). Additionally, university and business leaders who are offered community college administrative positions may lack the appropriate background knowledge for running the unique institutions that are community colleges (Evelyn, 2001a; Kelly, 2002). Many future community college leaders think it is important to attend some type of leadership preparation program to prepare for future leadership roles (Shults, 2001).

**Community College Leadership Shortage**

Community colleges have to compete with four-year colleges and universities for funding and faculty among other resources; as such, these colleges must maintain strong leaders capable of leading the institution (Watts & Hammons, 2002a). Community colleges across the United States are faced with a potential shortage of qualified leaders in the near future (Bumphus W., 2007; “Competencies for community,” 2006; Drumm, 2004; Ebbers, Conover, and Samuels, 2010; Evelyn, 2001a; Friedel, 2010; Katsinas & Kempner, 2005; “Leadership 2020,” 2001; Leadership Development, 2006; McPhail, Robinson, & Scott, 2008; Quinton, 2006; Shults, 2001; Vaughn, 2001; Watts & Hammons, 2002a; Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). This has prompted community college leadership to become a key issue in the ongoing discussion of higher education. As stated
by McPhail, Robinson, and Scott (p. 362), “A central concern of community college leaders for the past decade has been the goal of replenishing the community college leadership pipeline.” Table 2.1 summarizes many of the issues related to the leadership crisis as described in the literature along with the potential impact associated with each issue.

Many experts and researchers in the area of community college leadership believe there will be a shortage of qualified candidates to lead our community colleges beginning early in the 21st century (Amey, 2005; Bumphus & Neal, 2008; Evelyn, 2001a; Shults, 2001). This shortage will be due in large part to high retirement and turnover rates of baby boomers (Bumphus & Neal; Friedel, 2010; Mann, 2010; Shults). In agreement, Evelyn (2001b) shared results of a survey of community college leaders which indicates that a third believe that 25-50% of community college administrators will retire by 2006. States like California, a state with a relatively large community college system, face a high turnover in community college administration across the entire system in the early part of the 21st Century (Frost, 2009).

Academic deans are serving an average term of only five years with nearly one in five leaving his or her position every year putting a strain on the system to find qualified replacements (Gmelch, 2003).

Community college institutions and systems in many states purport similar fears as those reported for California. As described in a study of 114 community college chief academic officers (CAOs) in Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming, 70% of CAOs reported that an internal issue facing community colleges was the need to provide career training for administrators (Cejda & Leist, 2006). In the same study, 65% of respondents indicated that administrative turnovers were an issue to be faced by community colleges; 73% of respondents indicated that faculty turnovers were another issue which could negatively impact community colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Issue Source</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 75% of the senior leadership positions within U.S.</td>
<td>Bumphus &amp; Neal, 2008; Bagnato, 2004; Shults, 2001</td>
<td>Loss of the cumulative knowledge held by the previous leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community colleges will be held by someone new to the position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer employees are stepping in to fill the pipeline for future</td>
<td>Frost, 2009; Bumphus &amp; Neal, 2008</td>
<td>Future positions may be filled by less qualified applicants or may remain open for longer periods of time; future leaders may require more extensive leadership development due to a lack of practical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer universities are offering degree programs in community college</td>
<td>McNair, Duree, and Ebbers, 2011; Romero, 2004</td>
<td>Incoming leaders are less likely to have formal training in community college leadership and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average age for community college faculty members, a pipeline</td>
<td>Frost, 2009; Kelly, 2002; Watts &amp; Hammons, 2002; Evelyn, 2001</td>
<td>Future positions may be filled by applicants with less community college experience and therefore less aware of issues unique to community colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for administrators, is nearing the retirement age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders for the community colleges are being heavily recruited by</td>
<td>Evelyn, 2001</td>
<td>Efforts to prepare future community college leaders may have the undesired impact of making the candidates more desirable to the K-12 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 schools which are also facing leadership shortages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development programs have not focused enough on</td>
<td>Romero, 2004</td>
<td>Community college leaders may be unable or unwilling to share leadership responsibilities which could lead to inefficient leadership and burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative leadership styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college leaders are still coming from traditional</td>
<td>Amey, 2005; American Association of Community Colleges, 2006</td>
<td>Leaders may lack skills needed to lead institutions providing programs for more diverse populations, using more advanced technology, and in environments or more accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One in five academic deans are leaving his or her position every</td>
<td>Gmelch, 2003; Lial 2009</td>
<td>Community colleges may be forced to deplete senior teaching ranks to fill vacancies in administration leading to less experience in the classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most academic deans have discipline specific backgrounds and lack</td>
<td>Bray, 2010</td>
<td>Higher education administrators have little or no experience or education in many of the key areas of higher education administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal education in higher education administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The leadership crisis, although due in large part to the larger number of administrators and faculty members reaching retirement age, is also impacted by the lack of available candidates to fill positions (Friedel, 2010). The majority of the community college presidents will retire in the next 10 years, and there are currently not enough people trained to take their places (Evelyn, 2001a; Katsinas & Kempner, 2005). Data indicate that many potential leadership candidates lack interest in attaining the complex and high stress positions (Frost, 2009). As reported by Bumphus and Neal (2008) and Frost, fewer employees are stepping in to fill the pipeline for future leadership positions. Also, many community college faculty members are approaching retirement just as are the leaders, so where will the new leadership come from given that the faculty has been a traditional pipeline (Katsinas & Kempner; Kelly, 2002; Lial, 2009). Most higher education leaders are actually former faculty members who ascended through the ranks (Evelyn, 2001; Romero, 2004). According to Dr. Walter Bumphus, former President of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, current Chair of the Community College Leadership Program of the University of Texas at Austin, and President and CEO of the American Association of Community Colleges, there exists a great need to develop leaders for the community and technical colleges throughout the United States (Louisiana Community and Technical College System, 2006).

The shortage of leaders for community colleges does not have to constitute a crisis but could instead constitute opportunities for upcoming leaders (Vaughn, 2001). The turnover in community college leadership positions can be seen as an opportunity to replace traditional forms of leadership with new ideas and greater diversity (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006). In order to avert a predicament, community colleges must begin to develop a plan to groom future leaders which has the added benefit to potentially bring in fresh ideas (Vaughn).
“Higher education has not effectively trained and prepared the next generation of academic leaders,” (Mann, 2010, p. A80). Romero (2004) concurs that many universities are no longer offering degree programs in community college leadership. As such, community colleges need to develop more programs to train future leaders and improve existing programs (Bagnato, 2004; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Experts agree that leadership development programs will play a vital role in developing the skills and competencies needed in the future community college leaders (Watts & Hammons). It is critical that leadership development programs for community college leaders provide training in the unique skills and leadership abilities needed by community college leaders (Romero).

Not all experts believe the upcoming leadership shortage is unusual. Evelyn (2001a) quoted George Vaughan, a professor at North Carolina State University, who believes that leadership opportunities are always available in community colleges where the average age of administrators has remained fairly constant. Cejda and Leist (2006) purport that administrative turnover will be slightly less than was previously reported in the literature. However, future leaders of community colleges may have to be willing to start in low- or mid-level administrative positions and earn their way into higher offices (Vaughn, 2001).

The leadership skills needed to guide community colleges in the 21st century are very different from what was needed in the past (Romero, 2004), and higher education faculty members are often not interested in moving into administrative positions (Gmelch, 2003). Although the emphasis is different, many of the issues identified by Dozier (2007) would likely apply to community college leadership as well. Dozier submitted a survey to 300 accomplished U.S. teachers in an attempt to discover what type of training they felt they needed to be better leaders. Of the 179 respondents, 65% felt they needed more training in policy, 64% in working collaboratively with policy makers, and 40% in interpreting educational research.
Whether or not there is a shortage of community college leaders, there is good news about community college leadership. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2006), many members of an institution share the leadership role by spreading the leadership across the institution. Further, from the same article came the recommendation that when teaching leadership, management and vision be combined in order to develop truly effective leadership. Ebbers, Conover, and Samuels (2010) determined that community college leaders must identify or develop leadership development options. Because of the complex nature of community college leadership, a team approach is required whereby various roles are handled across the leadership team (Romero, 2004).

**Leadership Development Options**

One option for improving community college leadership is professional development. In the 1970’s, professional development in community colleges emerged in response to the rapid growth in the number of institutions (Watts & Hammons, 2002). Around this time, the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development and the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development were founded to help institutions share information and resources related to staff and faculty development (Watts & Hammons). Administrators allocated funds and resources necessary to provide professional development programs (Watts & Hammons). In the 1980’s, many faculty and staff development programs were eliminated because of budget deficits associated with the issues in the U.S. economy (Watts & Hammons). By 1987, the Joint Committee of the California State University and the California Community Colleges on Leadership Programs was recommending that professional development programs be improved for California community colleges (Barnes, Edelstein, Ellner, Epler, Piland, & Casanova, 1987).
Today, there is no clear picture on the status of professional development with some institutions supporting thriving programs and other institutions offering little or no professional development opportunities (Watts & Hammons, 2002). To effectively overcome the challenges of the 21st century, community college administrators need to recognize that professional development programs are necessary and should not be offered only during times when excess funds are available (Watts & Hammons). The American Association of Community Colleges has identified skills which the association suggested be addressed in community college professional development programs (2001, p. 7): “understanding the community college missions, effective advocacy, administrative skills, community and economic development skills, and interpersonal skills.”

Professional development has evolved and provides training needed to help educators meet the leadership and faculty needs unique to the community college environment (Watts & Hammons, 2002). Professional development is most effective when there is a clear connection between the training and the participants’ job duties (Wood, Killian, McQuarrie, & Thompson, 1993). Determining the effectiveness of professional development programs can be very difficult (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007). “Both content and process contribute to the learning that takes place in any professional development program, and both affect whether the designer’s and the participant’s goals for training are realized” (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007, p. 109).

Characteristics associated with effective professional development programs (Wood, Killian, McQuarrie, & Thompson, 1993, p. 13):

... it includes small-group activities or team learning, it gives participants some degree of choice or control over their learning during training, it includes experiential activities that encourage participants to try out new behaviors and techniques, it includes peer and
trainer coaching, [and] it concludes with participants developing an action plan for implementing what they have learned.

Further according to Wood et al., a critical aspect to the continued improvement associated with professional development is access to colleagues which provides a further rationale for developing strong cohorts for the LDI program.

The LDI program is a professional development leadership training in that graduates do not earn a degree or certification; however, participants are given the opportunity to earn graduate credit (credit for a three-hour graduate course) for the program in conjunction with the University of New Orleans. One of the strengths of the LDI program is that it participants are working in leadership positions and are immediately able to incorporate information from the session. Conger and Fulmer (2003) determined that leadership development is more effective when training sessions are paired with authentic experiences. Gmelch (2003) furthered that leadership training when combined with networking and authentic experiences can improve an academic’s motivation and appreciation for learning leadership strategies. Leadership training is also important for “deans and other academic administrators [when facing the] challenge in the shift from a faculty position to an administrative one, ...” (Bray, 2010, p. 287).

Boggs and Kent (2002) provide the following list of activities that community college presidents considered critical to open the door into the presidency: doctoral degree in higher education or community college leadership, leadership seminars and workshops offered by universities or professional organizations, and mentoring. Although according the Beem (2010) and Friedel (2010), the Ph.D. or Ed.D. is considered a requirement for the highest level positions within community colleges; fewer universities are offering formal programs in community college leadership (Katsinas & Kempner, 2005; “Leadership 2020,” 2001; Shults, 2001). Recently that trend may have reversed, especially in California (Li, Friedel, and Rusche, 2011).
According to the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, as quoted by Walter Bumphus (2007), more than 50 colleges or universities offer programs in community college leadership. As early as 1944, the University of Texas had a community college leadership program (Lindsay, 2007). Leadership programs like that found at the University of Texas train future community college leaders by providing doctoral and master’s programs (Romero, 2004). Arguably one of the stronger available university programs, the University of Texas program under the leadership of Dr. John Roueche, former LDI presenter, offers either a Ph.D. or and Ed.D. in community college leadership (Evelyn, 2001b). In addition to three to five courses in research, the students in the program take a course in organizational behavior, a course in political issues and complete a semester long internship at a community college (Evelyn, 2001b).

A more recent addition to the offerings in community college Ed.D. programs, begun in fall 2009, is that offered by the California State University Northridge (Friedel, 2010; Li et al., 2011). The program which divides students into cohorts for K-12 and community college leadership is designed “to provide relevance and rigor to those aspiring to mid-level administrative and leadership positions as well as to those seeking a presidency” (Friedel, 2010, p. 54). It has yet to be determined whether the region will be able to support the Cal. State – Northridge program; however, as of 2011, Li et al. report that seven California State University campuses now offer doctoral programs in community college leadership.

A third and thriving program is located at Mississippi State University (MSU) (Katsinas & Kempner, 2005). The MSU program offers weekend, compressed video, and internet courses for working students from rural areas (Katsinas & Kempner). Other institutions offering doctoral degrees in community college leadership include North Carolina State University, Morgan State University, University of Florida, University of Michigan, and University of California – Los Angeles (Bumphus W., 2007).
In the 1960s and 1970s, the Kellog Foundation provided funds to start community college administration or leadership doctoral programs at 10 institutions (Anderson, 1996). Many of the community college leadership degree programs, traditionally financed by foundations, have been dropped as funding sources dried up (Evelyn, 2001a). Existing community college doctoral programs are suffering from a lack of program identity having often been lumped into “super-departments” or with K-12 or university leadership programs (Katsinas & Kempner, 2005).

Most educational leadership degrees are geared towards either K-12 administration or university leadership (Romero, 2004). According to Schults (2001) and Evelyn (2001a), doctoral and master’s degrees in higher education administration rose by just over 13% while degrees specifically in community college leadership dropped by 78%. Unfortunately, a standard higher education degree path may not be sufficient preparation for a leadership role in the changing environment of community college administration which often includes fundraising, working with community business leaders, prioritizing tasks and conflict resolution among other unique skills (Romero). Given that many universities are no longer offering degrees in community college leadership may be another reason for hosting professional development programs.

Although shorter programs are not as desirable as a university degree in community college leadership, the programs are important for filling the gap until university programs are revived or other better leadership development programs are created (Bagnato, 2004). By 2001, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACU) had a database of approximately 141 higher education leadership development programs ranging from workshops and conferences to longer-term programs (“President’s report,” 2002). By 2002, the AACC was proposing the certification of leadership development programs and had plans to offer additional Future
Leaders Institutes, the AACC’s certificate program for community college leadership (“President’s report,” 2002).

There has been a dramatic increase in the number of leadership development programs that are available for aspiring leaders (Bumphus & Neal, 2008; Drumm, 2004). More institutions and systems have developed leadership programs that are broader in scope and purpose than was the previously in vogue professional development seminars (Bumphus & Neal, 2008). The programs give institutions the possibility to identify potential future leaders and to provide participants an opportunity to gain leadership skills (Shults, 2001). Programs typically include teambuilding, mentoring, peer-support, and networking and are often designed around a cohort format (Bagnato, 2004). Networking was also mentioned as a key reason to attend a leadership program (Shults, 2001). Table 2.2 provides a list of key components of several leadership development programs.

Because of the higher percentage of retiring administrators and senior faculty members, leadership development programs must be prepared to work with participants who have fewer years of experience as many of the potential leaders in the traditional pipeline, the faculty ranks, are also approaching retirement age (Frost, 2009). As stated so eloquently by Conger and Fulmer (2003), community colleges can prepare for leadership shortages by “... combining succession planning and leadership development in a comprehensive process for finding and grooming future leaders at all levels of your organization.” Additionally, leadership development programs may be a breeding ground for future doctoral candidates (Bagnato, 2004).

Some experts believe that the high turnover in the community college leadership will be an opportunity to bring in fresh ideas and new leadership styles (Evelyn, 2001a). But, it must be remembered that developing new leadership will take time and require training and
Table 2.2
Components of Educational Leadership Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name Information Source</th>
<th>Program Components and/or Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Presidents Academy (Boggs & Kent, 2002) | • American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)  
• Leadership development program for CEO’s  
• Founded in 1975 when the AACC was known as the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges  
• All presidents of member institutions are automatically enrolled in the academy  
• Offers the Summer Institute, workshops and social activities for community college CEOs |
| Leadership Development for the 21st Century (LEAD21) (Phillips, 2005) | • 12 month program  
• Sponsored by the land grant system  
• Key components: leadership models, peer networks, leadership skills and competencies  
• 3 sessions:  
  o Self-evaluation  
  o Field trips  
  o Public policy trip to Washington, D.C. |
| Leadership Development Institute (LDI) | • 9 month program  
• Face-to-face sessions  
  o National speakers  
  o LCTCS speakers  
  o Self-assessment instruments  
  o Cohort member presentations  
  o Networking opportunities  
  o LCTCS board meeting  
• Mentoring Experience  
• Internship  
• Selected Readings on Leadership |

perseverance (Gmelch, 2003). According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), we must create a nurturing environment where new leaders can develop. “Leadership development institutions (LDI), also known as ‘grow your own’ programs, have entered the lexicon at campuses of many technical and community colleges,” (Bumphus & Neal, 2008, p. 30). Potential leaders for community colleges can be given the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to
lead through professional development opportunities (Lial, 2009). Leadership development should be a career long pursuit for community college administrators (Boggs & Kent, 2002).

Many state higher education systems have launched community college leadership development programs including Kentucky, Florida, Massachusetts, and Louisiana (Bagnato, 2004; Kelly, 2002). In a 2001 article, Evelyn (2001a) discussed the program that California was developing to meet the leadership needs of the state's community colleges. The California program included doctoral degrees, certificate programs, and workshops designed to groom future potential leaders (Evelyn, 2001a). Massachusetts’ leadership program is an eight-month program that includes monthly day-long meetings and a week-long seminar in June (Bagnato, 2004). Attending a leadership program while working in a community college has the advantage of allowing the participants to practice what is being learned (Bagnato, 2004). There is a mounting interest in creating sustainable leadership development programs (Frawley, 2009).

In order to be successful, community college leaders need to be equipped in the “knowledge of political, management, and decision-making processes and also the sharp, full-spectrum vision,” (Anderson, 1996, p. 28).

To achieve this new vision, leaders need both the theoretical and the practical skills required for governing these unique organizations. Leaders do not learn such situational skills from a textbook alone but in combination with practice and experience in similar circumstances (Anderson, p. 29). Further according to Anderson and Evelyn (2001a), shorter term and less expensive PD programs can help fill the gap caused by declining numbers of graduate programs.

“The professional literature supports a growing need to provide specific, supplementary leadership training for future leaders of the nation's community colleges,” (Anderson, 1996, p. 31). Regardless of the path to leadership development, community college leaders see their
development as a key to their ability to establish environments in which others can learn, grow, and collaborate (Amey, 2006). Will the professional development form of leadership development become the preferred method, or are these programs simply filling a gap until universities resume offering more leadership degrees or other forms of leadership development are identified (Kelly, 2002)?

### Cohort Design

By combining and molding the definitions of several experts in the field, this author has developed the following definition of a cohort; a cohort is a group of students who are enrolled in a sequence of courses, workshops, or development opportunities together and remain together throughout the term of their enrollment (Lawrence, 2002; McCarthy, Trenga, & Weiner, 2005; Nimer, 2009; Sneed, 2009; Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995). There are four basic cornerstones of cohort learning designs: “interaction”, “purpose”, “individual development”, and “group development” (Norris & Barnett, 1994). Cohort design can vary across multiple dimensions including length of program, types of activities, and student level; however, as quoted in Maher (2004), there are four common characteristics of cohort design: students enrolled in a long-term program, students working towards a common goal, schedule that is structured (often rigid), and the development of a network of learners. Cohorting works best when members of the group value the knowledge and skills of all the members of the cohort and work together (Lawrence, 2002).

Cohorting students for learning is not a new concept and has been the traditional model for medical schools, law schools, and other professional schools for quite some time (Maher, 2004; McCarthy, Trenga, & Weiner, 2005; Seed, 2008). The cohort model has been used in higher education programs on and off since the 1940s and is currently regaining popularity in educational leadership development graduate programs (Maher). Cohort models for leadership
development have been successfully implemented in several areas of the United States (Louisiana Community and Technical College System, 2006; McPhail, Robinson, & Scott, 2008; Quinton, 2006; Wallin, 2007; Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007; Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995).

There are numerous benefits that have been associated with cohorting students. These benefits include decreased isolation; development of leadership abilities; and improvements in critical thinking, motivation, and social skills (Seed, 2008). Improved satisfaction, performance, and retention have also been attributed to cohort learning (Maher, 2004). Additionally, students working in cohorts are more likely to successfully complete a program and are more likely to work collaboratively (Lawrence, 2002; Nimer, 2009; Norris & Barnett, 1994; Sneed, 2009).

Another benefit of cohort learning is the increased communication between cohort members and facilitators (Nimer, 2009). Cohort members report developing close personal relationships with other members of the cohort (Nimer). Participating in a cohort program, especially one with a high level of faculty interaction, improved retention rates (Bocchi, Eastman, & Swift, 2004). As stated by Norris and Barnett (1995), students in a cohort program felt they had a better support system which leads to better learning.

Also associated with cohort learning is the depth of interactions that is associated with developing a familiarity with other participants (Maher, 2004; Norris & Barnett, 1994; Seed, 2008). As cohort members become more comfortable with one another, they will be more willing to share ideas and take risks (Lawrence, 2002; Norris & Barnett). Wood et al (1993) indicate that adult participants learn more in settings where the fear of judgment from peers had been removed.

A key impact of cohort learning is the networking that occurs among members of the group (Maher, 2004; Nimer, 2009). Networking can provide an invaluable opportunity for future leaders to reach their potential (Hagel, Brown, & Davison, 2010). Cohort learning groups will
often network during down times which can be an important part of the learning process (Lawrence, 2002). A well known adage is that it is not what you know, but who you know (Hagel, Brown, & Davison).

As LDI employs a cohort model for leadership development, the author deemed it important to include research which involved a similar paradigm. According to Norris and Barnett (1994), cohort design can be effectively used for leadership development programs. Quinton (2006) describes the Daytona Beach Community College’s leadership program; however, she provides only a sketch of the program without any empirical evidence.

In a study of 54 incoming freshmen enrolled in a first-year psychology cohort, Buch and Spaulding (2008) identified the indirect benefits of significantly improved research involvement, improved internship involvement, and improved involvement in extracurricular activities as determined using a chi square analysis when comparing the cohort members to non-cohort students. Study results indicate that cohort participation improves student performance and participation in other aspects of university participation (Buch & Spaulding). An instructor in a cohort learning program determined that the importance of choosing the cohort learning model cannot be overstated because of the benefit of a cooperative learning environment (Schultz, 2004). “The process of reflection is essential if the cohort experience is to become a vehicle for transporting transformational leadership” (Norris & Barnett, 1994, p. 15)

A potential issue with cohort learning is the tendency towards “groupthink,” where members of the cohort limit ideas to the consensus of the cohort (Maher, 2004). In a survey of 64 online MBA students, Bocchi, Eastman, and Swift (2004) discovered that “learning from other students” ranked near or at the bottom of expectations from participating in cohort program; conversely, an instructor cited by Schultz (2004) indicated that lessons learned from other students is an important aspect of the cohort learning model. A second potential issue is the lack
of empirical evidence as to the effectiveness of cohorting students (McCarthy, Trenga, & Weiner, 2005; Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995).

**Experiential Learning**

Cohort development can be facilitated through experiential learning (Lawrence, 2002; Sneed, 2009). Experiential learning has its origins in the early part of the 20th century (Seed, 2008). Experiential learning is an established approach to adult learning in Europe, North America, and Australia and is attributed to work done primarily by John Dewey; however, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget are also mentioned prominently as providing work on the topic (Miettinen, 2000; Seed, 2008; Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010). Experiential learning is characterized by authentic learning experiences followed by reflection which according to Miettinen, Dewey postulated allowed participants to solve problems based on studying habitual behaviors. Informal learning with a pedagogical purpose and a deliberately shaped environment are features associated with a “Deweyian educational environment” which is student focused instead of activity focused (Wojcikiewicz & Mural).

“A simple definition of experiential education is where ‘knowledge development is undertaken by the learner rather than presented by the teacher’,” (Sneed, 2009, p. 92). In experiential learning, instructors act as guide and facilitator as opposed to “sage on the stage.” Students are more active in the learning (Sneed). Experiential learning authorities suggest that learning takes place when subjects are actively involved in solving real problems (Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010; Wood, Killian, McQuarrrie, & Thompson, 1993).

Experientialism as envisioned by Dewey provided that students should have learning opportunities that are grounded in the present but which also provide long-term impact (Wojcikiewicz & Mural, 2010). Sneed (2009, p. 94) lists 12 benefits associated with experiential learning:
1. informal networking that occurred during unstructured time was almost more valuable than the planned activities
2. powerful tool for relationship building
3. valuable tool for retaining and helping students succeed outside of the classroom; this was a different type of relationship than provided by the classroom setting
4. faculty role became more one of mentoring than direct instruction
5. knowledge development is undertaken by the student rather than presented by the teacher
6. faculty modeled rather than merely taught
7. the environment created was one of collaboration rather than one of competition
8. a team was built that led to mutual support and learning together
9. participants grew in their ability to think critically, developed a greater motivation to learn, acquired enhanced self-development, and obtained a broader knowledge base
10. trust in classmates and team problem solving increased
11. faculty were able to get to know students in a deeper and fuller way
12. relationship were built before academic classes officially began

Leaders can learn much of their craft through experiences (Amey, 2006). According to Miettinen (2000), experiential learning is the primary method used for management and leadership training. Reflection is also mentioned by Perrin (2010) as an attribute of effective leaders. Miettinen (p. 70) further stated, “... experience includes the objective forms of interaction between humans and the environment including all artifacts and things involved in the interaction.” Leaders learn best when faced with challenging experiences (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). “Repeated practice, followed by reflection, analysis, and discussion in small groups is an extremely productive means of helping teachers and administrators master new professional behaviors,” (Wood, Killian, McQuarrie, & Thompson, 1993, p. 13)

**Mentoring**

A critical component to a leadership development program is mentoring (Bagnato, 2004). Mentoring programs allow participants to benefit from the accumulated knowledge of members of the existing leadership team. “For those who aspire to a leadership role, the opportunity to engage in mentoring relationships with senior-level leaders is a powerful way to accelerate growth,” claim Olson and Jackson (2009, p. 47). Most leadership development programs
identified in the literature include some form of mentoring (Kelly, 2002). A true mentoring program involves more than the occasional meeting and should instead represent a serious investment of time on the part of both the mentor and the mentee (Vaughn, 2001). Leaders develop from observing other leaders and will emulate the leaders they observe (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Bolman and Deal (2009) consider finding a mentor a key to leadership development. Wood et al (1993) advocate mentoring as a key aspect to strengthening the retention of learning from professional development programs.

In findings published in the *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Olson and Jackson (2009) determined that mentoring relations opened doors for mentees to earn promotions or positions on important projects. Specifically, of the 34 mentoring pairs from an 18-month program studied between May 2002 and December 2006, 14 mentees were promoted and were assigned additional responsibilities. In the same study, 90% of the mentors reported actively seeking advancement opportunities for mentees, over 90% of the mentees were satisfied with the mentoring program, and 100% of the mentees reported developing a devoted relationship with the mentor.

**Relevant Research on Educational Leadership Professional Development Programs**

The information that follows provides a detailed account of research studies related to educational leadership development programs. Via Table 2.3, the author attempts to provide summary information concerning how recent research studies in the field have investigated community college leadership and important results.

In the study by Wallin (2007), participants take part in a week-long leadership program. Wallin employed an explanatory mixed-methods research design. Although the program was relatively short compared to the LCTCS’s LDI, the population included members from across the United States. Additionally, the entire population, N=44, was included in the study. Wallin found
that leadership issues related to mission and teaching/learning scored highest on the quantitative survey instrument. For the qualitative portion of the study, seven participants engaged in telephone interviews. Subjects indicated the largest impact came from the self assessment exercises included in the program.

More similar to LCTCS’s LDI in structure, the 2005 National Community College Hispanic Council Leadership Fellows Program (Wiessner & Sullivan, 2007) is a year-long program designed to develop leadership skills for subjects interested in a career as a community college president. The 2005 cohort included 12 individuals who were provided training, self-reflection, and mentoring opportunities. Wiessner and Sullivan’s qualitative research study focused on comparing participant results to the American Association of Community Colleges’ list of endorsed competencies: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism. Results of the study indicated that both the structure and the content of the professional development played a key role in the participants’ satisfaction and program success. Specifically, program participants reported gaining a “new awareness of the importance of systems thinking for community college presidents” (Wiessner & Sullivan, p. 95).

The research study by McPhail, et al. (2008) reviewed not a professional development program, but a doctoral program for community college leadership. The project followed an explanatory mixed methods approach similar to that of Wallin. For the project, 50 doctoral students were surveyed using a quantitative survey instrument; a separate group of 20 doctoral students took part in the qualitative focus group sessions (McPhail et al.). Findings from the qualitative portion of the study included a list of positive outcomes from the cohort design of the research, e.g. instructional methodology and community of knowledge; however, several negative aspects of
the cohort design were also discussed, e.g. unprepared participants and lack of commitment to
the project.

Table 2.3
Characteristics of the Included College Leadership Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Cohort Model</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malm</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong leadership is a vital part of the success of a community college, there are no characteristics universal among the community college president survey participants, and community colleges play an important role in American higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPhail, Robinson, and Scott</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Positive Aspects of Program: structure, instructors, networking, and curriculum; Negative Aspects of Program: dominant group members, lack of commitment, failure to meet expectations, traditional instruction, and inadequate facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull &amp; Keim</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>89% of community college presidents identified leadership development programs as valuable, 69% believe there is a need to expand leadership development programs, many felt the quality of leadership development programs should be improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy &amp; VanDerLinden</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>Findings were associated with 3 research areas: self-reporting of leadership role on campus, women's and men's descriptions of leadership, and varying views of leadership based on administrative position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cohort Model</td>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Professional development for community college leadership should focus on budget and financial skills, meeting facilitation, resource acquisition, conflict resolution, and legal concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiessner &amp; Sullivan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Findings were organized into 6 Themes: Learning organizations, communities of practice, knowledge construction, leadership, leading forward competencies, and mode of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Participants indicated that the program was a positive experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Participants were exposed to diverse perspectives based on race, gender and community designed to help participants appreciate the diverse populations of the schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although significantly older than previously mentioned research, the study done by Stone (1995) is worth noting because of the similarity to the LDI program. Stone studied participants from the Leadership Training Institute of Houston’s College without Walls. The program was designed to prepare future leaders for the Houston Community College System. The Leadership Training Institute consisted of monthly meetings, an individual or group project and attendance at a leadership conference of the participant’s choice. The pilot class of 11 participants was surveyed on their impressions about the program. Participants indicated that the program was a positive experience. The Stone (1995) study highlights the lack of empirical data available on the topic and the need for additional research.
In the next study included here, Malm (2008) interviewed six community college presidents. The interview protocol for the conversations included, among other items, questions on the environmental challenges and the leadership styles of the participants. A majority of the participants indicated a preference for situational leadership styles; however, no clear list of leadership characteristics was recognized among the presidents interviewed. In 2006, Cejda and Leist completed a study of community college chief academic officers (CAOs) in nine states. The researchers received 114 of 202 surveys for a return rate of 56%. Cejda and Leist were trying to determine the issues facing community colleges according the CAOs. Survey results indicate that 70.2% saw a need for administrative training/career development while nearly 65% saw impending retirements of faculty and administrators as a major issue.

Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) reported on data collected from a national survey of administrators at the community college level. The survey was delivered to a stratified sample of 1,700 administrators and had a return rate of nearly 54%. Results indicate that community college leaders see themselves as agents of change who must possess knowledge and expertise, and who must provide a vision for the institution.

Similarly, Hull and Keim (2007) surveyed 389 community college presidents with a response rate of approximately 74%. Results indicate that among the community colleges, leadership programs were offered at over 86% of the institutions. Further, community college presidents who planned to attend professional development in the area of executive community college leadership had increased to 31%, up from 14% in 2004. Therefore programs such as LCTCS’s LDI are likely to become more common practice.

Additional relevant information was provided in an article by Kelly (2002) who reviewed information related to the Parkland Community College’s leadership program. This program started in 1994 was designed to develop 20 leaders per year and at the time of the article had
176 graduates. Kelly determined that participants were exposed to diverse perspectives based on race, gender and community designed to help participants appreciate the diverse populations of the schools.

Summary

Numerous studies have evaluated the progress of higher education leadership development; however, the number of studies related to community college leadership is significant lower than what is available from four-year colleges and universities. What is clear to this investigator is that additional empirical research is necessary. As the proposed study will illicit information from a relatively large sample of community college leaders throughout Louisiana, the research should help to fill a significant gap in the literature.

The studies in this report have been used to provide a framework for evaluating the LCTCS's LDI program. The majority of the studies included a quantitative survey instrument. Two of the studies, Wallin (2007) and McPhail et al. (2008) employed explanatory mixed methods designs. All of the research studies reviewed provided positive outcomes associated with leadership training; however, many of the studies also indicated negative outcomes especially from a lack of commitment to the program.

In more of a synthesis of various works, Shults (2001) determined that the number of degrees in community college administration decreased 78% during the academic years from 1982-83 to 1996-97; therefore, professional development is vital to providing the community college leaders necessary to fill the positions that will occur due to retirements. Schults also determined that mentoring and networking are key components to leadership development programs in preparing future leaders to meet the challenges and tasks unique to community colleges.
“Those who conduct research on leaders often narrow their focus to analyzing a set of behaviors or skills acquired by individuals in particular roles” (Amey, 2005, p. 689). This researcher desired to provide a deeper understanding of the long term impact of extensive leadership training on the participants’ career and educational goals. All LDI former cohort members studied had completed the program a minimum of 15 months prior to inclusion in the study with some members having completed the program a full 9 years prior to study participation.

**Research Design**

The research design for this project involved an exploratory mixed methods approach as described by Creswell (2005). “The purpose of an exploratory mixed methods design is the procedure of first gathering qualitative data to explore a phenomenon, and then collecting quantitative data to explain relationships found in the qualitative data” (Creswell, 2005, p 516). This method was determined to be appropriate as the researcher intended to use information gathered during the individual interviews and a review of system documents as selections for responses on the survey that would be the quantitative portion of the study.

A mixed methods approach was selected for this project for several reasons. First, the mixed methods approach provides qualitative data which allowed the researcher to develop and provide to the reader a deeper understanding of the impact of LDI participation on former cohort members. Second, the qualitative data provided the basis for many questions developed for the quantitative survey instrument. Third, in addition to explaining the relationships found in the qualitative data, the quantitative data allows for group comparisons and adds to the generalizability of the results.
In this study, the qualitative phase involved a series of individual interviews and a review of various documents. The quantitative phase was a survey of all identified former LDI cohort members. Additional information about the two phases of the project is provided in the following sections.

In order to protect study participants, an application to the Institutional Review Board of Louisiana State University was made in advance of the commencement of data collection for Phase One (see Appendix A for a copy of the IRB Exemption and Phase One Informed Consent Form). A second application was made prior to commencing Phase Two so that a close approximation of the survey instrument developed at the end of the qualitative data collection could be included for IRB consideration (see Appendix B for a copy of the IRB Exemption and Phase Two Informed Consent).

As all of the subjects in the study are adults and no personal or professional risk was anticipated for research participants; the researcher completed an application for exemption of oversight from the Institutional Review Board and received approval. Other ethical considerations included protecting the privacy and confidentiality of program participants; demographic information for the participants is known to the researcher only. In addition, a letter of support for the research was secured from the President of the Louisiana Community College System, Dr. Joe May; a copy of the letter is included in Appendix C.

**Phase One – Sampling and Data Collection**

The first phase of the project was a qualitative phase intended to consist of document review, focus group meetings, and individual interview sessions. The document review began with a thorough search of:

- LCTCS documents;
- LCTCS online resources;
• LDI cohort graduation booklets; and
• information provided by key LCTCS personnel

After reviewing identified LDI information, the researcher employed a purposive sampling technique to determine potential focus group participants; thereby, creating a representative sample instead of a random selection (Onwuegbuzi, 2007). The typical LDI cohort member was a mid-level administrator or faculty member within the system, so the aim of the researcher during Phase One was to include three or more LDI (2%) cohort members who were mid-level administrators for each of the operational categories gender and institution type and to include two or more LDI (1%) cohort members who functioned as faculty members for each of the operational categories gender and institution type. The group referenced above would have provided a sample of 15 participants which represents approximately 10% of the LDI cohort members located at the time of the Phase One portion of the study.

The researcher offered five focus group meetings so that participants would have options for day of the week and time of the day. The focus group meetings were to be hosted in an online meeting account, Adobe Connect, so that LDI graduates could attend from any computer on the internet allowing for participation from cohort members located across Louisiana. Additionally, typical online meeting platforms allow meetings to be recorded thereby capturing video, audio, chat, etc. which could be maintained as a permanent product of the study. These recordings would provide the researcher with an exact copy of the meeting to analyze at the completion of the data collected.

To solicit participation in the focus groups, a letter of solicitation, see Appendix D, was sent to 15 former LDI cohort members in the following categories: gender -- 7 females, 8 males; position level -- 2 executive-level administrators, 7 mid-level administrators, and 6 faculty
members; type of institution -- 5 each from technical community colleges, technical colleges and community colleges, see Table 1.2 for the definitions associated with position levels. Definitions are intended to provide the reader with information which should foster replication of the study. Also of note, gender, type of institution, and position level of participants are independent (grouping) variables used to assess the data. The researcher determined grouping factors based on research interests, a working knowledge of the organizational structure of the LCTCS and a review of the available research. Table 3.1 provides the demographic information for the Phase One focus group invitees.

Table 3.1
Demographic Information for Phase One Focus Group Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping Category</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>• 2 – African-Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 – Hispanic-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 12 – Caucasian-Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• 8 – males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 7 – females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>• 6 – faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 7 – mid-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 – executive level administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>• 5 – community college members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – technical college members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – technical community college members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 15 cohort members contacted, only one person responded as willing to participate. The LDI past cohort members is a relatively small group. Additionally, LDI cohorts are regularly
invited to receptions and meetings at LCTCS conferences and other events, so many of the cohort members are quite familiar with each other. By using the audio function of the Adobe room, participants indicated they would be concerned that other participants would be able to recognize them. Since most former LDI cohort members still work for the LCTCs, subjects were leery of speaking publicly on the subject. The concern expressed by the potential participants seemed valid.

Undeterred by the lack of participation in the focus groups, the researcher determined it would be necessary to host individual interviews. Individual interviews would protect the anonymity of the study participants and would provide much the same information as was intended to be collected during focus group sessions. The researcher again employed a purposive mixed method multi-level sampling technique (Onwuegbuzi, 2007). The aim of the researcher was to include five or more, 3% of the entire known population and 4% of the located population, LDI cohort members who function as mid-level administrators since this is by far the largest group of LDI cohort members when organized by position. Additional participants were included in order to further explore the topic. The participants were sent an email solicitation to participate, see Appendix E.

The final group of interviewees included seven participants, 4% of the entire known population and 5% of the located population. Interview subjects met the following classifications: gender -- 4 women and 3 men; race -- 1 African American, 1 Asian American, and 5 Caucasian-Americans; type of institution -- 4 from technical community colleges and 3 from community colleges; and position level -- 1 executive level administrator and 6 mid-level administrators. The position levels indicated were held at the time of LDI participation. At the time of interview, position levels had changed significantly for the interview group; the position levels of the participants were now five executive level positions and two mid-level
administrators. Table 3.2 provides the demographic information for the Phase One interview subjects at the time of LDI participation.

For the individual interviews, the researcher scheduled via email a date and time to contact each interviewee by phone to conduct the actual interview. Questions for the first phase interview protocol were rooted in an analysis of the literature and focused heavily on open-ended opportunities for participants to share their opinions. The researcher did use a standard interview protocol to facilitate response coding; however, conversations were allowed to progress naturally and additional questions were added as needed to thoroughly investigate the topic. The protocol questions are included in Appendix G.

Table 3.2
Demographic Information for Phase One Interview Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping Category</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>• 1 – African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 – Asian-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 – Caucasian-Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• 3 – males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 – females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>• 6 – mid-level administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 – executive level administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>• 3 – community college members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 – technical community college members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the Audacity computer software package, interviews were recorded. Recordings were later transcribed by the researcher. From a review of the literature and a personal knowledge of the LDI program, the researcher developed a list of a priori codes to be used in the thematic analysis of the transcripts. The transcripts were analyzed for common themes by
grouping responses based on a priori codes and when necessary by adding new codes; Appendix K provides a list of the codes utilized during the thematic analysis.

In addition to the thematic analysis, the researcher used the transcribed interviews as a source for developing responses for several of the survey questions. For example, survey question #25, “What was the best aspect of the LDI program?” The selection of responses was taken from the transcriptions for the interview question “What was the best aspect of the program?” The purpose for the researcher was to limit the number of respondents selecting the “Other” choice for the question which would have made the quantitative analysis more difficult.

Leadership Development Long-term Impact Survey

An attempt was made to identify a published instrument that could be used to survey participants in this research study; however, a review of the Mental Measurements Yearbook revealed no appropriate instruments. The researcher developed the survey by adapting one vetted during a previous project and using information gathered during Phase One of the research and a review of the available literature. The research spent approximately one week creating the survey instrument. The instrument was created using Survey Monkey, an online survey hosting platform. After the survey development was completed, the researcher contacted three of the seven Phase One participants to request participation in the initial portion of Phase Two of the project by piloting the survey. All three participants indicated a willingness to participate in the pilot, so the survey link was sent to each subject via email. After completing the survey, the subjects were debriefed concerning the survey instrument. According to the pilot participants, all responses provided on the survey questions were recorded accurately; however, several questions were identified as being ambiguous in some way. The researcher used the participant information to adjust the identified questions prior to releasing the survey to the larger LDI cohort group. A copy of the final survey is included in Appendix H.
The researcher developed Leadership Development Long-term Impact Survey (LDLIS) instrument included a request for demographic information as well as questions concerning the impact of participation in the LDI program. The survey features an informed consent item, 9 demographic questions, 10 career questions, 5 education questions, 1 LDI program question and 1 cohort question. Most items were designed with a five option Likert-scale or with Yes/No answers for reliability purposes and for ease in administration and analysis.

The electronic survey platform used for the survey administration possessed the ability to skip questions that are not relevant based on the response made to a previous question. This process is called question logic and was determined by the researcher in advance of the survey launch. The purpose of using question logic is that it decreases the amount of time spent by the respondents, and it also omits questions that are not applicable. The question logic for the survey is included in Appendix I.

**Phase Two – Sampling and Data Collection**

All quantitative data collection for the project was conducted via the internet. Survey Monkey, an internet-based host survey site, hosted the electronic survey. A link to the survey was included in the email sent to potential participants.

Every effort was made to include the entire population of former LDI participants in the quantitative survey portion of the research, a census of the population. In order to facilitate survey participation, the researcher employed tactics similar to those described in many of the quantitative works reviewed. These tactics included:

1. a personalized appeal for participation,
2. a reminder sent approximately one week after the initial request,
3. an easy to read and complete survey instrument, and
4. a small enticement to encourage completion.
As survey participation is typically relatively low, the researcher deemed large scale distribution vital to securing a sufficient sample size. By means of the document review and with the assistance from former LDI cohort members, the researcher was able to identify 180 former LDI cohort members. As the number of LDI former cohort members is reported at approximately 170 (Louisiana Community and Technical College System, 2010), the researcher believes to have identified all or nearly all of the former LDI cohort members and deems the sample sufficient to provide reliable results.

In order to facilitate the survey portion of the research project, the researcher attempted to find an email address of all 180 identified former LDI cohort members as described previously. Through this process, an email address or institutional contact information was found for 130 potential participants, approximately 70% of the identified LDI population. The researcher was not able to find any contact information or had outdated information for the other 50 former LDI members. The researcher had planned to study both current and former participants in the LDI program; however, only former participants are available as the program has been discontinued due to budget issues. During the latter portion of October, 2011, the researcher continued with the second phase of the research project by sending a personal email message to the LDI cohort members for whom an email address was identified, Appendix F.

Email addresses were located via an examination of LCTCS cohort booklets; LCTCS cohort member lists; LCTCS board member meeting minutes; a review of the email directories for all Louisiana public higher education institutions, all Louisiana public higher education system offices, the Louisiana Board of Regents, and many of the private Louisiana higher education institutions; as well as information provided by key LCTCS personnel and LDI former cohort members.
Of the requests for participation sent, two were responded to by former LDI cohort members who indicated that they had not completed the LDI program. As the survey was intended to determine the impact of LDI completion on career and educational goals of LDI graduate participants, the survey included a question about completion. Subjects who indicated a failure to complete the LDI program were immediately routed to a “Thank You” screen, see Appendix I. Another 17 email messages were returned as undeliverable indicating that either the participant was no longer employed by the institution or the email address had been changed. A second attempt was made to identify a valid email address for the participant and an additional three email messages were delivered.

Initial responses to the survey were encouraging. Approximately one week after launching the LDLIS, the researcher had achieved nearly a 40% return rate. In an attempt to improve the response, a reminder was sent out to the potential project participants who had not responded, see Appendix J. The reminder email also generated a reasonable response.

Final response rates were: 77 total respondents, 59% of located LDI members; 2 non-completers; and 75 valid responses used for analysis. This is also 42% of the entire known LDI population. Survey participants met the following classifications: gender -- 24 men and 51 women; type of institution -- 13 from technical community colleges, 33 from technical colleges, 27 from community colleges, and 2 for the LCTCS office; position level -- 7 executive level administrators, 42 mid-level administrators, 10 faculty members, and 16 unclassified staff; and LDI cohort -- 9 members of the 2002 LDI Cohort, 7 members of the 2003 LDI Cohort, 7 members of the 2004 LDI Cohort, 1 member of the 2005 LDI Cohort, 10 members of the 2006 LDI Cohort, 6 members of the 2007 LDI Cohort, 10 members of the 2008 LDI Cohort, 12 members of the 2009 LDI Cohort, and 13 members of the 2010 LDI Cohort. Table 3.3 provides the demographic information for the Phase Two survey participants.
Table 3.3
Demographic Information for Phase Two Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping Category</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDI cohort</td>
<td>• 9 – Cohort 2002&lt;br&gt;• 7 – Cohort 2003&lt;br&gt;• 7 – Cohort 2004&lt;br&gt;• 1 – Cohort 2005&lt;br&gt;• 10 – Cohort 2006&lt;br&gt;• 6 – Cohort 2007&lt;br&gt;• 10 – Cohort 2008&lt;br&gt;• 12 – Cohort 2009&lt;br&gt;• 13 – Cohort 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• 24 – males&lt;br&gt;• 51 – females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Level</td>
<td>• 7 – executive level administrators&lt;br&gt;• 42 – mid-level administrators&lt;br&gt;• 10 – faculty members&lt;br&gt;• 16 – unclassified staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>• 27 – community college members&lt;br&gt;• 33 – technical college members&lt;br&gt;• 13 – technical community college members&lt;br&gt;• 2 - system office personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The research method for this study was based on a mixed methods design employing a qualitative interview process and document review followed by a quantitative survey of former LDI cohort members. The purpose of employing the mixed methods design was to develop a richer depiction of the LDI program than could be determined using only survey research. For the qualitative portion, an interview protocol developed from a review of the literature and an intimate knowledge of the program gave interviewees an opportunity to describe experiences and provide opinions about the LDI program. Interviews were guided by the protocol; however, additional paths of inquiry were allowed to develop naturally during the interview. For the quantitative portion, participants were surveyed using the LDLIS which was developed for the purpose of this research and was developed from an analysis of the interview data.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study was intended to contribute information concerning the long term impact of LDI participation on the careers and educational goals of program participants along with providing information about the aspects of the LDI program. The results include both a thematic analysis of the interviews and a statistical analysis of the Leadership Development Long-term Impact Survey. The thematic analysis is explained in additional detail in the section that follows. The statistical analysis included matched pairs t-tests and One-way ANOVAs as described below.

“A central issue for mixed methods research is for researchers to effectively integrate (or mix) the quantitative and qualitative data in their studies,” (Clark, Garrett, & Leslie-Pelecky, 2010, p. 87). In an effort to better present the information learned, many of the results below for the thematic analyses are organized into information matrices. These graphic representations are designed to provide the reader with a visual representation as a complement to the narrative. Therefore, the information is merged using both a discussion and a visual matrix (Clark et al).

Following the completion of Phase One of the research project, the individual interviews were coded. Codes used to perform the analysis were a combination of a priori and emergent codes and are included in Appendix K. The researcher then completed a thematic analysis to determine common themes expressed by the participants. Three key themes emerged from the data: personal goals, impressions related to program components, and the cohort experience. The researcher used the category personal goals when performing the thematic analysis to group responses related to the participants career goals, educational goals, and other aspects of the participants personal growth. The researcher deems the category of impressions related to program components to be self explanatory. The researcher used the category of cohort
experience to group responses associated with grouping participants into cohorts. All of the thematic results along with the quantitative analyses provided data to answer the research questions.

Impact of LDI on Career Goals

Included in the personal goal themes were items related to career impact such as a desire to increase the likelihood of career advancement and a desire to determine leadership worth. In Figure 4.1, readers are provided with not only the personal goal themes associated with career goals, but with a visual representation of all themes related to personal goals. Themes related to the intrinsic benefits of LDI participation included a desire to demonstrate the ability to complete the program and pride over having been selected to participate in the program.

In addition to a thematic analysis of the Phase One interviews, the researcher reviewed the interview transcripts related to the interview question “How did LDI impact your career goals?” An analysis of the seven responses for that interview question provided the following results. One participant stated that she was now interested in pursuing a new position within
Two participants indicated that completing LDI improved their confidence related to career goals; stated one interviewee,

I think I was very unsure of myself as a leader, especially in a dean's position whether my abilities would be I guess worthy of that position and whether I could manage it and some of the skills that I have gotten out of LDI helped me to see that yeah, I was a good leader.

One LDI participant indicated that completing LDI highlighted the need to set career goals. Finally, for one interviewee, “... I think it impacted my career goals in that it actually let me see that leadership is beyond just what you're doing in the job at the moment ...”

To complement the qualitative data collected concerning the career impact, several of the questions on the LDLIS, Appendix H, were related to career goals and provided the following results. Of the 75 survey respondents, 44 have applied for a new position within the LCTCS. Of the 44, 29 were offered the position with 22 of them indicating LDI completion gave them an advantage over other applicants for the position. Of the 75 survey respondents, 28 have been offered a new position within the LCTCS for which they were not required to apply with 19 of them indicating LDI completion was a reason the promotion was offered. Of the 75 survey respondents, 26 have applied for a new position outside the LCTCS. Of the 26 who have applied for a new position outside LCTCS, 15 were offered the position with 10 of them indicating LDI completion gave them an advantage over other applicants for the position. Table 4.1 provides a summary of the survey responses related to the participants' abilities to achieve career goals.

In order to determine if participants' attitudes had changed concerning career goals, a paired samples t-test was run using survey questions 10, “At the time of my participation in LDI, I was satisfied with the position I held,”, and 11, “After participating in LDI, I realized that I was satisfied with the position I held and was not interested in earning a promotion or applying for a higher position with the LCTCS or one of the LCTCS institutions.” To allow for the analysis using
Table 4.1
Survey Responses Related to Participants’ Achievement of Career Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Goal Achievement</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied for a new position within the LCTCS</td>
<td>• 44 respondents applied for position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 29 offered position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 22 credit LDI with advantage over other applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted within LCTCS without applying</td>
<td>• 28 respondents offered position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 19 credit LDI with promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for a new position outside LCTCS</td>
<td>• 26 respondents applied for position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 offered position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 credit LDI with advantage over other applicants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a statistical procedure, the participant responses for survey questions 10 and 11 were converted to numeric values using the following procedure: Strongly Agree converted to a 5, Agree converted to a 4, Neither Agree nor Disagree converted to a 3, Disagree converted to a 2, and Strongly Disagree converted to a 1. Subsequently, a paired samples t-test was run on the data collected. The results indicate that the mean value for Post-LDI scores (mean=2.17, sd=0.88) was significantly different from the mean value for Pre-LDI scores (mean=3.96, sd=0.85) on the items related to satisfied with current position, t(74) =13.41, p=0.00 as shown in Table 4.2. It should be noted that since there is no current LDI cohort to include in the research project and all former LDI cohorts had completed prior to the advent of this study, the researcher was unable to collect prior subject opinions and is limited to having subjects recall the opinion they held prior to becoming an LDI cohort member.

In order to determine whether there were group differences associated with the changes on job satisfaction ratings, the researcher determined the Pre-LDI and Post-LDI difference in the converted scores for questions 10 and 11 and performed three different one-way analysis of variance procedures. The analyses were run using three grouping factors, gender, position level,
Table 4.2

-t-Test Results of Career Satisfaction Opinion Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(T&lt;=t) two-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Critical two-tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and institution type. For the analysis based on gender of participants, the ANOVA results were not significant, F(1,73) =0.05, p=0.82. For the analysis based on type of institution of the participants, the ANOVA results were not significant, F(3,71) =0.63, p=0.60. For the analysis based on the position level of the participants, the ANOVA results were not significant, F(3,71) =0.05 p=0.98. Table 4.3 provides the ANOVA results for the change in ranking for survey questions 10 and 11.

Also of note, since completing the LDI program, participants indicated that they had applied for or were in consideration for higher positions and promotions. A review of the data for position changes within the LCTCS indicates that 44 of the 75 respondents (59%) had received either a promotion or been offered a higher position for which they had applied. By including those participants that have left the LCTCS, an unduplicated value for positions changes indicates that 52 of the 75 respondents (69%) had received either a promotion or been offered a higher position. An examination of the positions pre and post LDI for all 75 survey
Table 4.3
ANOVA Results of Career Satisfaction Opinion Changes

### Difference in Position Opinion by Grouped by Gender

#### Anova: Single Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.7255</td>
<td>1.5231</td>
<td>1.2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.9167</td>
<td>0.9493</td>
<td>0.9743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.5965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0746</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>0.8233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>97.9902</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.4847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.5867</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference in Position Opinion by Grouped by Type of Institution

#### Anova: Single Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.8148</td>
<td>1.6952</td>
<td>1.3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.8485</td>
<td>1.0701</td>
<td>1.0344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Community College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4615</td>
<td>1.4359</td>
<td>1.1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCTCS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.5394</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8465</td>
<td>0.6257</td>
<td>0.6007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>96.0473</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.3528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.5867</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference in Position Opinion by Grouped by Position Level

#### Anova: Single Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td>0.8095</td>
<td>0.8997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.8095</td>
<td>1.1823</td>
<td>1.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
<td>1.2889</td>
<td>1.1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.6875</td>
<td>2.2292</td>
<td>1.4930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.2158</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0719</td>
<td>0.0519</td>
<td>0.9843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>98.3708</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.3855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.5867</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents was as follows: 20 graduates had vertical position changes (a promotion that moved the graduate from either a faculty or staff member to a mid-level administrator or a promotion that moved the graduate from a mid-level to an executive administrator), 20 graduates had intermediate position changes (promotion that did not change the position level as described in this study), 31 graduates had no change in position, 3 graduates moved to lower level positions, and 1 graduate retired. Overall, 40 of the 75 respondents are working in positions higher than when they entered LDI.

**Impact of LDI on Educational Goals**

The seven interviews were also reviewed for personal goal themes related to educational goals, see figure 4.1, such as participants having no desire to earn additional degrees or certifications prior to participation in the LDI program and a shift to a desire to earn an additional degree or certification subsequent to participation. Results included four subjects indicating that following LDI they considered enrolling in a Ph.D. program for the very first time. For one interviewee, LDI participation allowed for a complete change in educational goals. The interviewee’s opinion of getting a Ph.D. prior to LDI was, “I didn’t think I could get it. I didn’t think that was something I’d be qualified for.” Since participating in the LDI program, this same interviewee has enrolled in and completed a Ph.D. program in higher education.

Again to complement the qualitative results, several of the questions on the LDLIS, Appendix H, were related to educational goals and provided the following results. Results were determined based on actual higher education enrollments and are as follows: 15 respondents enrolled in programs to further their education before or during LDI participation, 25 respondents have enrolled in programs to further their education since completing the LDI
program, and 28 respondents have earned an additional degree, diploma, or certificate since completing LDI.

Also using survey information, an analysis was done to determine where LDI graduates were more or less likely to enroll for further education after completing LDI. To allow for an analysis of this information using a statistical procedure, the participant responses for survey questions 20, “Prior to my LDI participation, I intended to further my education at some point in the future,” and 21, “Since my LDI participation, I have an interest in furthering my education at some point in the future.” Scores on the two items were converted to numeric values using the following procedure: Strongly Agree converted to a 5, Agree converted to a 4, Neither Agree nor Disagree converted to a 3, Disagree converted to a 2, and Strongly Disagree converted to a 1.

In order to determine if LDI graduates were more or less likely to enroll for further education after completing LDI, a paired samples t-test was run on survey items 20 and 21. Results indicate that LDI graduates are not significantly more interested in earning a higher degree, diploma, or certificate; results are provided in Table 4.4. It should be noted that since there is no current LDI cohort to include in the research project and all prior LDI cohorts had completed prior to the advent of this study, the researcher was unable to collect prior subject opinions and is limited to having subjects recall the opinion they held prior to becoming an LDI cohort member.

**Impressions of LDI Program**

Program related themes involved items associated with commitment, practice, and design, see figure 4.2. Here the researcher was able to identify themes from the interviews related to benefits of participating in the LDI program being worth the time and effort, importance of release time to complete program requirements, magnitude of support from
school personnel and administration for program participant, and the time required to complete program requirements was significant yet manageable.

As provided by one interviewee, “I believe the benefit of participating in the program far outweighs the time and commitment involved. Participants are exposed to national speakers, system presenters, mentoring, internships, etc. which provide a rich experience.” The Program/Practice themes included opportunity to learn ways to provide better service to students, assessments designed to determine leadership style, and learning methods for improving leadership effectiveness.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-Test Results of Educational Goal Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Participants for Changes in Educational Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ Stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P(T&lt;=t)$ two-tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ Critical two-tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program/Design themes included an opportunity to see how the LCTCS is structured; high quality presentations were provided by both national, regional, and local presenters; and the accumulation of reference materials. Stated interviewee #4, “I became more aware of how the LCTCS system works, and I began to see the entire process not just what’s going on at my institution.” In a similar opinion, interviewee #5 stated,
I think it allowed me to have a greater understanding overall of the system. Prior to being an LDI student, I really, I knew a lot about the organization that I was at with regards to just being at [my institution], but I really didn’t understand a lot of the components on the state level, so I think that being able to network with other students in the [institute] and being able to get a feel for what other institutions were doing allowed me to provide better quality to our students and offer more for my position because I was able to get more of a grasp of what was happening on a state-wide level.

Figure 4.2 Program Related Themes

Also included in the area of LDI impressions were participant opinions as to the various aspects of the LDI program. Specifically mentioned as highlights of the program by several interviewees were networking with other cohort members, learning about procedures from
other institutions, and presentations by national, regional and local speakers. Interviewees were also asked to provide suggestions for improving the LDI program. The following suggestions were offered: include more speakers from within the system to give LCTCS specific information, possibly offer track options, choose readings from materials geared towards education as business related books do not always apply, and perform an assessment of cohort members prior to beginning the LDI program so topics can be tailored to the needs of program participants.

When interviewees were asked about the impact of LDI completion on their ability to perform the position they held at the time, four indicated that it provided them with a better awareness of the LCTCS; three indicated that they were provided with valuable reference materials; three felt the speakers had provided them with important information about such topics as professionalism, accreditation, financial issues; three indicated that networking with cohort members was likely to be valuable; one indicated that the subject was able to discover himself/herself as a leader; one indicated that he/she was motivated to do a better job because of having been selected to participate in LDI; and one indicated that the knowledge and experience gained would be very valuable.

The interviewees in this study expressed very strong feelings about the positive impact of LDI participation. One interviewee stated,

... the benefits were, I thought, very valuable because it helped me to understand myself as a leader and also understand my faculty role and my faculty’s role, me as a faculty and them as a faculty and see how the two are intertwined.

The LDLIS also included a question asking respondents to identify “... the best aspect of the LDI program,” survey question 25. The survey responses included: provided broader view of LCTCS, networking with cohort members, system/in-state presenters, self-assessment activities,
assigned readings, internship, mentorship, and other (please specify). Participant responses were as follows: 20 participants indicated provided a broader view of the LCTCS, 17 participants indicated the national presenters, 16 subjects indicated networking with cohort members, 7 participants indicated the internship, 7 participants indicated the mentorship, 3 participants indicated the self-assessment activities, and 2 participants indicated the system/in-state presenters. Three subjects selected the other response with two indicating that all aspects of the program were best and one indicating that many aspects were best. Figure 4.3 provides a graphical representation of the survey responses for survey question 25.

Figure 4.3 Graphical Representation of the Best Components of the LDI Program.
Aspects of LDI Cohort Model

For the interview question “How would you describe the LDI cohort experience,” all seven interviewees indicated that the LDI cohort experience was very positive with three interviewees indicating that the cohort experience gave a broader view of the LCTCS. During the LDI program, many cohort members forge lasting friendships; one participant stated, “… I’m still in contact with some of those individuals from my class... I would say our cohort was like a family.”

When analyzing the individual interviews, cohort related themes did not have any associated subcategories. The cohort themes included the positive aspects of having a cohort design used for the program, the interaction between cohort members outside of the LDI session events, the networking opportunities provided within the cohort and the support participants felt was provided by other cohort members. Figure 4.4 shows the cohort themes.

![Figure 4.4 Cohort Themes](image)

Using the interview responses and a review of the literature, the researcher crafted the responses for a similar question on the LDLIS. Survey respondents were asked to provide feedback on the LDI cohort experience. Respondents were allowed to check as many responses as they wanted from the list of available responses: very positive, no impact on the learning
environment, not effective, gave a broader view of the LCTCS, bonding experience, like a family, and other. Of the 75 survey respondents, 59 respondents (79%) indicated very positive, 41 respondents (54%) indicated gave a broader view of the LCTCS, 31 respondents (41%) bonding experience, 11 respondents (15%) indicated like a family, 0 respondents indicated no impact on the learning environment, 0 respondents indicated not effective, and 10 respondents indicated other.

Respondents selecting other on the survey question regarding the LDI cohort experience were asked to provide additional information. For one LDI graduate, the cohort experience was an opportunity to “[meet] many more colleagues that we can email/call and talk about issues and ideas as an outside opinion rather than just those within my college.” A similar statement was made by several participants who checked the other option.

Summary

Although not all of the analyses performed on the quantitative data revealed significant results, the evidence provided by the survey responses and the individual interviews indicates that LDI participation fosters the growth of positive relationships among LCTCS employees. There is also some evidence that LDI participation prepares cohort members to assume higher level leadership roles, alters career aspirations, and may impact career opportunities. Educational goals of LDI cohort members may also be impacted by program participation. A quote from one of the participant is indicative of the potential enlightenment participants will experience during the LDI program,

I would say that in any leadership position that you have you are going to be confronted with experiences that you are not familiar with and that if you would be able to put the time and effort into what is being asked of you in certain programs like LDI, that what you are really learning about is not just the specific skills of how do you solve this problem or
how do you deal with this type of a problem, but what you are really doing is learning about yourself, and you're giving yourself the tools to be able to handle different situations later, ...
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Of the 180 identified former LDI cohort members a public records and directory search indicates that 122 (nearly 68%) still work for an LCTCS institution or the system office. This finding combined with the participants’ increased interest in applying for new positions indicates that as a “Grow Your Own Leaders” program, the LCTCS’s LDI should be deemed a successful professional development program. In a 2010 study, Robison, Sugar, and Miller found the professional development programs studied to be effective in improving the leadership abilities of participants. Also in a 2010 study, McNair surveyed community college leaders in California. Of those surveyed, 75% considered it essential to have professional development programs with more than 80% crediting professional development as the method whereby community college administrators develop skills in resource management, communication, collaboration, and professionalism.

In answer to the research question regarding the impact of LDI participation on the career goals and achievement of participants, the researcher determined that LDI participants were significantly more likely to be interested in promotion after completing the LDI program. It was further determined that a large percentage of LDI graduates had been promoted within the LCTCS. Although there was no significant impact on the educational goals of former LDI graduates, it should be noted that many have earned additional degrees, diplomas, or certificates since completing the LDI program.

In answer to the research question regarding the effectiveness of the various aspects of the LDI program, this researcher determined that networking and cohorting were considered to be extremely effective by the LDI participants. Similarly in the study by Hassan, Dellow, and Jackson (2010), it was determined that networking was important for developing the ability to
advocate for one’s community college; advocacy is one of the AACU’s leadership competencies. They further determined that networking improves relations internal and external to the community college. In agreement, Ebbers, Conover, and Samuels (2010, p. 62) maintain “[n]etworking is very important inasmuch as the community college world is small, in the sense of people knowing and working with each other.” In regards to the effectiveness of the various aspects of the cohort model for the LDI program, an overwhelming majority of respondents considered the cohort model to have a very positive impact on the program. It should be noted that no respondents indicated that the cohort model had either no impact or a negative impact.

Further worth noting, interviewees were asked to explain their feelings about the cost/benefit of participating in the LDI program. All seven of the interview subjects indicated they had benefitted from participating in the LDI program. Five interview subjects felt the benefits from the program outweighed the program costs, and five interview subjects indicated that the LDI program was worth the time invested. For interviewee #3, “… the positive experience of being selected and a part of LDI certainly reinforced my motivation to perform at a high level.”

The information collected and provided in this project establishes clearly that the career and educational goals of LDI cohort members were impacted by program participation. What’s more, the impact was significant in the area of career goals and lasted over time. In the case of some study participants, nearly 10 years have elapsed since LDI participation.

Implications for Practice

To date, the LCTCS has not offered the LDI program since the 2009/2010 cohort graduated. Although a cohort was planned to start for the 2011/2012 academic year (“Leadership Development,” 2011), that plan was abandoned. Given the results determined in
this research project, the author believes resurrecting the LDI program would be beneficial to the LCTCS and the students enrolled in LCTCS institutions.

The study results provided several implications related to changes in career goals in that they were significantly impacted by program participation. For a “grow your own leaders” program, this is an extremely important finding because the purpose of the program is to improve the leadership skills of the participants so that they can perform move effectively in their current roles and fill future openings (Leadership Development, 2006). The majority of LDI graduates are still working for the LCTCS, and a striking 59% of survey respondents had moved to a higher position within the LCTCS since graduating from the LDI program. Based on the results of this study and the study by Robison, Sugar, and Miller (2010) it can be inferred that graduates of the LDI program will be prepared and interested in filling future leadership positions within the LCTCS.

Less pronounced than the results related to career goals, the study also provided educational implications. Although the results of the study did not indicate a significant difference in the educational goals of LDI graduates after program completion, there was a positive impact indicated. Twenty-eight of the 75 (37%) survey respondents have earned a higher degree, diploma, or certificate since completing the LDI program; yet, those same respondents to the survey question “Prior to my LDI participation, I intended to further my education at some point in the future” indicated either “Disagree” or “Neither Agree nor Disagree.” Further evidence can be found in unduplicated responses to the question “Since my LDI participation, I have enrolled in a higher education program.” Likewise, a remarkable number of subjects indicated they have enrolled in a higher education program since completing LDI, after responding with either “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” on this same question. These responses indicate a rather pronounced impact on the students’ educational goals.
There were also implications related to leadership development programs. The participants felt that completing the LDI program provided them with a better view of how the LCTCS is structured. It also gave them unique networking, mentoring, and internship opportunities that were considered to be very valuable. Li et al. (2011) from a survey of community college administrators similarly report the importance of programs developing networking and partnership opportunities in order to further the mission of the community college. Respondents were impressed by all the presentations, especially those provided by nationally recognized experts in their field.

Final implications related to the use of a cohort model. The cohort paradigm of the LDI program provided students with a network of other participants that they could count on for support during the LDI program and for information and assistance outside of the program, a finding also reported by McPhail et al. in 2008. The cohort helped LDI participants to learn more about the policies and procedures at other LCTCS institutions. Additionally, several LDI participants indicated they have forged lasting friendships with some or all of their cohort members.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study contributed to the body of literature related to the long-term impact of a leadership development program on the career aspirations and educational goals of community college leaders. This researcher discovered a significant gap in the literature related to community colleges as compared to K-12, four-year institutions, or higher education in general. This gap was especially glaring in relation to community college leadership. For many of the articles included in the literature review for this work, the author was compelled to refer to articles on related topics as very few sources could be found that were on point.
Given the unique skills needed to lead a community college and the likelihood that community college enrollments will continue to increase, community college leadership should be explored in more detail (Evelyn, 2001a; Kelly, 2002). Specifically, community college leadership development programs in other states should be evaluated in more detail. Findings related to program formats and components for developing the leadership potential of participants would be useful contributions to the literature and for institutional planning purposes.

This researcher specifically recommends that future studies explore the long-term impact of other leadership development programs on community college leaders in the United States and in other countries. Additional work is also recommended to determine the most effective and/or cost-effective method for delivering leadership training to community college officials. Finally, it is recommended that additional research be completed to explore the uniqueness of community college leadership (Evelyn, 2001a; Kelly, 2002; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The results of this study indicate that “Grow Your Own” leadership programs can have a significant impact on the career goals of participants thereby preparing system personnel to assume the positions of leaders who have left or retired from the system; however, additional research could confirm or refute the impact on participants educational goals, determine effective program components for leadership programs, and establish the value of cohorting for educational leadership development.
REFERENCES


Drumm, K. (2004, August 2). What’s all the fuss about leadership? *Community College Week*, p. 4.


McNair, D. E., Duree, C. A., & Ebbers, L. (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, pp. 3-25.


SurveyMonkey [Software]. Available from www.surveymonkey.com


The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2009). *California community colleges: Principles and leadership in the context of higher education*.


APPENDIX A

PHASE ONE INFORMED CONSENT FORM WITH IRB APPROVAL

Informed Consent Form

1. Study Title: How function community colleges are committing the shortage of higher education leaders: A study of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System’s Leadership Development Institute

2. Investigator: Peggy L. Holman, Kaplan University, (985) 691-7662

3. Purpose: The purpose of this mixed methods study will be to determine the impact of participation on the educational goals and careers of former LDI cohort members.

4. Subjects: All Leadership Development Institute (LDI) former cohort members

5. Number of subjects: 15-20

6. Procedure: The study will be conducted in two phases. This consent is to cover the 1st phase of the project.
   a. Phase One of this research project will be the qualitative portion of the study and will be composed of interviews and focus groups. These sessions will take place in an online environment or to allow for participation by former LDI participants located throughout the state of Louisiana.

7. Benefits: All participation is voluntary; however, a small stipend will be offered for participation. Each focus group or interview participant will be provided a $25 gift card to Amazon or Starbucks.

8. Risks: All efforts will be made to maintain confidentiality of the study subjects; therefore, there are no known risks to the subjects. Additionally, Dr. Kay, LCTCS President, has provided a letter of support for the research.

9. Right to Refusal: Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time.

10. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

The study has been described, and my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Watkins, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-6592. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator’s obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form.

Signature of Subject: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Study Investigator By:
Dr. Robert C. Watkins, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
232 B-1 David Skidmore
225-578-6592, www.lsu.edu/irb
Signature Expired: [Signature Date]
APPENDIX B
PHASE TWO INFORMED CONSENT FORM WITH IRB APPROVAL

Sample > final Version TBD

Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Participant Survey

At the end of the survey, you will find information about an opportunity to win a $50 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks that is being given away to a project participant.

All demographic information provided will be used by the researcher for classification purposes only. Strict participant confidentiality will be maintained.

By completing this survey, I am consenting to participate in the study by Peggy L. Hohensee, Kaplan University.

The purpose of this mixed methods study will be to determine the impact of participation on the educational goals and careers of former LDI cohort members. All efforts will be made to maintain confidentiality of the study subjects; therefore, there are no known risks to the subjects. Additionally, Dr. May, LCTCS President, has provided a letter of support for the research. Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time. Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law. I may direct questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation by completing this survey instrument.

I agree to participate in this study and have my responses included in the study results. Yes No

Name: 

Gender: M F LDI Cohort Year:

LCTCS Home Institution: During LDI Participation

Job Title: Highest Earned Degree/Certificate:

Current Information

LCTCS Home Institution:

Job Title: Highest Earned Degree/Certificate:

Please indicate your answer to each of the following questions:

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 I www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 10-15-2014
APPENDIX C
LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM LCTCS PRESIDENT

LOUISIANA COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

October 8, 2009

Dr. Susan MacGregor  
Louisiana State University  
111H Peabody Hall  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Re: Peggy Hohensee

Dear Dr. MacGregor,

I recently met with Mrs. Peggy Hohensee, a doctoral student at Louisiana State University. During the meeting, Mrs. Hohensee proposed a study of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System’s Leadership Development Institute (LDI). Mrs. Hohensee suggested a mixed method research plan that includes a review of records, interviews and focus group meetings with current and previous LDI cohort members, as well as electronic surveys of cohort members and their coworkers.

On behalf of LCTCS, I have agreed to allow Mrs. Hohensee to pursue her research. As part of the agreement, Mrs. Hohensee will provide my office with the research results at the end of the study period. Throughout the study, participant confidentiality will be maintained.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joe D. May
President

JDM/CES

cc: Mrs. Peggy Hohensee
APPENDIX D
LETTER OF SOLICITATION FOR FOCUS GROUPS

Dear [Participant],

As a former Leadership Development Institute (LDI) cohort member and a doctoral student at LSU, I have decided to complete my doctoral study on the LDI program. I am soliciting participation in my study from all former LDI cohort members. The study will be divided into two phases. The first phase of the project will be a series of focus groups which will be hosted online using Adobe Connect. Participants will be able to login to the discussion using their name or a pseudonym. To participate, you do not have to purchase any additional software or hardware. The second phase will be a short survey which can be completed on paper or electronically. You may participate in either or both phases of the project; however, I am hopeful that you will agree to participate in both. I have selected a group of 15 past LDI members across several categories, including but not limited to:

- type of institution:
  - community college
  - technical community college
  - technical college

- gender

- position level:
  - faculty member
  - mid-level administrator

Each focus group session will have a maximum of 5 participants in order to facilitate and open environment.

All LDI cohort members who take part in Phase I of this research project will be given a $20 gift card from either Amazon.com or Starbucks. All participants in Phase II given an
opportunity to win either a $50 gift card or a $25 gift card from either Amazon.com or Starbucks.

Focus group sessions will be open to invited participants only, and a professional atmosphere will be maintained at all times. When entering the focus group sessions, participants will be given the opportunity to use either their name or a pseudonym. Additionally, Dr. May, President of the LCTCS, has provided a letter of support for the project.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study and would like additional information, please contact me by phone at (985) 691-7662 or by email at phohensee@comcast.net. You may also contact Mr. Robert C. Mathews, Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board, at (225) 578-8692.

If you would like to participate, please complete the attached informed consent and select which sessions you would prefer to attend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Session</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Preference: (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/12/11</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/13/11</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/14/11</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/14/11</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will use the pseudonym: __________

The forms can be scanned and emailed to phohensee@comcast.net. Once forms are received, participants will be provided with meeting information by return email.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

Peg

Peggy L. Hohensee
Kaplan University
APPENDIX E
LETTER OF SOLICITATION FOR INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

Dear [participant name],

As a former Leadership Development Institute (LDI) cohort member and a doctoral student at LSU, I have decided to complete my doctoral study on the LDI program. I am soliciting participation in my study from former LDI cohort members. The study will be divided into two phases. The first phase of the project will be individual interviews. All LDI cohort members who take part in Phase I of this research project will be given a $20 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks. I’m hopeful that you will be willing to participating.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study and would like additional information, please contact me by phone at (985) 691-7662 or by email at phohensee@comcast.net. You may also contact Mr. Robert C. Mathews, Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board, at (225) 578-8692. Additionally, Dr. May, President of the LCTCS, has provided a letter of support for the project.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

Peg

Peggy L. Hohensee
Kaplan University
Dear [participant name],

As a former Leadership Development Institute (LDI) cohort member and a doctoral student at LSU, I have decided to complete my doctoral study on the LDI program. I am asking former LDI cohort members to complete a very short electronic survey.

I anticipate the survey can be completed in 3-5 minutes. All LDI cohort members who take part in this survey will be given an opportunity to win a $50 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks.

To access the survey, click the link: www.surveymonkey.com/s/6W78R2S. The survey will be available until November 2, 2011.

All information provided on the survey will be reported as group results only. Additionally, Dr. May, President of the LCTCS, has provided a letter of support for the project.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study and would like additional information, please contact me by phone at (985) 691-7662 or by email at phohensee@comcast.net. You may also contact Mr. Robert C. Mathews, Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board, at (225) 578-8692.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

Peg

Peggy L. Hohensee
Kaplan University
1. What factors impacted your ability to complete or not complete the LDI program?

2. How did LDI participation impact your ability to perform in the position you held at the time? Describe a situation where you applied what you learned from the program.

3. How did LDI participation impact your career goals?

4. How did LDI participation impact your educational goals?

5. Explain your feelings about the cost/benefit of participation given the time and commitment involved.

6. How would you explain the cost/benefit of participation to a peer?

7. What was the best aspect of the program?

8. What aspect of the program was least applicable to your professional responsibilities?

9. How would you revise that portion of the program to make it more applicable?

10. How would you describe the LDI cohort experience?

Note: Additional questions were asked as needed to elicit complete information from participants.
APPENDIX H
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT LONG-TERM IMPACT SURVEY

Introduction and Consent

At the end of the survey, you will find information about an opportunity to win a $50 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks that is being given away to a project participant.

All demographic information provided will be used by the researcher for classification purposes only. Strict participant confidentiality will be maintained.

By completing this survey, I am consenting to participate in the study by Peggy L. Hohensee, Kaplan University.

1. The purpose of this mixed methods study will be to determine the impact of participation on the educational goals and careers of former LDI cohort members. All efforts will be made to maintain confidentiality of the study subjects; therefore, there are no known risks to the subjects. Additionally, Dr. May, LCTCS President, has provided a letter of support for the research. Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time. Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law. I may direct questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator’s obligation by completing this survey instrument.

I agree to participate in this study and have my responses included in the study results.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Demographic Information

All demographic information provided will be used by the researcher for classification purposes only. Strict participant confidentiality will be maintained.

2. Name

3. LDI Cohort Year:

4. Gender

☐ Male
☐ Female
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5.</strong> Home institution during LDI participation (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6.</strong> Job title at time of LDI participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7.</strong> Current Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>8.</strong> Highest degree/certificate earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>9. Did you complete the LDI program?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Career Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>10.</strong> At the time of my participation in LDI, I was satisfied with the position I held.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>11.</strong> After participating in LDI, I realize that I was satisfied with the position I held and would not be interested in earning a promotion or applying for a higher position within the LCTCS or one of the LCTCS institutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12.</strong> Since participating in LDI, I have desired and applied for a new position within my institution, at another LCTCS institution, or at the LCTCS office.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.</strong> I was offered/accepted the position mentioned in the previous question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Participant Survey**

14. I believe my participation in LDI gave me an advantage over the other applicants for the position.
   - Yes
   - No

15. Since participating in LDI, I have received a promotion within my institution or office for which I was not required to apply.
   - Yes
   - No

16. I believe my participation in LDI was a factor in my receiving the promotion.
   - Yes
   - No

17. Since participating in LDI, I have desired and applied for a new position with an institution outside of the LCTCS.
   - Yes
   - No

18. I was offered/accepted the position mentioned in the previous question.
   - Yes
   - No

19. I believe my participation in LDI gave me an advantage over the other applicants for the position.
   - Yes
   - No

**Education Questions**
20. Prior to my LDI participation, I intended to further my education at some point in the future.
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

21. Since my LDI participation, I have an interest in furthering my education at some point in the future.
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

22. At the time of my LDI participation, I was enrolled in a higher education program.
- Yes
- No

23. Since my LDI participation, I have enrolled in a higher education program.
- Yes
- No

24. Since my LDI participation, I have earned a degree, diploma, certificate, or specialization.
- Yes
- No

LDI Program Question
Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Participant Survey

25. What was the best aspect of the LDI program?
- Provided broader view of LCTCS
- Networking with cohort members
- System/in-state presenters
- National presenters
- Self-assessment activities
- Assigned readings
- Internship
- Mentorship
- Other (please specify)

26. How would you describe the LDI cohort experience? (please check all that apply)
- Very positive
- No impact on learning environment
- Not effective
- Gave broader view of LCTCS
- Bonding experience
- Like a family
- Other (please specify)

Thank you!

Thank you for your participation. If you are interested in participating in the drawing for a $50 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks, please provide your email address and gift card preference.

27. Email Address

28. Gift card preference
- Amazon.com
- Starbucks
APPENDIX I
PHASE TWO SURVEY QUESTION LOGIC

Question 1  I agree to participate in this study and have my responses included in the study results.
   a. Yes: Question 2
   b. No: End of Survey

Question 9  Did you complete the LDI program?
   a. Yes: Question 10
   b. No: End of Survey

Question 12  Since participating in LDI, I have desired and applied for a new position within my institution, at another LCTCS institution, or at the LCTCS office.
   a. Yes: Question 13
   b. No: Question 15

Question 15  Since participating in LDI, I have received a promotion within my institution or office for which I was not required to apply.
   a. Yes: Question 16
   b. No: Question 17

Question 17  Since participating in LDI, I have desired and applied for a new position with an institution outside of the LCTCS.
   a. Yes: Question 18
   b. No: Question 20
Greetings,

As the survey end date approaches, I wanted to send a reminder because I'm hoping you will take part in my research study. All LDI cohort members who participate in this survey will be given an opportunity to win a $50 gift card to either Amazon.com or Starbucks. The survey only takes 3-5 minutes to complete.

To access the survey, click the link: www.surveymonkey.com/s/6W78R2S. The survey will be available until November 2, 2011.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating, please contact me by phone at (985) 691-7662 or by email at phohensee@comcast.net. You may also contact Mr. Robert C. Mathews, Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board, at (225) 578-8692.

Thank you,

Peg

Peggy L. Hohensee
Kaplan University
APPENDIX K
PHASE ONE THEMATIC ANALYSIS CODES

• Cohort Category
  o Cohort interaction outside LDI program *
  o Cohort support *
  o Cohort valuable program component
  o Networking benefit *

• Personal Goal Category
  o Desire to complete
  o Desire to earn higher degree *
  o Determine worth as leader
  o Impact of being selected
  o Increased likelihood of advancement *
  o Message to complete program
  o Moving up might not be desirable
  o No desire to earn degree prior to LDI
  o Set a personal goal

• Program Strengths Category
  o All subordinates leadership roles
  o Benefits of participation worth effort *
  o Better service to students
  o Challenge
  o Instilled confidence
  o More in-state speakers
  o Opportunity to see system structure
  o Program worth cost to system
  o Quality presentations
  o Reference materials *
  o Release time for program
  o Right people working
  o See how to be effective *
  o See type of leader
  o Some presentations not applicable
  o Support from school/administration
  o Time and commitment heavy
  o Time and commitment not too bad

* Indicated an a priori code
VITA

Peggy L. Hohensee completed a bachelor of arts degree in special and elementary education (dual major) from Nicholls State University (NSU) in 1993. After completing her degree, she began her teaching career with Lafourche Parish School Systems. Peggy later returned to NSU to earn a master of education degree in curriculum and instruction (2001) and a master of science degree in applied mathematics (2005). While working on her advanced degrees, Peggy held the position of Program Coordinator for the Louisiana Center for Dyslexia and Related Learning Disorders which is located on the NSU campus.

Peggy left NSU for Fletcher Technical Community College (Fletcher) in 2005 where she began as a math instructor. She was later promoted to the positions of General Education Division Chair, Dean of Arts and Sciences, and Dean of Student Affairs. During her tenure at Fletcher, Peggy was the Louisiana community college math delegate to the American Diploma Project and participated in the Louisiana Community and Technical College System’s Leadership Development Institute, thus her interest in this project.

In advance of a move to Maine, Peggy applied for and was offered a position with Kaplan University. Peggy is the Director of the Kaplan University Math Center and Foundations. In her position with Kaplan, Peggy leads two departments. In the Math Center she heads a team of 20 full-time and part-time math tutors who provide remote live-tutoring, math workshops, project review, video example service, a question & answer service, and instructional modules for students enrolled in courses ranging from developmental math to graduate statistics. As the chair of the Student Success Department, Peggy is responsible for all online developmental educational at Kaplan University. Her team of approximately 50 full-time and part-time instructors provides instruction in developmental reading, writing, math and study skills.
Peggy is an avid presenter. She has presented nationally for the Online Teaching Conference for MERLOT, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Conference, the CIT Conference for the League for Innovations, the STEMtech Conference for the League for Innovations, the National Tutoring Association, and the General Education Conference for Kaplan University. She has presented at the state level for the Louisiana Community and Technical College System Conference. In addition to her conference presentations, she has made television appearances and has been an invited speaker in the fields of dual enrollment and accommodating students with learning difficulties.

On a personal note, Peggy has been married to Myron Hohensee for 26 happy years. Their oldest son, Gerard, is following in his mother’s footsteps and is an education major at NSU. Their youngest son, Jacob, is a physics major at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette.