



**AACC Leadership Summit of University Leadership Development Programs
Web Summary
March 16, 2004**

A summary of the third **Leading Forward** Leadership Summits was published by the *Community College Times* on March 30, 2004. It can be viewed at www.aacc.nche.edu. A more detailed account of the eight hour meeting at the Hotel Monaco in Washington, D.C., follows.

A. WELCOME and explanation of Leading Forward

George Boggs, President and CEO of the American Association of Community Colleges, welcomed the 31 summit participants. They represented a broad range of graduate school programs, from land grant to virtual universities. It was noted by several of the summit participants that the gathering marked the first time AACC had brought so many university program leaders together to discuss community college leadership. Boggs pointed out that those attending the meeting represented established programs as well as new and newly-energized programs.

He went over data compiled by researchers in 2001 which estimated that 79 percent of community college presidents would retire by 2012. "What is alarming to us at AACC is the people who report to the president are almost as old as the president," he said. With the number of people enrolled in graduate school programs, which are the traditional "pipeline" to these administrative posts, low relative to the predicted need, the departure of so many experienced community college leaders is viewed by some as a crisis.

"We've all seen that leadership makes a significant difference," Boggs said, explaining the association's interest in guiding a solution that blends existing efforts with a new generation of leadership development programs. Much of this will take time to accomplish, but, Boggs said, he would immediately "like to convince every college president that a big part of their job is to bring along new leaders."

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded AACC a two-year, \$1.8 million planning grant that supports the **Leading Forward** initiative. "We, of course, are very excited about the Kellogg support," he said.

Boggs explained that at the four **Leading Forward** summits, AACC is seeking the advice of various community college stakeholders to help it prepare a proposal for a major action grant. **Leading Forward** is also collecting information about existing leadership programs and conducting research. One of those research projects is a study of the impact of community college fellowships that the Kellogg Foundation funded in the 1960s.

Lynn Barnett, AACC vice president of academic, student and community development and co-director of **Leading Forward**, briefly explained that **Leading**

Forward would like to develop a mechanism that makes leadership development information more useful to users and program developers. Facilitating collaborations between existing programs and developing other strategies that address the unmet leadership needs at community college's are among goals she outlined for the initiative.

Steve Brigham, chief operating officer of AmericaSpeaks and facilitator of the summits, then asked those in attendance to identify themselves and the institution with which they are affiliated. To break the ice, Brigham asked everyone to share something about their graduate school program with the others seated at their tables.

The day's work then began with Brigham's request that participants talk in small groups, comprised of the people seated at each table, about the issues presented in four worksheets. He pointed out that the first worksheet asks that the conversations focus on the knowledge, skills and values that each participant thinks are necessary for a community college leader to be effective. Brigham went on to explain that the small groups will report to a plenary session the items from their lists that they, as a group, agree are most important.

B. WORKSHEET#1: Knowledge, Skills and Values for Effective Community College Leaders

Key Leadership Knowledge Identified by the Groups and Shared during the Plenary Session:

Key Knowledge

(Qualities mentioned by more than one group are noted with an asterisk *)

*Community college culture as an umbrella term to cover knowing the history, philosophy of community college and students and their diverse backgrounds and communities

*Organizational & leadership theory—an understanding of how organizations function and leadership theory

*Policy understanding including understanding of state, federal and institutional policies

* Fiscal issues that affect community colleges

Knowledge of community, particularly the political ramifications of local and state policies

* Accountability including student assessment

Conflict resolution and ways to handle adversity

* Knowledge of Higher Education, especially as it relates to the trend of bringing in business people to lead community colleges

History of higher education & community colleges

Budget and finance

Higher education laws

Knowledge of internal and external partnerships

* Knowledge of key issues for kindergarten through 16

Knowledge of planning cycles

Knowledge of the importance of teaching and learning

Strategies and tactics for dealing with crisis management and other issues

How to ask good questions

Motivational theories that can fit into the college's organization
How to create wealth, particularly as it relates to the college's economic development role in its community
National and international community college history, as well as history one's institution
Qualifiers
Distinct definitions for presidential leadership and leadership at other administrative levels
Definition of knowledge and skills
Good knowledge versus bad knowledge (This was described as the problem of people who are caught up in fads or who know too much about one thing, to the exclusion of other useful knowledge areas. It also includes people who don't know how their narrow knowledge base fits with larger picture.)
Knowledge of human relationships
Knowledge of psychology
Knowledge of ethnography
Knowledge of ethics
Knowledge of emotional knowledge
Personal physical limitations (This was defined as individuals knowing the answer to questions about their personal endurance. Questions like: "Do I know my body? Can I stand up for 8 hours in a classroom?")
Intellectual curiosity
Intellect beyond external information (Are there degrees and depth of knowledge?)

In the plenary discussion it was noted that leadership issues are filled with philosophical questions. One speaker talked about general competencies, knowledge and skills, and said that with leaders one assumes all are there and it is just a matter of looking at contextualized need. But another person said "it is situational" which of the three general attributes – knowledge, skills or values – drives the others. "A value judgment is not worthwhile to you unless you have the knowledge and skills," one speaker said.

Brigham pointed out that the qualities most frequently cited by the groups were knowledge of:

Community college culture
Community college mission
Organizational development, behavior and change
Public policy knowledge
How community colleges fit in the broader scheme of kindergarten thru the 16th year of formal learning
Financial management
Understanding the community college student population and how it is changing

Key Leadership Skills Identified by the Groups and Shared during the Plenary Session:

(Qualities mentioned by more than one group are noted with an asterisk *)

* People skills, including human relations knowledge and conflict resolution

* Communications skills, including listening, speaking and writing well

Critical thinking and value-based analysis (These were defined as the complex skill of understanding salient strategies and values, balancing them with accurate use of past experience and then making good decisions.)

Versatility

Friend-raising (Defined as the kinder, gentler method of raising funds.)

How to draw out the best of those around you

Cultural competency

Adaptability

Adhocracy

* Political savvy

* Strategic thinking

Boundary-spanning efforts that connect educational programs from kindergarten through graduate school

Communications and relationship skills

Crisis leadership and how to prevent crises

Critical thinking and listening skills

Power of “follower-ship”

Intuition that helps make sound judgments

Skills in quantitative and qualitative interpretation

* “Follower-ship”

Ability to test one’s assumptions and change them as needed

Communications

Creating shared visions

Relationship-building

Understanding of group dynamics and how to work them

Risk-taking

Ability to mentor

Ability to understand and engage in conflict management

Fundraising

* Being able to influence the behavior of others, organizational politics

Ability to distribute resources effectively throughout the institution

Modeling and mentoring

Key Leadership Values Identified by the Groups and Shared during the Plenary Session:

*Mentoring (Defined as nurturing a new generation of leaders.)

*Conflict management

*Advocacy

Strategic planning

Board relations

Valuing diversity and actually doing something to foster it

Managing change

Communications (Defined as speaking, writing, and using technology fluently.)

Strategic planning, including mentoring staff

Problem-solving, including labor negotiations and conflict resolution

Time and stress management
Championing democracy of community college access
* Valuing learning as a lifelong endeavor
*Ethics (Defined as someone who exhibits strong, ethical behavior.)
Flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity
Great tolerance coupled with great patience
* Belief in the worth of other humans and their ability to succeed
Quality-driven
Emotional intelligence
Entrepreneurship
*Critical reflection – the self-examined life
Team building as more than just talk
Value teaching and learning
Value faculty
*Honesty, integrity and trust
*Vision (that is clear in purposeful communications)
*Passion for the community college mission
Commitment to lifelong learning and critical self-reflection
*Commitment to a vision for the institution and communication about the purpose of the institution
Commitment to scholarship (Likened to the scholarly role for presidents advocated by George Vaughn.)
Commitment to access
Commitment to staff development and growth
Identification of outcomes
Humility and respect
Contributing to broader social benefits
Academic freedom
Ethics
Diversity
Flexibility
Valuing contributions of others
Integrity (connected to ethics but the group wanted it to be recognized separately)
Inquisitive and seeker of others' ideas
A life (This was defined by the group to mean someone with a reasonable balance between professional and personal concerns.)
Valuing a shared vision
Passion and commitment to the community college mission
Credibility
Trust
Tolerance
Respect
Polite
Effective use of data (Described by the group as establishing a culture of evidence that uses data-based decision-making and institutional research in a way that makes community college leaders good consumers and producers of applied research.)

Reflective professional practices (The group spokesperson explained these practices should be based on understanding one's own experiences and what others are thinking and writing. It also covers leaders' interaction with higher education in general.)
Self-knowledge and understanding how one can be the best leader by being the best person they can be
Passion for one's community colleges and its mission

After hearing from all the groups on knowledge, skills and values, Steve Brigham pointed out that there were many areas of overlap among the responses. He checked many of these as repeated points on the lists he wrote on flip charts as the groups reported their priority responses. He said this was a reflection of the small group conversations.

When he opened the floor to a general discussion, one speaker said he would like "to reconfigure part of knowledge" to group secondary education more closely with community college knowledge and higher education. He wants this to happen because he thinks secondary education will become an even bigger partner with community colleges in the future.

Another speaker said that as he looked over the lists he was struck by the thought that "it is not easy to be all these things, or for governing boards to find people who can do all these things." He said governing boards "need to gear up and be prepared" when they recruit new leaders. But, he added, "I don't know too many people who are good at all these things." Taken as a whole the list can be overwhelming, he said, noting it may be a privilege to lead but it is hard to do.

Community college leadership is akin to "management of a help agency or organization," one man pointed out. Simply the need to communicate with educators from kindergarten to grade 12, as well as the corporate sector makes it very hard to get your arms around it all, he said.

Another speaker pointed out that grappling with accreditation can be challenging. Another person added that helping students with financial needs is another complicated task of leadership. Several speakers then added more items to the list of leaders' tasks: understanding local business; understanding the employment climate, and appreciating the role of technology in the changing world.

Underscoring all these tasks for the academicians is the ideal of scholarship in leadership practices. One person referred to this as "applied scholarship vision." Someone else praised George Boggs as a good model because he wrote extensively while president of Palomar College.

Boggs did not respond directly to this comment, but said, "Leaders need to nurture the new generation of leaders. A lot of us mentor, but it's more complex than just saying we want to do it. There are skills involved."

C. Worksheet #2: Working Definitions of Leadership Development With Lists of Strategies for Developing Effective Leaders

After discussing what leadership development is and how to accomplish it, the small groups offered the following responses to: **What is leadership development?**

Leadership development is a systematic and opportunistic process for meaningful experiences that change or reinforce the behavior of actual and potential leaders throughout the organization in ways that prepare them for the challenges that face complex organizations in a turbulent environment.

Leadership development focuses on the individual as a learner in ways that include self-assessment and self-reflection. It focuses on implementation or use of the knowledge gained. It raises the question: Who does leadership development with and for me?

Leadership development is content-rich, knowledge-based process. It can be a formal, non-formal, and informal learning process or program that recognizes the leadership potential of all persons. For potential community college leaders, the context of their learning should be community colleges. The process should include reflective practices and academic practitioners. It should also integrate knowledge, skills and values.

Leadership development can be a formal and informal process. As a formal process, leadership development is a program of study that helps students achieve or enhance their knowledge, skills and values. (It is not arrogant, not self-centered, and not without cultural connections. It builds from the core/foundation of the individual's character, his or her fairness and ability to connect with people and empathize.) As an informal process, leadership development is internalized from reflection and reading.

Leadership development is a continuous process for predisposed individuals to learn knowledge, skills and values to become effective leaders.

Leadership development implies professional and personal growth leading to the capacity to sustain, grow and transform an organization dedicated to teaching and learning and community building. It has three distinct aspects 1) Personal growth and self-development; 2) Personal growth through institution-based, in-service programs and external professional associations; and 3) Personal growth through extended study of education, kindergarten through baccalaureate degree, that is external to the community college. Leadership development has cognitive and affective aspects. It can be accomplished through university-based degree programs, professional and continuing education as well as self-study and reflective thinking.

After the groups shared their definitions and some of the ideas that went into crafting these definitions (One speaker likened facilitating his group's discussion to herding cats.), Steve Brigham asked the summit participants to identify anything striking among the definitions, as well as points of commonality. One group said they liked another group's mention of "predisposed individuals."

Another man said that the notion of informal versus formal was important because he recognized that his university program is just one piece of a student's development as a leader.

Another speaker stressed the importance of leadership development as a continuous process.

But leadership development should not be restricted to executive management, one participant cautioned, explaining that some people who were not predisposed to leadership are among the most phenomenal leaders community colleges currently have. Some faculty and staff members do not realize they are leaders until they are asked to assume positions of leadership, he said. Conversely, some individuals who are

predisposed to leadership roles are not good leaders, so their commands become “hallucinations” of leadership. “It’s the accidents that happen that are very interesting,” he said, referring to those individuals who unexpectedly became leaders and grew in those roles.

Another speaker questioned whether leaders are made. “I can teach about skills and theories but I can’t make a leader. Leaders have certain dispositions so leadership development programs can’t necessarily create leaders. I think that is an important distinction,” he said.

There is not a cookbook recipe for leadership despite best-selling books touting seven easy steps to effective leadership, one person said.

While acknowledging another speaker’s concern about the difficulty of highly-introverted people succeeding in leadership positions, a speaker said she did not like the notion that certain people are born leaders. She cautioned that this type of thinking kept women and minorities out of leadership positions until recently. Certainly there has to be the right fit between an individual and the post they seek, but if someone wants to be a leader, she contends, that with mentoring in the right situation they will succeed.

One speaker asked whether leadership development programs can prevent really bad leadership because he could identify “100 community college presidents who have really screwed it up.”

Someone else pointed out that there is an applied nature to leadership development. It is not theoretical, but based on experience. Each program has its own understanding of leadership and changes based on what the people teaching in these programs have experienced.

Another person cautioned that leadership is not a sterile paradigm. “What is an effective leader today may not be an effective leader at another time,” he said.

Steve Brigham then asked each group to report their prioritized list of strategies for developing effective leaders. (This discussion took so long that the lists were not combined into one list of strategies during the plenary session as they had been at previous summits.)

Group 1

- 1) Good performance appraisals
- 2) Coaching and mentoring, than can be done by internal or external coaches or executive coaching services
- 3) Structured learning experiences, formal and informal, credit and non-credit, long-term and short-term.
- 4) Expand exposure to professions and other organizations and dealings with the public and other work groups like classified personnel and academics.
- 5) Networking affiliations

Group 2

- 1) Involve mentors
- 2) Conduct 360-degree, formative assessments
- 3) Assess one’s self, externally and internally
- 4) Use feedback
- 5) Reflection

This group raised the issue of professional practice, and whether developing a sense of competencies should be assessed.

Group 3 used a matrix that included formal, non-formal and informal strategies

1. Graduate School Programs (formal, credit programs that utilize an array of strategies including lectures, seminars, distance education, face-to-face meetings, experiential or internship opportunities, and various other aspects of graduate programs
2. Non-formal programs provided by AACC or some colleges, seminars and other programs that may evolve in peer groups
3. Informal processes including peer coaching, training of individuals in workplaces to develop expertise in particular job, and to explain the practices of particular institution.

In response to a question, the group explained that non-formal programs are officially sponsored but informal processes are “something that happens to individuals.”

(the highlighted info from my notes differs from the flip chart sheets which had:

Formal

1. Classroom instruction -- different types and levels
2. Experiential

Informal

1. Seminars
2. Mentoring

Non-formal

Peer coaching

Group 4

1. Select people who already show leadership potential – encourage self-assessments and then expose these individuals to situations and to readings.
2. Conduct multiple assessments and strategies to enhance self-development.
3. Utilize experiential learning through internships, job shadowing, modeling, mentoring, and coaching.

The group agreed that leadership development is a lifelong process that at various times uses aspects of these three steps.

Group 5

1. Collaborative learning that engages student cohorts in groups where they have to work together to develop a product to completion.
2. Authentic learning including practical opportunities like observing or working in a one-stop student development center at a community college to see how student services work. (It was noted that finding opportunities for authentic learning would be a way for university programs to work more closely with community colleges.)
3. Individual learning plans. Some programs already write these plans when students enter programs.
4. Readings and other strategies for lifelong learning

5. Mentoring and executive coaching

Group 6

1. Degree programs including doctorates, master's degrees, specialist studies, certificates, cohorts, theory-practice relationships with special emphasis on writing and the study of history
2. Professional/Continuing Education (Non-Credit) including participation on accreditation teams, participation in national organizations like AACC and its Affiliated Councils, ACT, League for Innovation in the Community Colleges etc., presenting at national meetings, attending leadership academies or non-education leadership institutes
3. Personal Self-Development through reflective journal writing, lifelong study of education, scholarly writing and reading, and a health lifestyle.

During the listing of strategies there was a group conversation about college presidents' scholarship. One speaker said, that under ideal circumstances presidents would be writing in scholarly journals and elsewhere as a way of leading. Another person observed that with time pressures on chief executives he wasn't sure college presidents had time even to read. But it was agreed that efforts to read and write showed an individual's interest in continuing to grow intellectually.

During the discussion of the various strategies listed by the groups, one man said the strategies suggested a continuum of exposure and that it is important to create opportunities for leadership development.

A woman responded that if there is a continuum of exposure that helps people develop skills for university-based programs, how can people obtain help at different phases of their careers? She said this challenge requires "us to think differently how to do the formal piece" of leadership development. That, she observed is more complex than what any program is set up to do now. It was observed that this need to customize leadership development is a source of tension.

One participant said he thought the day's discussions were "a bit informal" for dealing with something as critical as leadership development. He encouraged **Leading Forward** to utilize the science from this field in making its decisions about how to proceed with community college leadership development. "There are a number of colleagues who have expertise in this area and you should review the science," he said.

One woman noted that university programs do not exist alone, but that university requirements, like GRE scores, are frequently the first hoop a person has to jump through on the way to leadership positions. But, she said, there are current community college chancellors who could not meet the admission criteria for university programs. She also shared her observation that more of her students are young, fulltime students, rather than the working professionals who were previously the mainstay of her university's graduate education program.

D. **Worksheet #3: Leadership Inventory for University-based Programs**

Steve Brigham asked the participants to review the program inventory compiled from the information that summit participants submitted prior to the meeting. He asked

the small groups to consider what is on the list, what might be opportunities for collaboration and what is missing.

What do you see on the list?

After discussing the inventory in small groups for about 40 minutes, a representative from each of the tables shared the following observations:

- There is a lot of variation in delivery methods among programs, a great deal more diversity in methods than five years ago.
- Course titles are similar but they are delivered differently.
- Most university-based programs are connected with community colleges in their areas.

What is missing from the inventory?

- Leveraging of university-based community college programs to work with other industries to improve what were doing for leadership training
- Information on external advisory committee of the practitioners
- A statement of good practices
- More details, like the demographics of students in programs
- A list of faculty and information on their credentials
- Information on the research that university programs are conducting
- Financial information about the programs, including identification of their main funding sources
- Identification of what an ideal program would look like
- Information of non-degree leadership programs

There was discussion about university-based programs' need to recruit people with community college expertise who are then able to attract students interested in community college administrative and faculty positions. One person posed the following questions: Where do you get professors? How do you "sell" a professor who has credibility in the community college field and is valued both by practitioners and scholars?

Another person attributed university programs' difficulty finding faculty who can teach community college leadership skills to the newness of this area of expertise in a field that has been marginalized.

One person pointed out that the research orientation of some programs is not addressed in the inventory. It was also noted that advising and directing doctoral students is a challenging, time-consuming activity within university programs but that it does not appear on the inventory either.

One professor said he uses community colleges as a study environment for his higher education graduate students, even those who have not expressed an interest in community colleges. His students conduct research on community colleges' organizations, and how they are different from each other and other institutions. He incorporates information on the processes and design of community colleges in his courses too.

One speaker noted that some programs in the inventory do not have specific seminars on community colleges but have successfully guided community college leaders through advanced degrees. He noted that there are trade-offs between general higher education

administration degrees and those focused on community college administration depending on how one defines them and what topics are included and excluded.

A woman countered this view, first noting that as a person with a doctorate from a higher education program she does not want to denigrate them. But, she said, “community colleges are very different from a generic leadership program ... they have different ways of doing things and a different purpose.” To prepare people to walk into community college posts, their graduate education has to have some theoretical base.

The man responded, “It’s a matter of striking a balance.” University-based programs need to be able to teach and guide people for community college leadership but these programs would be deficient if they do not embed community colleges within the larger world of higher education.

Another woman noted that university-based community college programs existed in clusters with other graduate education programs. In many instances, she said, community college programs are not a priority for the graduate schools or their universities. In some instances community college graduate programs are marginalized among the most marginalized graduate school programs in universities. If community college program leaders do not connect their work and students with the others and strategize with them, she said, then they could become victims of budget slashing. She cautioned that when community college programs differentiate themselves too distinctly, they risk losing funding. Therefore, she said, collaboration is important for economic as well as pedagogical reasons.

Another speaker pointed out that the inventory lacked a model program. “We don’t know what an ideal program will look like, because all of those listed are opportunistic programs based on grants or vestiges of the old Kellogg program that one person is trying to keep alive,” he said. Others are extensions of tenured faculty members’ careers or the “shadow” of one key person. In all these cases there is more imperative to collaborate. “It behooves us to think about what an ideal program would be to create community college leaders in the future,” he said, adding an ideal model is not something to be cobbled out of opportunity or a need to please a particular contingent.

A number of people spoke about the need to know more about the students who are currently enrolled in university-based programs. Their questions included: How many graduate students are there? How many finish their doctorates? How many women and minorities are completing these programs? How many people with the necessary credentials for leadership positions are in the workforce?

Another person suggested that the inventory document the credentials of those teaching community college leadership.

A speaker asked whether the Kellogg Foundation would fund students’ graduate studies as fellows in established programs in exchange for the students’ promises to teach community college leadership programs at other institutions. He thought this might help solve the predicted leadership gap.

A question was then raised about the many community college leaders who do not have doctorates and the trend in some places to recruit non-educators to lead community colleges. He suggested that university programs consider using a contract education model to take leadership training to community colleges. This speaker also would like to see information in the inventory about how the program is funded, including specific dollar amounts of funding, and to whom the program is accountable.

Steve Brigham closed this discussion noting that the suggestions would be taken into consideration as the **Leading Forward** staff prepares the inventory for its website, where it will continue to be a work-in-progress because it will have to be kept up-to-date. He also noted that the inventory was not intended “to cover the waterfront” but to provide a quick perspective on the programs with contact information that users could utilize to obtain more information.

E. Worksheet #4: Building a National Framework Together

To begin this discussion, Steve Brigham projected a diagram of the National Framework for Community College Leadership Development with the framework at the center of concentric circles. Content and delivery were in the smallest circle with the framework, surrounded first by providers and users. Knowledge, skills and values filled the large outer circle. He described the diagram as an attempt to illustrate the different elements of a national framework for purposes of discussion at the summit. He stressed that this would probably not be what the framework will look like in a year when AACC plans to make another grant proposal to the Kellogg Foundation.

He asked the small groups to consider what a national framework might look like. What can **Leading Forward** do to ensure the comprehensiveness of the national model? How can **Leading Forward** help people make real choices and distinguish between leadership development programs? How does **Leading Forward** make sure the national framework is useful?

“Those are three questions we want your best thinking on,” he said, adding he would like the participants to think about what makes sense from a national perspective.

Before the small groups started, one participant said “I don’t understand the question.” He asked Brigham several clarifying questions about the national framework. “I just don’t know what that means,” the speaker said of the ambiguously-defined framework. Several other participants offered their concepts of a national framework, with one describing it as a grid with overlapping parts.

“We have been struggling over the course of a few months about how much to define the national framework,” Brigham said. The AACC staff working on **Leading Forward** intentionally left the framework undefined to get ideas from the summit participants. The central question the staff hopes to address with the framework is how best, at the national level, to connect university-based programs with other leadership programs for people interested in community college leadership. Their concern is how the framework will serve program providers and users? He identified framework users as prospective students and those already in programs. How does **Leading Forward** develop the content and how does it incorporate knowledge, skills and values for effective community college leadership? He said the essential question is, “From your perspective, what do you think a more coherent system would look like, and what should the framework look like, so users and providers buy in to it?” He later said, “I’m aware it’s ambiguous.”

The questioner said he thinks the discussion needs to start at different point. He suggested the question as, “Should there be a national framework, and if so why?” He asked if it would be possible for those at his table to consider instead, “How can university leadership programs cooperate and collaborate to improve the number of

students who graduate from our programs?” Brigham agreed that each small group could tackle the issue of a national framework with their own questions.

Plenary Session

This discussion began with the observation that de facto professional development results from individuals’ own initiatives. “Do we really know how universities fit in or contribute to that framework?” he asked, adding, Can we articulate how we contribute, how we can collaborate and how we complement other entities?

Others also took issue with the idea of a framework.

University-based programs provide educational preparation for certain levels of leadership. They do not attempt every aspect of leadership development, so it is not, therefore necessary, for faculty to have every skill that community college leaders are going to need later on, one speaker said.

A national framework presupposes more cooperation, one participant observed. But with the rise of for-profits, she predicted there be less, not more cooperation. The growth of for-profit universities is making other universities “very nervous,” she said.

Another participant offered an alternative diagram of leadership development. He drew a big circle on a flip chart with university programs and other activities in small overlapping circles within the larger circle, which he said is largely made up of other life experiences. “There are organized activities that overlap. Then,” he said as he drew the diagram, “there is the whole life experience out there that leadership development programs have nothing to do with. We are a part of this puzzle, but we may not even be the biggest part.”

Endorsing a national framework would require more ideas and information, one group decided. Its members, however, agreed that building toward comprehensiveness was a good goal. They also agreed that completing an inventory of programs would be helpful. They liked the idea of an information-sharing process to catalog and publicize programs. They would like recognition of helpful collaborations. They did not, however, reach consensus on how to make a framework useful.

Another group’s spokeswoman said it was important for **Leading Forward’s** staff to understand “on a fairly deep level” what university-based programs do, what they have to do to sustain themselves and to whom they are accountable within their institutions. “This is different than the councils’ leadership development institutes because this is our livelihood. There are lots of things we do that never enter into this conversation (of leadership development) that take up a lot of time,” she said.

Another group reported struggling with the idea of a national framework. But, this group agreed, it would be helpful to have a clearinghouse of best practices. It suggested that AACC develop case studies that identify best practices. These studies could focus on topics and issues that **Leading Forward** identifies as needed but that are not covered in current university-based programs, he said.

The national framework could look at skills the university-based programs are doing but also identify issues that would help influence university programs. This group’s speaker said university-based community college leadership programs could use a “statement of good practices” from **Leading Forward**. The university programs could then share this statement with faculty and other administrators to explain their programs and serve as guidelines for their placement within the mission of research universities.

Another person suggested that the framework should address policy questions with answers crafted by AACC.

Another speaker explored the potential for a voucher system that would provide financial assistance for people to attend leadership development programs at various institutions, rather than fellowships that support graduate studies at just one location.

Rather than attempting to be encyclopedic, it was suggested that the inventory focus on what the university programs do well.

There were several suggestions for AACC to take a larger role in leadership development. One man wants AACC to “go on the record” with a recommendation to community colleges about what percentage of their institutions’ budgets should be set aside for professional development. Another person suggested AACC not just seek to connect community colleges, but that it should help connect and support those doing community college education.

A woman followed up on this idea by pointing out that community college education is often the work of one individual within a college or department within a research university. She pointed out that someone other than the individual who is focused on community colleges typically makes the decision about whether additional faculty will be hired and what other financial support the program will get. Because of this isolation, a national faculty association is incredibly critical for individuals to learn about good practices and to stay current on research, she said.

But, someone urged, that the competencies of community college faculty NOT be separated from others in higher education. Instead, this individual, suggested beefing up existing faculty organizations.

It was pointed out that typical organizational structures have changed in recent years. He said it also seems that every his university has a new dean or leader, he has to justify his program’s existence. He would like AACC to play a role in addressing this difficulty, especially with enrollments rising and public funding decreasing. He thinks it would be helpful if community colleges had information about community-based foundations from which they can seek funds. He thought this information would be helpful if the Kellogg Foundation is interested in using its resources to leverage other fund sources.

The spokeswoman for another table reported there was a great deal of conversation about the word “framework.” She said her group finally decided that a framework provides “more of a lens to look through rather than a structure.” Still, the group had lingering questions, about “How are we structuring this? Does this mean a program has to have specific standards?” It was suggested that there could be a “default framework” that identifies the providers and then carves out the functions they provide. She said the group talked about the possibility of AACC providing a clearinghouse, though members of the group disagreed about what services would fall into this area. Perhaps, the group suggested, a peer review of the clearinghouse materials could identify the expertise of programs.

Another spokesman said his group wrestled with the framework question for so long it became “a cul-de-sac we backed ourselves into.” The group then moved on to decide that AACC needs to develop an inventory or source book that is a balance between pithy descriptions of programs and updatable “binder pages” with descriptions of programs that include basic data on the students, graduates, and faculty. Longer

descriptions and details could be available on-line, he suggested. With regard to collaborations, this group suggested a clearinghouse of information about good programs with sufficient contact information for people to connect with them. He said AACCC might be able to identify different types of programs and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses from a broader perspective.

A woman raised the issue of specialized accreditation and how that would fit with a national framework. Another person noted that because programs are so different this would not make sense. Someone else suggested that perhaps some kind of certification can be established to use as leverage to maintain resources.

Other participants had questions about the capacity of university-based programs because recent enrollments have been so limited. If a program has 15 students and adds two, one person asked, is that really going to make a dent in the number of new leaders needed?

One participant described the final conversations as “a rich discussion of vital issues.” But one woman, who described the conversations as a “very wonderful discussion” said her group was “not of a mind.” She reported, “Some of my colleagues are just wrong headed.”

Wrapping up the meeting, Brigham thanked the participants for sharing their opinions and noted that the conversations differ from summit to summit.