

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2003-04-14

An Evaluation Study of a Community College Administrative Leadership Development Program

Cristina Chiriboga-Hahn EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Chiriboga-Hahn, Cristina EdD, "An Evaluation Study of a Community College Administrative Leadership Development Program" (2003). *Dissertations*. 703.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/703>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**AN EVALUATION STUDY OF A COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

by

Cristina Chiriboga-Hahn

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

April 14, 2003

Dissertation Committee

Dan M. Miller, Ph. D., Chair
Robert Donmoyer, Ph. D., Committee Member
William Piland, Ph. D., Committee Member

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was scanned as received.

75-76

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this study was to examine a model for professional development designed to meet the needs of administrators who work within the community college segment of higher education. Specifically, the research project was structured as a formative evaluation of the California community college administrative development program entitled *Administration 101* offered through the state's primary professional association for administrators, the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA).

The study employed a mixed research methodology that included quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess:

1. The usefulness of the concepts presented in *Administration 101* based on the perceptions of participants and presenters,
2. The need for other program topics that should be incorporated in future sessions,
3. Program curricular elements that should be expanded, deleted or modified,
4. Ways in which the formats and delivery strategies utilized in *Administration 101* could be changed to facilitate participant learning.

The results of the study pointed out the need for 1) improved integration and coherence of curriculum elements, 2) the need for expanded use of interactive and application-oriented case studies in the delivery of the program, and 3) a curriculum development direction for the program.

The findings of the study also substantiated the significance of the *Administration 101* practitioner-based program model in meeting the unique professional development needs of California community college administrators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to sincerely thank Dr. Dan M. Miller, my dissertation committee chair, whose guidance and counsel have contributed greatly to this study from its inception. As well, Dr. Robert Donmoyer has given generously of his time and expertise to the review of this dissertation at all stages. Dr. William Piland brought his considerable knowledge and experience as a researcher on community colleges to bear on this project and made a number of constructive suggestions to the study. I very much appreciate the contributions and support of each of these committee members.

Special thanks to my colleagues from the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) and especially all of the members of the Management Development Commission. I particularly want to express my appreciation to Susan Bray, Executive Director of ACCCA, Rose Del Gaudio, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources at the Rancho Santiago Community College, and Lisa Sugimoto, Dean of Counseling and Student Support Services at Long Beach City College, for their support.

Special acknowledgements are due to Dr. Sherrill Amador for her friendship and counsel throughout my graduate program as well as Dr. Geraldine Perri for her enthusiastic support. To Debra Ridulfo-Miller from Cuyamaca College I want to express my heartfelt thanks for her assistance and kindness throughout this project.

I wish to especially thank my husband, Dr. Thomas Hahn, for his love and support. I particularly appreciated his consistent assertions that he enjoyed nothing better on a weekend than to accompany me to work in the office. I benefited too from his wisdom and expertise as a scholar.

Finally, a large measure of appreciation to my brother, John, and his wife, Charlsa, and daughters, Breanne and Whitney, for serving as the cheering section for this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
TABLE OF FIGURES.....	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	x
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background Of Study.....	2
Need for Community College Training Programs.....	3
Background Of <i>Administration 101</i> Project.....	5
Statement Of Problem.....	10
Purpose Of The Study.....	12
Research Questions.....	12
Significance Of The Study.....	13
Theoretical Assumptions, Conceptual Framework, and Methods.....	14
Limitations Of The Study.....	17
Overview Of The Study.....	20
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	22
Review Of The Research Literature.....	22
Administrative Skills And Competencies.....	23
Community College Leadership Development Models.....	34
Emergent Leadership Challenges And Implications for Administrative Development Programs.....	39
Theoretical Assumptions And Conceptual Framework.....	42
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS.....	51
Methods.....	52
Sampling Strategy.....	54
Data Collection.....	55
Focus Group Interviews – Summer, 2002.....	57
Follow-Up Surveys – 2002 Cohort.....	59
Interviews With Presenters – Summer 2002.....	60
Data Analysis.....	62
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	66
Population.....	67
Data Handling.....	69
Results of Evaluation Strategies.....	70
Evaluation Questionnaires.....	70
Focus Group Interviews.....	106
Follow-Up Survey to 2002 Participants.....	114
Interviews With Program Presenters.....	116

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS...	120
Major Findings.....	120
Recommendations.....	124
Short-Term Recommendations.....	125
Long Term Program Development Recommendations.....	127
Implications Of The Study.....	129
Conclusions.....	132
Directions For Further Research.....	133
REFERENCES.....	137
APPENDICES.....	142

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. <u>Topic: California Community College Governance</u>	73
Table 2. <u>Topic: The Role of the Board of Trustees in College Governance</u>	75
Table 3. <u>Topic: Successful Models of Participatory Governance</u> <u>(2002 Program topic only)</u>	78
Table 4. <u>Topic: Financing Higher Education</u>	79
Table 5. <u>Topic: Instruction and Student Services: Case Studies</u>	82
Table 6. <u>Topic: Accreditation (2002 Program topic only)</u>	86
Table 7. <u>Topic: Budget</u>	87
Table 8. <u>Topic: Technology Planning</u>	89
Table 9. <u>Topic: Research and Strategic Planning (2001 Program topic only)</u>	91
Table 10. <u>Topic: Institutional Dynamics</u>	92
Table 11. <u>Topic: Human Resources</u>	94
Table 12. <u>Topic: Current Legislation</u>	97
Table 13. <u>Topic: Closing Presentation</u>	98
Table 14. <u>Topic: Proposal for New Topics</u>	113
Table 15. <u>Topic: Preferred Topics in Priority Order</u>	114

TABLE OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. <u>Research Design</u>	53

APPENDICES⁷

A. Administration 101 Course Outline.....	143
B. Focus Group Protocol.....	148
C. Presenter Interview Protocol.....	151
D. Follow-Up Survey Protocol.....	153

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine a model for administrative professional development that is designed to meet the needs of practitioners who work within the community college segment of higher education. Specifically, this study is designed as a formative evaluation for the community college administrative development program entitled *Administration 101* offered through the state's primary professional association for administrators, the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA). As such, this study extends the current research on the subject of administrative leadership development, especially as the concepts apply to the unique California community college environment.

Background of Study

Community colleges nationwide enroll one-half of all first year students entering institutions of higher education (Kent, 1996). Within this major segment of higher education, California Community Colleges comprise the single largest system, with 108 colleges statewide that enroll 1.6 million students. It is therefore not surprising given the magnitude of the enterprise, that community college administration has come into its own as a "collegial profession" (Garavalia, 1996). Accompanying the growth of community colleges as a segment in higher education has been the concomitant growth in the scope and complexity of the

community college mission. In California, the community college mission has been well defined within the state Educational Master Plan for Higher Education to include general education/transfer preparation, vocational/technical career education, basic skills development, and a number of community learning programs and activities. Community college administrative roles and responsibilities have likewise grown increasingly complex in order to fulfill these multiple objectives and mandates.

Unfortunately, professional training and development programs have not kept pace with the challenge. Nationwide there exist only five doctoral programs that specialize in community college administration and leadership—none in California. Typically, colleges and universities offer support for community college specialties only as options within existing educational administration or leadership programs; frequently, there is a lack of curriculum designed specifically to explore community college topics. The recent advent of the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) reflects a statewide recognition of the need for specialized professional development.

It is within this context that the significance of the ACCCA professional development program, *Administration 101*, is best understood. In response to the expressed needs of the field—and in an attempt to address the lack of professional development opportunities available to California community college administrators-- the Association undertook the design and implementation of a specialized, intensive training program targeting this population. The *Administration 101* curriculum presents an overview of the topics and issues considered to be central for effective administrative functioning in the field, such as governance, the regulatory environment, selected instructional and student service issues and other key subjects. The five-day program was first offered in summer 2001 at the University

of California, Los Angeles Sunset Center. The need now exists to evaluate the effectiveness of the program from the perspectives of both participants (consumers) and presenters (providers). The proposed evaluation will be conducted on behalf of the Association's Management Development Commission (MDC) that is charged with conducting the program. As a formative evaluation, to paraphrase Patton, the main purpose of the project is to provide feedback to program organizers that can be used for on-going program development and improvement (1980).

Need for Community College Training Programs

It is instructive to survey the historical development of community colleges over the past few decades to fully appreciate the need for well-trained administrators within the community college system. The decade of the 1970's were characterized by growing enrollments but declining funding and rising costs; a consequent value was placed on good managers who could be effective and efficient. The 1980's introduced a preoccupation with issues of quality and institutional effectiveness. Policy papers from this era stress the need for improvement of undergraduate education that translated into a concern for quality, standards and performance accountability. The challenges of the 1990's and the first decade of the millennium include concerns over increasingly diverse student populations who require innovative delivery systems and improved access. Just as critical has been the rise in competition among colleges and private sector providers for students, funding resources and federal dollars. For community colleges there exist continuing pressures to address workplace training needs in addition to those of transfer preparation as part of the community college mission. (Green, 1988).

Rouche (1996) and Baker (1992) emphasize that community college administration will never again be like it was in the opening decades of the 60's and 70's. In these entrepreneurial times, community college administration was a patchwork of structures led by "faculty types" managing small enrollments, budgets and facilities in loosely defined environments. The explosion of enrollments as well as the development of the comprehensive community college mission has necessitated the creation of a distinct professional niche for administrators who lead this segment in conjunction with faculty colleagues. Baker (1992) has comparatively catalogued the challenges of today over those of 25 years ago. In his view, the American community college is characterized by:

Volatile enrollments, alarming attrition rates, shrinking economic resources, increasing controls by state governments...rising pressures placed on curricula by expanding and changing technologies, new challenges related to increased diversity in the workforce and among students, and the challenges of under prepared students (1992, p.1).

In California, a unique set of environmental factors likewise contributes to community college organizational complexity and leadership challenges. First, milestone legislation passed in 1987, AB 1725, created structural divides between faculty and administration; the law also formalized "shared governance" processes for a number of specified professional activities. Second, community colleges must function within a densely regulated system—namely the detailed State Education Code and Community College Title 5 administrative provisions that govern every facet of community college educational operations. Collective bargaining agreements in place throughout California community colleges further limit and restrict administrative prerogatives. Increasingly, legal issues such as American Disability Act compliance and questions such as those of sexual harassment and violence in the workplace

have emerged as administrative concerns. Finally, in 1999, a statewide performance-based funding mechanism entitled *Partnership for Excellence* was implemented to ensure accountability for system wide outcomes. It is clear, therefore, that unique factors within the California community college environment parallel those at the national level and create requirements for effective and efficient administrative leadership in order to cope with and address such challenges.

Background of Administration 101 Project

Specific background information regarding the need for an ACCCA *Administration 101* program within the state is presented in order to highlight the significance of the program—and by extension the need for this evaluation study. Further, a general overview of the evolution of the program within the context of the California higher education environment may be helpful in understanding the genesis and nature of the ACCCA response.

Administration 101 is best understood as a kind of “first response” to the current need for administrative professional leadership development within the state. While it is not the only response, the ACCCA program does represent a unique, field-driven approach to meeting the professional development needs of its constituency. As such, the program model is worth examining at this point in its development, especially in view of the fact that ACCCA intends to continue to offer the program on an on-going basis. The purpose of this study is to provide the organization with the feedback necessary to strengthen, improve and build upon the first effort.

In order to function effectively in the California community college environment—highlighted earlier—administrators must possess a knowledge base of specific regulatory codes, finance, governance and legal aspects. The literature suggests that there needs to be

collaboration between scholars and practitioners to design optimal professional development programs (Walker, 1979; Cohen, 1986). Programs are needed that incorporate academic/theoretical content as well as applied understanding of administrative work.

The challenge of developing leadership in California community colleges has long been recognized. The Report of the Joint Committee of the California State University and the California Community Colleges on Leadership Programs (1987) described a number of policy studies, including the work of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). An inventory of existing leadership programs is included in the work of the Commission. Emphasis is placed on formal doctoral programs in education. One noted gap in this survey is the absence of community college field input.

Further evidence of the growing awareness of the need to develop community college leadership is the creation in Spring, 2000 of the California Chancellor's Office Task Force on Community College Leadership. Chaired by Brice Harris, Chancellor of the Los Rios Community College District, the group has been charged with exploring two questions: 1) What programs or initiatives to develop new leaders and support existing leaders (including administrative, faculty, staff, and students) should the California Community College system initiate, sponsor, and/or recognize? And 2) Should the system seek funding to support these programs or initiatives?

The report draft prepared by the Task Force (2001) documents the dearth of leadership training programs designed specifically to meet the needs of the community college system as follows:

One clearly troubling trend in California is the declining number of formal degree programs aimed specifically at community college leaders. Programs at universities in California that were once dedicated exclusively to the training of community college leaders have been weakened...There continues to be a wealth of Ph.D. programs in California in specific subject areas, but these are not necessarily pathways to leadership in community colleges...No California programs appear on lists of the most recognized community college leadership programs in the nation, even though the state has the largest system of community colleges in existence.

More recently, in April, 2000, the Community College Leadership Institute (CCLDI) marked the creation of a partnership between the California community college system and the Claremont Graduate School. This was a milestone development as it specifically focused on community college administration. The CCLDI model typifies the traditional education administration approach; it envisions the creation of a formal doctoral program of study to be offered through existing public and private universities in the state. The innovative aspect of CCLDI is the formalized linkage between the California community college system and university providers. For the first time in many years, community college practitioners have the opportunity of providing input into program design and curriculum.

Another approach to meeting California community college administrative leadership training needs has been through the work of the state's two primary professional associations: the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA). As evidenced by their conference programs and on-going activities since 1998, the development of administrative professionals equipped

to deal with the changing needs and new demographics of California community colleges is a major statewide priority.

Specifically representing the administrative constituency, ACCCA in 1999 identified its new organizational priority to be the implementation of a leadership development program. Its Commission for Management Development was charged with identifying core content/knowledge elements required for effective California community college administration. The group examined a number of existing community college leadership training programs and institutes available nationwide, such as the national Department Chair Academy located in Phoenix, Arizona . The ACCCA Board and membership rejected such models, however, on the basis that these provided “generic leadership topics” that failed to address the specific training needs of California community college administrators (Blue, 1999). The ACCCA Board therefore created a curriculum advisory board drawn from the ranks of administrative practitioners within the California community college system. The charge to the group was to structure the model curriculum for a professional development program designed to prepare and support administrators to function successfully within the state community college system. The project was entitled *Administration 101*.

Through a number of channels, including the use of focus groups conducted at the Association’s annual spring conference as well as the state’s Chief Instructional Officers Conference, a number of special issues and topics were identified by the field as essential for administrators to understand in order to work effectively in community colleges. While some topics are similar to those that appear on many national community college association agendas, such as those of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and the national Department Chair Academy, the following list describes and defines the topics within

the context of California's unique regulatory, fiscal and governance environment. Examples of topics include but are not limited to the following:

- California Community College Governance—understanding the mission and goals of California Community Colleges; community college governmental relations; the role of the system's Board of Governors as well as the governance structure at local levels; and the principle of consultative/participative governance as defined in AB 1725.
- Instruction and Student Services—the community college curriculum development process; matriculation and assessment requirements; enrollment management; and selected aspects of unique instructional delivery modes such as Distance Education and learning support services.
- Institutional Dynamics/Strategic Planning and Administrative Roles—tools for understanding institutional culture and politics; exploring collaboration, communication and linkages with the community for purposes of educational and economic development.
- Human Resources- Education Code and Title 5 requirements for recruitment, selection, hiring and the tenure process for community college faculty as well as understanding collective bargaining and various legal aspects of human resource management.

(See appendix A-*Administration 101* Curriculum)

In summer, 2001, ACCCA conducted the first *Administration 101* program. Originally planned for a maximum of 50 participants, the program was immediately oversubscribed, and registration had to be limited to 65. *Administration 101* had obviously "hit a nerve." Applicants—or their home institutions-- were willing to underwrite costs and spend five

intensive days of study at the UCLA Sunset Conference Center. Program presenters included recognized leaders within the state system and represented a wide variety of specializations and professional roles/positions. Participants were drawn from every region of the state, from every type of institution (single and multi-college districts) and from every professional level (faculty coordinators and directors through the ranks of deans, vice presidents and even one new president). Based on this initial overwhelming response from the field and given the evident training needs expressed by participants, the ACCCA Board determined to continue *Administration 101* and build upon the model.

Statement of Problem

Given the direction of the ACCCA Board, members of the Association's Management Development Commission organized to continue *Administration 101*. A sub-committee was formed and charged with planning for future sessions, continuing to implement the program, and developing and proposing refinements and revisions to program curriculum in order to maintain program currency and ensure the incorporation of new topics or changing field requirements for California community college administrators. Changes to program curriculum are ultimately reviewed and approved by the Management Development Commission and the ACCCA Board. Central to this endeavor is the need of program organizers to evaluate what is working well within the program and to identify what needs revision. It became clear that a formative evaluation of *Administration 101* was necessary in order to provide the information needed for on-going program development and improvement. This then is the problem addressed in this study.

Since its initial and only session, there has been no follow-up evaluation regarding the usefulness of the core content nor any subsequent identification of additional training needs

that may exist. What other learning needs, if any, may be identified among community college participants of *Administration 101*? Are there specific aspects of the program that participants would have preferred to see expanded, enhanced, or de-emphasized? Are there other topics relevant to community college administrative leadership that participants would have liked to see introduced? Secondly, a need exists to examine the delivery formats used in the program.. Because the program is not static but will evolve over time, an opportunity exists to build upon first year experiences of *Administration 101* participants with follow up evaluation activities conducted during the second session that took place in July and August, 2002.

While the general goals of the program are well understood, the program curriculum design and the delivery formats must be evaluated with an eye to refining and improving the program if it is to flourish. Program organizers are only too aware of the challenge of translating a “model California community college administrative training curriculum” into an actual quality training experience. Presenters, topics, learning activities, and general program organization must be assessed as it actually occurs in order to provide the basis for program improvement. While initial enrollments in this program have been strong— even exceeding original projections—the program can only persist and grow if participant expectations are successfully met. After all, initial program enrollments could have been a reflection of the level of need for a professional administrative training program for California community college administrators. An unsatisfying or poor quality program could result in participant dissatisfaction, and by extension, lead to negative word of mouth that in turn could weaken future enrollments in the program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the first two sessions of ACCCA's *Administration 101* program. As such, this constitutes a formative evaluation to be used by the ACCCA Management Development Commission (MDC) to improve the program. The evaluation is based on the perspectives of two populations: the program presenters and the program participants (consumers). The goal is to present a coherent picture that merges these two perspectives regarding the content, format and delivery of the program. It is therefore anticipated that evaluation results will point to possible new directions or topics as well as revised formats and delivery strategies for the program.

Research Questions

1. Based on participant and presenter responses, how does the program content meet the goals of *Administration 101*?
 - In what ways do these two groups perceive the usefulness of the concepts presented in *Administration 101* (content)?
 - Are there other topics that should be incorporated in future sessions?
 - Are there *Administration 101* curriculum content elements that should be expanded or deleted or modified?
2. What are participant and presenter reactions to the format and delivery of *Administration 101*?
 - Are there ways in which delivery strategies could be changed to facilitate participant learning?

Significance of the Study

It is anticipated that the proposed study will extend in a modest way the current research and literature on community college administrative leadership development and needed administrative leadership skills, especially as these concepts apply to California community colleges. Specifically, the study will address identified gaps in the literature by focusing on 1) California community college administrative leadership skill requirements, and 2) practitioner-based definitions of needed competencies and skill sets, and 3) the organization and delivery of these skills.

Findings will be shared with the Management Development Commission of ACCCA in order to improve program quality, particularly in areas dealing with curriculum design and delivery. On a broader level, it is anticipated that the study will contribute to further understanding of administration leadership development needs in California community colleges. The study will rely on practitioner input to articulate perceived administrative leadership development needs.

Because there exist such few programs and opportunities for administrative professional development that specifically target California community college administrators, the ACCCA *Administration 101* program model promises to be especially valuable for other potential educational providers. For instance, in January 2002, state funding was approved for the State Chancellor's Office to implement the establishment of the Community College Leadership Institute (CCLDI) at Claremont Graduate University. The ACCCA program model may well serve as a point of departure for the development of a graduate curriculum. The CCLDI is to be a collaborative effort between community college practitioners and graduate level academicians and scholars. This study offers a channel for the

voices of significant numbers of community college administrators as to the topics, issues, and delivery formats preferred by the target population. Additionally, other potential higher education providers such as the University of California (UC) and the California State University and College (CSUC) systems or other in-state private institutions may find the results of the evaluation useful in developing curriculum designed to meet the needs of community college administrators within the context of existing educational administration or leadership programs.

Theoretical Assumptions, Conceptual Framework, and Methods

For purposes of this introductory chapter, the theoretical underpinnings and conceptual framework used for this evaluation are described only in general terms. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature and theoretical assumptions and conceptual framework used in this study. Suffice to say at this point that there exists a wide array of theoretical approaches and ways of conceptualizing evaluations. This study is designed as a formative evaluation study that is driven by a utilization focus, as described in Patton's work (1997).

Generally speaking, this evaluation study could loosely be characterized as a type of action research. This research form has as its primary goal the intent of addressing a stated problem or improving an established system or practice. The purpose of this study is precisely that: to provide assistance to the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) in its efforts to address the professional development needs of California community college administrators and to strengthen the *Administration 101* program.

Action research is widely used in educational settings. It offers a method to improve practice through a cycle of observing, reflecting, and acting. Information is gathered through multiple means, often including both quantitative and qualitative approaches. During

reflection or analysis, the data are interpreted and multiple viewpoints are shared and synthesized, often by the very stakeholders within an organization. An assumption is made “that those who have previously been designated as subjects should participate directly in research processes and that those processes should be applied in ways that benefit all participants directly” (Stringer cited in Glessne, 1998). Action Research typically leads to a subsequent cycle of planning and implementation based on the data gathered in the research phase. Such an activity goes beyond the purpose of this study. Nonetheless, action research protocols (participant-based data gathering) and its central “bias for action” characterize this study.

This study may be classified as one of program evaluation; specifically, it is conceptualized as a formative evaluation that incorporates a mixed methodology of qualitative and quantitative techniques. It has a process focus--rather than that of outcomes, impact, costs, or cost benefits. The goal is to provide the “consumers” of the study with information needed to make changes in the ways that the ACCCA *Administration 101* program is being offered.

Patton (1997) stresses that program evaluation is:

The systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming. Utilization-focused program evaluation (as opposed to program evaluation in general) is evaluation done for and with specific intended primary users for specific, intended uses (p. 23).

This definition emphasizes systematic data collection rather than applying social science methods. Patton stresses that program evaluation differs from traditional forms of research in the purpose of data collection and standards for judging quality. The goal of

scientific research, in his estimation, is to “discover new knowledge, test theories, establish truth, and generalize across time and space.” In contrast, program evaluation is undertaken to “inform decisions, clarify options, identify improvements and provide information about programs and policies within contextual boundaries of time, place, values and politics” (1997, p. 24). The critical distinction between research and evaluation, according to Cronbach and Suppes as cited in Patton (1997), is the difference between conclusion-oriented and decision-oriented inquiry.

In terms of theoretical outcomes, this study does not purport to create new frameworks—simply to provide new interpretations based on practitioner perspectives. At best, “empirical generalizations” at low levels of abstraction as defined by Glasser and Strauss (1967) will result. My purpose is to use research findings from this study as well as those of related studies to raise new questions about the best approaches for developing and training California community college administrators for today’s educational environments.

In order to answer the research questions, a mixed research methodology that included both quantitative and qualitative approaches was designed for purposes of this formative evaluation. Research methods included the following: 1) An analysis of participant written evaluations from both the 2001 and the 2002 sessions was used to assess program content and delivery. 2) Focus group interviews were conducted with selected participants of the summer 2002 session to assess content and program delivery. 3) Follow up surveys were sent to all members of the second cohort to query them on the value and usefulness of *Administration 101*. They were asked to describe in what specific ways, if any, they had applied *Administration 101* program concepts and strategies in their work. 4) To incorporate the presenters’ perspectives, phone interviews were conducted individually with those returning

for the second summer session; again, the focus of the interviews was on program content and delivery questions. Presenters had the opportunity to provide impressions of what worked and to identify challenges they experienced in effectively presenting assigned topics. By describing and analyzing the perspectives of both presenters and participants and triangulating the data and results of the various methods, an in-process assessment or formative evaluation of the *Administration 101* program emerges.

Limitations of the Study

In terms of methodology, the study utilized the written evaluations completed by participants of ACCCA's *Administration 101* programs. A clear limitation of the study is that the design and focus of these evaluations were not established with the idea of answering broader research questions regarding professional development needs of community college administrators. Therefore, analysis of the written evaluations was supplemented by follow-up surveying of participants of the summer 2001 *Administration 101* session. In this way, broader questions of the value and utility of the program curriculum were explored.

As a formative evaluation, the study had the further limitation that it is aimed at making improvements in program implementation. The study does not include an experimental design wherein "treatment"—namely the *Administration 101* programs-- for session I (summer 2001) participants is compared to that of session II (summer 2002). Rather, the focus was on identifying methods of improving the program, be it in terms of content definition or delivery formats. It was anticipated that as the program evolved, certain minor modifications would take place in the program structure. Although the curriculum and even the composition of presenters remained generally the same, inevitable changes took place

between the 2001 and 2002 sessions. This evaluation study required taking these adjustments into consideration.

A broader limitation of the study is that it focuses on a very specific administrative leadership development program within the state; therefore evaluation findings may not be generalized to other state community college systems. The very nature of the intense institute format also means that results may not be generalized to other types of programs, such as programs of graduate study in educational administration or leadership.

The role of the researcher in this study posed another potential limiting factor. Glessne (1998) and others have observed that when one is familiar with a culture or group, one's angle of vision is narrowed by personal bias. In short, one brings assumptions about what is going on. This proposed study constitutes a kind of "backyard research." As a working community college Vice President of Instruction, I have clearly developed certain views and assumptions about the roles and responsibilities of community college administrators, and I have established perspectives on the nature of the California community college environment. Thus, there are caveats related to performing "backyard research" that I will address about being in the role of researcher. As discussed in the foregoing section, I have selected several approaches with an eye to balancing or addressing my own researcher bias.

In what ways does my role as an instructional administrator affect my effectiveness as a researcher? Glessne indicates that in Action Research, the researcher works within the organization to "make projects better." My familiarity with California community college administration and with the actual community college field of 108 institutions equips me with an understanding of participant experiences. Access to data and to respondents themselves is facilitated by my current position and by my membership in ACCCA.

Beyond the overarching advantage described above, however, there are specific aspects of this study which served, by design, to buffer my involvement in the study and served to minimize any possible “conflict of interest” as I worked with administrator participants:

1. This evaluation study and activity took place outside of my own institution. Indeed, I enjoyed a certain anonymity as I undertook the project as a volunteer in a professional association.
2. The report was prepared for use by an external agency, ACCCA, outside the structures of any community college in the state. This also contributed to the validity of participant responses.
3. Participants selected for interview in this study did not have a formal linkage or a reporting relationship with me in any way.
4. The focus of this study fell outside of my own day-to-day responsibilities as a college administrator. Thus, there existed significant emotional and even “cognitive” distance from the subject of the study. That is, results do not reflect on either my own or my College’s functions. I could afford to be “objective” or “neutral” about findings and recommendations.
5. This study did not uncover what is termed “dangerous knowledge.”

On the whole, I believe that my professional experiences constituted an overwhelming advantage in conducting this study. My own commitment to quality professional standards for community college administrators provided me with the motivation to undertake the work. In conducting an evaluation of the *Administration 101* program and its curriculum, in my estimation, it proved to be an advantage for the researcher to be informed and well

versed on the issues, principles and environmental realities of administrators who work within California community colleges.

Finally, a key check on researcher bias is the fact that study findings will be submitted to the ACCCA Commission for Management Development, a group composed of peer administrators drawn from diverse community colleges across the state. Members represent every type of administrative position—from Director levels to Chief Executive Officer-- and from every unit, including but not limited to Instruction, Student Services, Human Resources, Business Services, and categorical programs such as Disabled Students' Program Services. This group is well equipped to identify and factor out narrow or biased assessments.

Overview of the Study

The following describes the organization and contents of this study.

Chapter 2, Review of the Literature and Theoretical and Conceptual Framework, explores three specific bodies of literature that have relevance to this study: 1) the professional competencies required for effective community college administration; 2) the means or professional development avenues available for acquisition of the skills needed for effective community college administration; and 3) the nature of the emergent leadership challenge—and by extension, the “new skills” needed to meet these challenges. Special attention has been focused on the unique administrative leadership issues within California.

The theoretical underpinnings of this study are also explored in Chapter 2. A comparison and contrast of diverse theoretical approaches and models is presented, including a discussion of objective and values oriented studies. Since this evaluation may

be placed in the latter category, theoretical approaches and various methods for conducting these type of studies are described in that chapter. The discussion includes, but is not limited, to an assessment of responsive evaluation, the CIPP model (incorporating components for context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation and product evaluation), and the Formative-Summative approach as developed by Scriven.

Chapter 3, Research Methods, describes the methods utilized in this study and the procedural logistics involved in collecting the data. Approaches to sampling strategies and data analysis are also discussed.

Chapter 4, Results and Discussion, presents a description of the population of the study and data handling procedures. The central focus is on the presentation of results based on the data collection strategies, including 1) analysis of participant evaluation questionnaires, 2) participant focus group discussions, 3) follow-up survey of 2002 program participants, and 4) presenter interviews. Analysis of results and preliminary findings are presented within each section.

Chapter 5, Findings, Recommendations, Implications, and Conclusions, presents a synthesis of the findings related to the research questions. Recommendations related to program content, delivery formats, and possible future curriculum directions are presented. The implications of study findings in relation to the literature pertaining to community college administrative professional development are also discussed. Limitations of the study are described, and future directions for research are detailed. Finally, conclusions regarding *Administration 101* program outcomes and their implications for further development of professional development programs for serving California community college administrators are highlighted.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: 1) Present a review of the research literature; and 2) discuss the theoretical/methodological framework of the study.

Review of the Research Literature

Three bodies of literature have particular relevance to this study. These areas of scholarship include research on the following topics: 1) the professional competencies required for effective community college administration; 2) community college professional development avenues for acquisition of skills needed for effective community college administration; and 3) the emergent administrative leadership challenges within community colleges today—and by extension, the “new” skills needed to meet these challenges. Special attention has been focused on the unique administrative/ leadership challenges within California.

Rather than providing an exhaustive review of the literature, this chapter focuses more selectively on the strands of research that informed this study and that provide background for understanding the goals and program curriculum of the *ACCCA Administration 101* institute. Gaps in the literature will be suggested that highlight the need for further work, particularly in the area of practitioner-based research.

Administrative Skills and Competencies

A preliminary exploration of the literature on skills and competencies required for administrative leadership in community colleges indicates that there is no lack of studies conducted over the past 25 years. The results of existing research could usefully be ranged along a continuum from those that emphasize “leadership” to those that focus on “management” frameworks. Indeed, several scholars comment on the “overly segmented approaches” to the topic that overstate distinctions (Garavalia, p. 6). Walker even emphasizes that the distinction between practicality and theory is not one of rigor or effort but of perspective and emphasis (1981, p. x). A guiding principle used in this review of the literature is that *conceptual frameworks and long-term views* should illuminate the realities of administrative leadership, and works were selected that underscore that linkage. Because the literature on this topic is extensive, it is useful to classify works in terms of conceptual frameworks including managerial, charismatic, transactional and transformational.

One category of studies could be described as emphasizing managerial frameworks—that is, those that stress the importance of technical skills such as planning, budgeting, and supervision. Leading authorities within this school such as Drucker (1974) define critical managerial/administrative functions to include planning, organizing, staffing, delegating and controlling and decision-making.

As applied to community college administration, several studies make use of the managerial approach. Murray and Hammons (1995) conducted a study designed to identify a core set of criteria considered essential in assessing the managerial effectiveness of community college administrators. Through an exhaustive review of the literature, a list of 70 management audit assessment criteria was presented to a panel of experts. It was concluded

that many business management methods and applications could be useful in enhancing administrative effectiveness in community colleges. Indeed, the authors concluded that “In varying degrees, business managers and college administrators, whether they are aware of it or not, perform the basic management functions of planning, organizing, controlling, directing or leading, staffing, communicating and decision making” (Murray and Hammons, p. 210).

The literature also indicates that community college administrators, by and large, are not familiar with basic management concepts for the simple reason that many lack formal business management education. Rouché (1996) found that the community college administrative segment during the 60’s, 70’s, and 80’s was primarily drawn from “faculty types.” This cadre by definition emerged from academic departments of various kinds and was not professionally trained for management roles.

In another key study, Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo (1997) pointed to a number of studies that identified essential competencies that are clearly managerial (Stolcap and Wilson, Stodgill, Hammons and Keller, and Vaughn). In these studies, administrators in two-year colleges reported primary functions to include: a) planning, b) organizing, c) staffing, d) directing, and e) controlling. Key competencies include delegation, personnel selection, and decision-making.

Townsend (1997) provides an excellent bridging study between managerial/professional competencies and leadership skills. By surveying a sample of community college senior administrators on what they considered to be necessary knowledge and skills, a “baseline subject content” was derived for higher education administration programs (Townsend, p. 41). The study results identified six professional competencies, including conceptual, technical, contextual, interpersonal, communication, integrative and

adaptive. It is evident from the description on the categories that skills are required beyond those needed to perform narrowly defined administrative/managerial functions.

Another major study by Brown and Rodriguez (1989) focused on the creation of a performance appraisal instrument for community college administrators. Thirty performance dimensions were identified and validated by a sample of community college administrators. Using statistical methods (e.g. Pearson Product Moment Correlation) reliability for the instrument was established. Twenty-one of the 30 dimensions were validated with 13 of these having high reliability coefficients. Significant dimensions included the need for managerial skills in the areas of supervision, academic planning, facility property management, and fiscal management.

Within California, the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA), the major statewide administrative professional association, designed the curriculum for *Administration 101* with the goal of addressing the need to develop administrative skills and competencies specifically required by administrators working within the state system. Using practitioner focus groups and expert input from senior administrative consultation groups (e.g. Chief Executive Officers, Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Student Service Officers, and Chief Business Officers), a number of technical competencies have been defined. The Association curriculum writers have identified skills/competencies very specific to California community college administration (2000). Among the topics that clearly fall within the definition of managerial skills are enrollment management (related to efficiency/production management skills), categorical program budget compliance, Title 5 and Education Code regulation (which relates to controlling/staffing functions) legal issues,

budget and finance, human resource questions, and various facets of decision making in community college shared governance environments.

Far and away, the major gap in utilizing management frameworks to solely define necessary administrative skill competencies, however, is the limited horizon these offer on the complex nature of organizational leadership. It is evident that it is possible to train competent managers and yet not produce effective administrative leaders. The problem lies in the very definition of leadership as organizational effectiveness. In Heifetz' words "Again this theory has the benefit of being generally applicable, but it provides no real guide to determine the nature or formation of these [organizational] goals "(1998, p.22).

In contrast to managerial conceptual frameworks, charismatic frameworks tend to focus on characteristics or traits of leaders. There is no lack of studies that utilize approaches that emphasize such personality traits as courage, trust, integrity, empathy, and high energy. Great leaders are characterized by larger than life, heroic profiles. Such theories or studies place great weight on personal or individualistic traits. Often studies define leaders as persons who are able to develop prominence or influence in organizations or societies.

A number of studies have been conducted that ask community college senior administrators what they consider to be necessary knowledge and attitudes for academic administration. By incorporating questions of attributes or characteristics, researchers such as Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo, Stolcap and Wilson (cited in Townsend), Hammons and Keller (1990), and Vaughn (1986) make use of what could be described as a charismatic leadership framework.

Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo (1997) in their bridging study, identify both professional competencies and attitudes. Charismatic trait dimensions include adaptability,

professional identity, motivation for continued learning and ethical standards (1997, p. 44). Interestingly, responses from 160 two-year college academic officers pointed to only three attitudes that were listed by ten or more respondents in common: open mindedness, flexibility, and patience (Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo, p. 50).

Upon comparing definitions of charismatic leadership traits, ethical standards were listed most frequently as the most significant for a community college administrator. Ethical leadership is defined as the need for moral leadership. Robles (1998), for example, believes that leaders must demonstrate high ethical standards in word and deed.

The next most important leadership trait listed for an effective community college administrator is risk-taking—sometimes defined in attitude inventories as innovation. Hammons and Keller define risk-taking “as the ability to make an assessment and take a chance, including the ability to cope with pressure from within and outside the organization” (1990, p. 37). Heifetz (1998) also stresses the ability to create “holding environments” that allow for the emergence of change, a definition that has many similarities to the commonly used one of risk-taking.

In discussions of current leadership challenges and trends, two traits that are frequently mentioned are adaptability and sensitivity. Fincher (1998), for instance, highlights the reality of a growing professionalization and transiency among academic leaders that require such characteristics.

The strength of the charismatic leadership frameworks lies in the descriptive power of the studies that make use of the trait/characteristic scheme. Again, Walker (1981) ultimately drew from the empirical and/or examined experience of administrators in the field. Many leadership studies employ methods that call for survey of successful leaders, and examples

of these are frequently defined in terms of positions (e.g. Chief Executive Officers, Chief Instructional Officers, etc.) or by type of institution (e.g. two-year, four-year, technical, liberal arts, etc.), regions, or even cohorts. Based on responses, lists of leadership traits in contrast to skill sets or competencies are presented. The advantage of this approach is that it is rooted in the “real world” of practitioners and tends to command great face validity. A mirror is held up to the field, and for that very reason is accepted by it. Indeed, identified traits appear desirable and are sought after by organizations; efforts are made to identify individuals who possess the required attributes or characteristics.

Therein lies a potential flaw in this approach. If the basic premise of administrative leadership development is that leaders can be taught, then a reliance on the existence of intrinsic personal traits would seem to undermine this assumption. Characteristics such as high energy, confidence, flexibility, and desire to lead are highly individual and cannot be easily imparted. Thus we are left with a tautology: if it is defined that leaders are those persons who possess certain traits—as opposed to skills—then it would appear that leaders or “great men” are born rather than made. In short trait lists are of limited value if the goal of an educational initiative is to foster leadership development.

An even deeper criticism of charismatic leadership theory and, by extension, studies based on this perspective, is offered by Heifetz (1998). His contention is that the trait approach is downright dangerous as it suggests that great leaders may be a type of alpha male, thought of as bigger than life. The charismatic theory, in Heifetz’ view, places a disproportionate emphasis on the individual independent of the specific situation. Instead of generating creativity and responsibility, charismatic authority can generate a mindless following or encourage the emergence of bureaucratic institutions. Indeed, it encourages

=

autocratic forms of leadership. Instead, Heifetz would argue that “True creativity is stimulated by engaging in one’s environment” (1998, p. 66).

Transactional leadership theory, which dominated the literature in the 1960’s, offers a major corrective to the charismatic approach. This framework stresses, as the term suggests, the transactions or relationship between leaders and followers and focuses on the exchange that occurs between the two parties, such as jobs for votes, positive reinforcement for good work, etc. Robles (1998) emphasizes that exchange takes place within the established structure of the organization or system. Thus transactional management is the process of executing tasks with other individuals to achieve a desired objective. For community college leaders who must manage scarce resources in highly political environments, transactional management skills are indispensable.

The literature on community college leadership frequently utilizes transactional concepts. Bryant (1992) reflects the themes of many researchers who underscore the idea that shared governance models that characterize community college environments require skill sets that include the ability to delegate and to communicate effectively. He cites the 1988 Carnegie Foundation survey that points to the need for dynamic leadership models by revealing that 60 percent of community college faculty rated administrators as “autocratic” (Bryant, p. 78). Likewise Fincher (1998) identified the persistence of “elitist attitudes” among many administrators in higher education. Obviously, an emphasis on the development of transactional skill building offers a corrective alternative.

Hammons (1990) identifies eight skill areas that are fundamental to transactional management: planning, decision making, budgeting/finance, controlling, personnel selection, conflict resolution, knowledge of Total Quality Management, and public relations. Note that

the approach combines organizational management with aspects of human behavior. Heifetz (1998) summarizes the transactional process as one based on reciprocity; both leaders and followers impact each other. In his view, the leader enjoys the benefits of status in exchange for creating stability for followers. Another dimension of transactional management points to bargaining and persuasion as the *sine qua non* of political power. Thus, understanding and balancing the needs of diverse stakeholders is key.

In the world of community college administration, vital organizational functions require transactional kinds of administrative competencies: personnel selection, budgeting and finance, decision making, enrollment management, class scheduling, curriculum development, program evaluation, and collective bargaining. And this is but a partial list. It is no accident that in developing *Administration 101*, the curriculum advisory group for ACCCA focused on many of these activities. A list of topics for the training program was derived through the use of focus groups drawn from California community college administrators as well as recognized leaders and consultants in the field. Key subject areas included specific applications of above listed functions. These are specifically translated as California community college participatory governance, statewide curriculum development guidelines and “good practices,” enrollment management, community partnerships, strategic planning, the California funding mechanism, budget development, Education Code regulations for faculty hiring, tenure and evaluation, conflict/grievance resolution, and collective bargaining. The essence of these activities lies in the inherent reciprocity required to create positive or productive outcomes. The role of the leader is one of managing dynamic processes and balancing needs of stakeholders in the name of meeting the community college mission

The evident strength of the transactional framework is its emphasis on the relationship between leaders and followers. On its face, an emphasis on managing the dynamics of leadership is useful. There is no question that in the world of community college administration it is critical for the practitioner to be able to scan the organization and assess how constituencies are affected or disaffected.

Despite these advantages, however, Sergiovanni, as cited by Robles (1998) observes that many experts believe that transactional analysis has run its course due to its limited view of human potential. Personal interest is not the sole motivator within organizations. Indeed, frequently the only way to cut the gorgon's knot of conflicting interests is to appeal to higher goals.

Heifetz (1998) comments on a related issue: with its emphasis on relational dynamics and influence, transactional theory sidesteps the purpose to which influence is put or the way that purposes within the organization are derived. "Leadership as influence implicitly promotes influence as an orienting value, perpetuating a confusion between means and ends" (Heifetz, p. 18).

From the 1970's on, studies have emphasized the use of transformational theory that extends the limited horizon of transactional theory. Transformational theory converts followers into leaders by asking them to transcend self-interest for the good of the organization. James MacGregor Burns, the predominant theorist of transformational leadership, suggests that this appeal elevates everyone in the organization to focus on broader moral values. As Heifetz (1998) notes, it has the benefit of promoting discussion about orienting values.

Applied to the world of community college leadership, transformational goals are interpreted as the ability of leaders to create a shared vision and to act as agents of change. Researchers such as Chieffo (1992) identify the ability to create a compelling vision as critical. Only by doing so, can faculty and staff transcend limits of current thinking and commit themselves to inspired performance.

Fincher (1998) who focuses on leadership challenges, and Robles (1998) and Bryant (1992) would argue that transformational leadership competencies include an ability to create shared vision and a propensity to act as change agents. Skill sub-sets of these abilities include collaborative skills such as consensus building, team development and empowerment, and openness to the perceptions of others.

Transformational leadership theory dominates the literature today. Certainly one great attraction is its recognition of the complexity of organizational environments. Another strength is its acknowledgement of organizational culture as a significant factor. It de-emphasizes personality traits of leaders and heightens awareness of situational factors. Interestingly, it incorporates elements from charismatic theory, particularly the elusive ability to inspire. Similar to transactional perspectives, it reinforces the notion of leadership as cause and effect of interactions between leaders and followers.

If there is any gap in this framework, it may be that it is difficult to appraise and evaluate transformational leadership competencies. To draw again from current work done by ACCCA (2000), transformational skill sets have been identified to be essential for system leaders. In its curriculum for *Administration 101*, topics such as “leading through change” and “strategic planning” reflect the influence of transformational leadership perspectives. From a practical perspective, it is difficult to train practitioners in these competencies as the

specifics of leadership are inextricably tied to situations and organizational environments and cultures. At best, “students” can be encouraged to develop sensitivities to the undercurrents and unspoken challenges of organizational life.

A significant problem posed by the selective survey of the literature presented here on professional competencies required for effective community college administration is a methodological one. The research is dominated by quantitative, descriptive studies of community college administrative skill/competency requirements. As described in Chapter 1, a number of representative works (Murray and Hammons, 1995; Stolcap and Wilson (cited in Townsend); Hammons and Keller, 1990; Vaughn, 1996; Townsend and Bossoppo-Moyo, 1997; Brown and Rodriguez, 1999) are based on largely quantitative studies. Time and again, survey methods have been employed in these studies to depict profiles of administrative leaders and to produce lists of administrative competencies required by practitioners. However, the competency/skill lists are typically derived by methods that call for forced choices by selected samples of administrators in the field from proffered menu’s of skills or competencies. The problem with this approach is that definitions of skill areas or competencies are frequently lacking or are ambiguous. What do administrators mean by identifying “communication skills” as essential, for instance? What do “planning skills” entail? Often skill sets are found in differing types of analysis. For example, budgeting and finance competencies are frequently discussed in different contexts and with clearly different emphases. In certain cases, the negotiating, consensus-building aspects of budget development functions are stressed while in others, focus is on technical concerns.

Is there a way to clarify such ambiguities—and by extension the ambiguous implications for administrative professional preparation? A need exists for qualitative analysis

that would explore richer definitions of skill competencies and their applications to actual community college organizations. Open-ended surveying of community college senior administrators or even interview based research approaches may offer promising alternatives for studying the question. While responses from the field using these kind of approaches would be relatively more complicated to codify or to administer, results may be produced which would be clearer on the topic of needed skill/competencies and may prove more useful for purposes of professional development.

Community College Leadership Development Models

A related body of literature that has particular relevance to the study is research on the topic of community college leadership development approaches. By examining the professional development models specifically available to the community college segment, avenues for the acquisition of needed administrative skills can be explored. What are the optimal development pathways for acquiring essential administrative skills? A review of the literature on this topic yields one surprise: until recently there were comparatively few systematic studies on community college leadership development program models.

Various explanations account for the delayed research focus on professional administrative development. As late as 1988, Green could note in her study, "Because of the historic ambivalence regarding leadership, higher education has paid little attention to leadership development because academia views with suspicion the notion of management" (p.18). Cohen and March (1986) in their seminal study depicted colleges as organized anarchies, hopelessly confused about organizational goals. In such environments, how is it possible to adequately prepare for administrative leadership when neither desired outcomes nor internal processes are well understood? Walker (1979) described community colleges as

systems of polycentric authority. Thus leadership becomes a collective practice allowing for the emergence of a plurality of voices. Again, this definition precludes clear notions of how to adequately prepare for administrative leadership goals. Finally, several researchers (Rouche, 1996; Garavalia, 1996; and Townsend, 1996) point to the ambiguous genesis of community college administration as a profession. In their view, the fact that administrative careers in earlier times, the decades of the 1960's and the 1970's, blurred the roles of faculty and administrators delayed the recognition that administrative duties required distinct skill sets than those of faculty. There existed a prevailing notion that administrative positions were undertaken on a temporary basis. Such an idea could not help but delay a commitment to systematic and on-going administrative leadership development activities.

In general there exists a broad consensus in the literature that administrative leadership or administrative management supports the central functions of teaching and learning. Mayhew (1979) carefully differentiates between management and leadership. In his view, management focuses on bringing relevant information concerning issues, reflecting rationally on these, and making plans—especially related to resource allocation. Administrative leadership, by contrast, suggests a presence of vision, an understanding of the big picture, and of external environmental challenges.

Again, however, Green notes that the “Historic resistance to management as well as faculty antipathy to administration have made formal leadership and management training programs a recent phenomenon” (1988, p.21). Likewise, Gillet-Karam (1999) documents the lack of formal training provided to mid-level managers in community colleges across the nation. In California, both leading community college professional associations, the Community College League of California and the Association of California Community

College Administrators (ACCCA) identified the issue of leadership development in the late 1990's to be the major priority on their agendas precisely due to the widespread recognition of the dearth of professional development opportunities within the state.

In the absence of formal management development programs such as those found in business, McCauley (1986) found that managers in higher education acquired skills through three major activities: 1) Learning on-the-job—the more challenging the position, the more they learned. 2) Learning through other people, especially colleagues. Mentoring and observing bosses as role models figure prominently as examples. 3) Intermittent and limited formal training opportunities. In a similar fashion, Eisner (1984) stressed the need to combine graduate programs with on-the-job training.

In 2000, Bragg asserted the need to prepare community college deans to address complex environmental challenges such as those noted by Baker. Leading change is identified as the heart of the “new” administrative work. She stresses that professional development needs to be timely, continuous and practical. Based on extensive research activities conducted at the University of Illinois, six core knowledge areas were deemed critical:

- Mission, philosophy and history,
- Learner-centered orientation,
- Instructional leadership,
- Informational and educational technologies,
- Institutional accountability and learner assessment,
- Administrative preparation.

Bragg does note, however, that while elements of a comprehensive professional development system for community college instructional deans have existed for some time, what is still

lacking is a concerted effort to link the elements together into a coherent and meaningful whole.

Gibson-Beninger (1996) explored graduate programs for community college leaders and stressed the importance of curriculum on democratic models of leadership. She emphasizes five training components: 1) understanding of organizations as cultures; 2) sensitivity to individual differences that allows for all to contribute to decisions and change; 3) commitment to empowering diverse constituents; 4) recognitions of mentoring approaches; and 5) emphasis on teambuilding through collaborative work.

Professional development opportunities for community college leaders are still widely scattered and segmented. At the local levels, there are many creative opportunities for administrative personnel to develop leadership skills. The literature shows many examples (Ebbers, 2000; Laden, 1995; Palmer and Katsinas, 1997) of innovative institutional programs of management skill development. Programs are offered in retreat or conference formats. In turn, professional development on the local level can be coordinated with efforts of state and national agencies and professional associations. For instance, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) provides targeted professional development options. In Illinois, the development of future community college leaders is the focus of a series of workshops sponsored by the Illinois Resident's Council. Another well known example of professional development model programs is the Department Chair Academy. Filan (1999) describes this grassroots movement begun in 1990 in the Maricopa Community College District in Arizona. Since then, the organization has developed institutes and conferences offered throughout the country focusing on diverse aspects of mid-management or department chair functions ranging from methods for effective scheduling, budgeting and staffing to more complex

leadership activities fostering innovation and staff diversity. Finally, graduate education provides capstone educational opportunities for professional development.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) in a major policy statement similarly recognized that leaders must have strong management skills, be coalition builders, possess vision, and be able to revitalize campus communities.

The challenge of developing leadership in California community colleges has long been recognized. The Report of the Joint Committee of the California State University and the California Community Colleges on Leadership Programs (1987) described a number of policy studies, including the work of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). An inventory of existing leadership programs is included; emphasis is placed on formal doctoral programs in education. Still, no studies based on the requirements identified by the field were presented.

Most recently, in April, 2000, the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) saw the creation of a partnership between the California Community College system and the Claremont Graduate School. This proved to be a milestone development as it specifically targeted community college administrators. CCLDI underscores the growing recognition by the system and administrative practitioners of the need for formalized leadership development programs.

To summarize, an analysis of the existing literature on community college leadership development models correlated with the research conducted on administrative skills/competencies suggests potentially useful directions for further study. It is clear that there is an abundance of studies conducted on desirable community college administrative

skills or competencies. By contrast, research on the best community college leadership development approaches lags behind—reflecting an evident traditional resistance in academia to the need for management or administrative leadership. While there is a plethora of training programs—local, state and formal educational opportunities—there is no real consensus on “best practices” regarding content or curricular design. Nonetheless, there is a variety of development models that address the full range of needed skill development for community college administrators, ranging from those that provide information regarding technical content to those that develop practitioners’ abilities to lead complex organizations and address change issues. Over the professional lifetime of a community college administrative leader, on-going development is needed at all levels. The need clearly exists for data-driven evaluation studies that would shed light on the effectiveness of various administrative professional development program models.

Emergent Leadership Challenges and Implications for Administrative Development Programs

Fincher (1998) summarizes the findings of many researchers in his discussion of changes in administrative roles and responsibilities within institutions of higher education during the first decade of the 21st century. In his scan of the field, he noted that increasingly administrators are characterized by a growing diversity in terms of race, ethnicity, origin, experience and preparation. Four key findings include: 1) administrators will become more specialized, 2) administrators will become more dependent on professional staff services, such as information services, 3) administrative career paths will be marked by increased professionalization and mobility, and 4) despite the growing diversity among administrators,

an elitist notion of leadership will persist, notwithstanding the predominance of participatory decision making environments.

Such trends are disturbing yet patently evident in California community colleges. The literature points first to the changing nature of the community college environment. O'Rourke (1997) argues that in the opening decade of the 21st century, the qualifications for effective community college administrators have changed; the administrative skills needed to maintain and improve the largest single segment within higher education are not the same as those needed to establish it in earlier decades. Today the system is far more complex with varying geographic locations, demographics, and governance structures. Cohen (1986) likewise noted a national community college trend that is even more pronounced in California: a growing student diversity and the increased complexity of missions. Fincher's finding regarding the apparent trend toward increased levels of professionalization among administrators would appear to be validated.

Looking at another change dimension, the rise in the number of non-traditional students enrolled in community colleges calls for the creation of specialized instructional delivery systems. Thus, the diversity of college cultures and organizations creates a demand for leaders who can fill multiple roles and adapt to a variety of circumstances. Fincher's findings regarding the persistence of elitist attitudes would suggest a problematical disconnect.

What are the training and development implications of such changes as applied to community college administration? As indicated in the foregoing section, Gibson-Beninger (1996) identified key curricular components needed to address today's community college needs. O'Rourke would similarly stress the importance of understanding multiculturalism in

today's environments and consequently the need for democratic practices, but he also adds understanding of the difference between compliance and empowerment—a concept of particular importance when applied to California's densely regulated community college environment.

Still, within the literature there is little that focuses on California's special requirements—a serious gap. As suggested earlier, this state poses unique leadership challenges for community college administrators: a dense regulatory system; collective bargaining environments; the prevalence of a strong shared governance culture; and a democratization of clientele/student populations. If Fincher is correct in his assessments of changes in administrative roles and responsibilities within institutions of higher education nationwide, then there would appear to be a mismatch in California between administrative applicants and environmental conditions. But is this a true picture? No statewide assessment of employment trends or administrative requirements has been conducted formally. Again, an analysis of necessary administrative skill competencies required specifically for California community colleges is yet to be written nor has a complete description of the profile of emerging California community college administrators emerged from the research.

Incidentally, given such critical gaps in the research on the California community college administrative demographic profile, the importance of the ACCCA *Administration 101* program is underscored. The program curriculum has emerged on the basis of field input within the state and is reflective of administrative practitioners' priorities. The "curricular prescriptions" of O'Rourke (1997), Hockaday (1988), Gibson-Beninger (1996), and others find resonance in the curricular recommendations that have emerged from the ACCCA Curriculum Advisory Committee and practitioner focus groups. For instance, the program

emphasizes an understanding of the diverse California community college cultures and institutional dynamics. In summer 2002, sessions were added specifically addressing successful models of participatory governance and best practices for promoting the retention of non-traditional students. In short, an evaluation such as this of the *Administration 101* professional development program may be useful in addressing a few of the identified gaps in the research literature.

Theoretical Assumptions and Conceptual Framework

Within the field of educational evaluation there exist diverse theoretical approaches and ways of conceptualizing these. Shufflebeam and Webster (1983) loosely define an educational evaluation study as one “that is designed and conducted to assist some audience to judge and improve the worth of some educational object (p.24).” That said, however, there are multiple alternatives for designing studies depending on the purposes, context and needs of those commissioning the study. As stated in Chapter 1, this program evaluation is conceptualized as a formative evaluation that incorporates a mixed methodology of qualitative and quantitative techniques. It has a process focus--rather than that of outcomes, impact, costs, or cost benefits. The goal is to provide the “consumers” of the study with information needed to make changes in the ways that the ACCCA *Administration 101* program is being offered.

To best understand the theoretical assumptions and design of this evaluation study, it is useful to survey the array of evaluative models and the reasons for selecting a formative evaluation approach—and further, one based on a utilization-focused premise. It is instructive to examine as well as compare and contrast selected types of evaluation models that are available. One approach to classifying types of evaluation studies is to distinguish

between politically oriented evaluations, questions-oriented evaluation and value oriented studies (Shufflebeam and Webster, 1983, p. 37).

Politically oriented studies, have been labeled “pseudo-evaluations.” Motivations for these are rooted in the clients’ needs to ensure favorable outcomes designed to guarantee funding, influence, or other such advantages. Public relations inspired studies also fall into this category as clients seek a positive image for a district or program. Needless to say, this type of study fails to meet the field’s standards for accuracy, feasibility or propriety. Still, this classification is noteworthy for suggesting attention to the purpose and ethics of a study. Certainly the planned uses and political context of an evaluation study need to be well considered in order to be sensitized to potential pressures for either validating preconceived notions or ensuring favorable outcomes. In the case of this evaluation, ACCCA will utilize the results for internal, program improvement purposes. The clients, in this case, are not dependent on “soft monies” for funding *Administration 101*. Evaluation results will not be used for either publicity or marketing purposes. Rather, the study is being conducted in order to inform program planning; results will be used by program organizers to strengthen the quality of the program and to implement “mid-term” corrections in the way it is being delivered.

Question-oriented studies are so labeled because they start with a particular question and then move to the methodology appropriate for answering the queries. The most well known example of this type of studies are the objective based studies founded in the work of Ralph Tyler, the so-called “father of educational evaluation” (Madaus, p. 8). In this conceptualization, evaluation is viewed as a comparison of intended outcomes with actual ones. The usual purpose of such studies is to determine whether stated objectives have been

achieved. Such studies are highly prevalent in educational institutions and have a great common sense appeal. In terms of methods, these typically involve collection and analysis of performance data relative to specified objectives. Educators are very familiar with the technologies of behavioral objectives and standardized testing classically used in these studies. Other types of question-oriented studies include accountability studies, experimental research studies, testing programs and management information studies. The main advantage of question oriented studies is that evidence can be provided to assess selected dimensions of a program or of its implementation. However, information is often so narrowly focused in scope as to be of little use in improving a program or providing a sound basis for judging its worth. The ACCCA Management Development Commission-- and specifically its *Administration 101* subcommittee-- is primarily interested in examining process-oriented questions. Given such goals, questions oriented models would not appear to be the most appropriate for this evaluation study.

Values-oriented studies are typically undertaken to assess and or improve the value of some object. In Shufflebeam and Webster's typology, there is a wide array of such studies: accreditation/certification, policy studies, decision oriented, consumer oriented, client centered, and connoisseur studies. In many respects, these kind of studies were developed in response to a growing realization among professional evaluators in the 1960's that classically structured objective based evaluations were not particularly helpful to program organizers nor responsive to the questions of enhancing program effectiveness. Cronbach (cited in Madaus, 1983) for example, criticized evaluation work that lacked relevance and utility and often relied on *post hoc* evidence. He urged re-thinking of evaluation as a process of gathering and reporting information that could guide program organizers.

Decision-oriented studies, a sub-type of the values-oriented category, emphasize that evaluation should be used proactively to help improve a program. Suggested questions typically include: How should a program or enterprise be planned? How should a given plan be carried out? How should a program be revised? Answers to these questions are based on underlying good standards of education. An obvious main advantage of this type of study is that it encourages educators—or, as in this case, *Administration 101* program organizers—to use evaluation continuously and systematically in their efforts to plan and implement an administrative training program.

Another sub-type identified by Shufflebeam and Webster are client-centered studies which are increasingly used today. The purpose of this kind of study is to help people in a local setting understand the operations of a program, the ways the operations are valued by the people affected by them, and the ways they are valued by people who are expert in the program area. Responsive evaluation, a form of client-centered studies, is widely used. As developed by Stake (2000), it places an emphasis on assisting people responsible for program implementation to conduct their own evaluations. Stake stresses that responsive evaluation is a type of “goal-free evaluation” that focuses not on the preordinate goals of program sponsors but on the emergent goals of program participants. Of course no evaluation is value free. The implication here is that responsive evaluation is not based on preconceived ideas about desirable outcomes and may remain open-ended even in terms of evaluation focus areas.

An educational evaluation is responsive evaluation if it orients more directly to program activities than to program intents, if it responds to audience requirements for information, and if the different value perspectives of the people at

hand are referred to in reporting the success and failure of the program. (Stake, pg.292)

Responsive evaluation methods stress naturalistic observation. Instead of using objectives as advanced organizers for evaluation, the emphasis in responsive evaluation is to pay attention to what is happening in the program and identify emergent issues. In a sense the evaluation goal may be a moving target as it responds to emergent issues not just established evaluation questions. The main weakness identified in responsive evaluations is the lack of external credibility as implementers have a great control over the evaluation study.

In contrast to the responsive evaluation model, there has emerged the comprehensive and highly structured CIPP model. Corresponding to the letters in the acronym 'CIPP,' this evaluation framework consists of context evaluation to inform planning decisions, input evaluation to serve structuring or management decisions, process evaluation to assist with implementation decisions, and product evaluation to guide recycling decisions. While both responsive evaluation and CIPP emphasize the improvement function of evaluation, it can be said that responsive evaluation is geared most directly to serve project staff whereas the CIPP model is oriented to serving the needs of those charged with planning and administering projects. It should also be noted that the responsive model is far more focused on strictly implementation issues rather than on antecedent questions of program planning and design. Finally, and perhaps most important, the responsive evaluation approach is more involved with collecting data from all persons interested in the project in order to explore questions of value and relevance, whereas the CIPP model looks more to whether assessed needs have been met. Nonetheless, both approaches are sensitive to tailoring evaluation to meet the needs

of relevant or identified audiences in a way that failed to be addressed in more traditional objective-based evaluations (Shufflebeam, 1983).

The foregoing should not be viewed an exhaustive survey of evaluation approaches. Indeed, as the field of program evaluation has developed, many other variations on the above named themes have emerged. This study may best be classified as a formative evaluation in which an external evaluator collects and reports data and judgments to assist the development of a program. Note that in contrast to the responsive evaluation model, the work is done not by a program participant but by an external evaluator. Given the goals established by *Administration 101* program organizers, this model appears to best respond to the evaluation needs of the client. The CIPP model best addresses institutional needs and is strongly systems-oriented whereas the Formative-Summative approach, derived from the work of Michael Scriven, is more appropriate for an individual study such as this. Scriven (2000) calls for an independent evaluator to collect and report data and judgments to assist the development of an object. As described in Chapter 1, a formative evaluation is designed to “collect information that can be used primarily for on-going program development and improvement” (Patton, 1980, p.71). Formative evaluations focus on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a program and typically involve collecting internal information and processing critical appraisals made by participants and other concerned stakeholders.

Patton (1997) describes typical formative evaluation questions as follows:

1. What are the program’s key characteristics as perceived by various stakeholders such as participants and staff?
2. What are the characteristics of program participants and how do these compare to what was expected?

3. What's working as expected? What challenges and barriers have emerged?
4. What do participants like and dislike? What are their perceptions of what's working and not working?
5. What has changed from the original design and why? On what basis are adaptations from the original design being made?
6. What monitoring system has been established to assess implementation on an on-going basis and how is it being used?

Given the goals of this study, responses to these kinds of questions are precisely the information that is needed by *Administration 101* program organizers. The study research questions have been structured to address in-process questions related to content and delivery formats. Answers to these questions are based in great part on participant and presenter perceptions and therefore provide data as to consumer levels of satisfaction with the program and providers' insights into program challenges.

Patton (1990) notes that formative evaluation approaches are particularly appropriate for developing innovative programs where the focus is on program improvement, facilitating more effective implementation, or exploring effects of participants. Such an approach can be especially important early in the life of a program or at key points of transition.

At the end of its second year, the ACCCA *Administration 101* program is at a critical point in its development. If the program is to persist as an on-going ACCCA activity, it is important to refine the program content and delivery in order to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of the field. In short, as ACCCA "institutionalizes" this program, it is necessary to evaluate what is working and to build upon the originally conceived program model to maintain and enhance currency.

Finally, as referenced in the opening section's description of this study, a utilization focus has been an overarching consideration in this work. Utilization-focused evaluation is not a type, model, method or even theory of evaluation. Rather it is a kind of "mind set" or commitment that the evaluation be useful to the actual intended users—in this case, the *Administration 101* organizers who comprise the program subcommittee and the members of the ACCCA Management Development Commission.

Above all, a utilization focus means that an evaluation is based on the collaboration of intended primary users in order to ensure that the products will be of actual use. Conducting an effective utilization-focused evaluation requires not only identifying the primary stakeholders but narrowing the list from the general to the specific in order to determine intended uses for the evaluation. As such, the process is by definition highly personal and situational, as in this case. The purposes of evaluation must be carefully negotiated to help determine the type of evaluation needed. In no way, however, does the concern about utility obviate the need to attend to questions of accuracy, feasibility, and propriety as defined by the Joint Committee on Standards in 1994 (cited in Patton, 1996). A formative evaluation study, as in this instance, must still be conducted in a systematic fashion using data-based inquiries.

These considerations have shaped how this study has been conducted. There exist many possible stakeholders for this study, including potential community college administrative participants and other higher educational providers. However, the primary stakeholders consist of the immediate *Administration 101* organizers and members of the ACCCA Management Development Commission who are charged with program oversight. Included in this group are selected ACCCA staff members. These individuals indeed comprise the group of primary users of this study. It is their responsibility—as determined by the

ACCCA Board-- to continue to implement the program and to build upon it. The ACCCA Board itself is also identified as a key stakeholder—albeit a bit more removed from the preoccupations of program implementation.

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide feedback as to the value and usefulness of the curriculum content from the point of view of program presenters (the experts and providers) and program participants (consumers) and to provide information as to the appropriateness and effectiveness of delivery formats. It was anticipated—and indeed borne out—that not only data on these questions would be provided but that emergent program issues would also be identified. These expectations are wholly in keeping with the assumptions and theories that drive formative evaluation studies.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

Specifically, the research project was designed as a formative evaluation of the California community college administrative development program entitled *Administration 101* offered through the state's primary professional association, the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA).

This study attempted to identify which aspects of the *Administration 101* content proved useful and which elements of the delivery formats proved effective.

The research questions include:

1. Based on participant and presenter responses, how does the program content meet the goals of *Administration 101*?
 - In what ways do these two groups perceive the usefulness of the concepts presented in *Administration 101* (content)?
 - Are there other topics that should be incorporated in future sessions?
 - Are there curriculum elements that should be expanded, deleted, or modified?
2. What are participant and presenter reactions to the format and delivery of *Administration 101*?

- Are there ways in which delivery strategies could be changed to facilitate participant learning?

Methods

This study made use of both “hard” and “soft” data. As noted by Patton (1997), the issue is never hard versus soft but relevant and appropriate. In this case, the research questions were designed in order to assist program organizers in making future decisions about the *Administration 101* program curriculum and delivery formats. Two key data sources (evaluation questionnaires and presenter orientations) were already in place. It was essential to utilize these untapped sources of information as these were perceived to be highly valid by program organizers and staff. Two additional evaluative methods (focus group discussions and participant surveying) were included to provide supplemental data points. Focus groups provided immediate feedback from program participants as they experienced the program while participant surveying conducted six months after the program allowed for a retroactive evaluation as to program usefulness by participants. In this way, the overall research design aimed at utilizing distinct sources of information in order to answer the research questions. The figure on the following page provides a graphic representation of research methods, data collection strategies, and data analysis.

Figure 1. Research Design

<p>Purpose of the Study Conduct a formative evaluation of ACCCA's <i>Administration 101</i> Professional Development Program</p>	<p>Population Summer 2001 Participants 65 Summer 2002 Participants 64 Program Presenters Returning 15 2002 Presenters</p>	<p>Research Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on participant and presenter responses, how does the program content meet the goals of <i>Administration 101</i>? 2. What are participant and presenter reactions to the format and delivery of <i>Administration 101</i>?
<p>Methodology</p>	<p>Mixed Methodology: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches</p>	<p>Data Collection Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evaluation questionnaires completed by all participants in both the summer 2001 and 2002 <i>Administration 101</i> sessions ➤ Participant focus group input from summer 2002 program participants ➤ Follow-up surveys administered to summer 2002 participants designed to assess, in retrospect, the benefit and usefulness of the <i>Administration 101</i> curriculum elements and experience ➤ Presenters input derived from telephone interviews conducted in summer 2002
<p>Data Analysis</p>	<p>Triangulate data results of diverse methods to answer research questions</p>	<p>Data Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Statistical summaries of participant ratings for all program sessions ➤ Content analysis of evaluations to identify themes related to research questions ➤ Summary and content analysis of focus group input ➤ Synthesis and content analysis of presenter input

Sampling Strategy

By definition, utilization-focused evaluation, which may include the type of formative evaluation conducted here, requires moving from the general and abstract—that is, possible audiences and potential users—to the real and specific—actual primary intended users. Patton (1997) stresses that in any evaluation, there are many potential stakeholders and a wide range of possible applications. The stated purpose of this evaluation is to provide program organizers with key information relative to the usefulness of the content and effectiveness of the delivery formats in order to improve the program. Thus, this study focuses on the participant/presenter population, such as it is. Given the evaluation goals, it is their perspectives that can best provide the data required to make useful decisions about how best to improve the program and make mid-point corrections to meet the needs of actual users.

This study made use of written evaluations completed by all of the participants of the summer 2001 and 2002 institutes. Again, 65 participants attended the 2001 session and 64 attended the 2002 institute.

All presenters from the first session were contacted to provide input regarding their impressions of what worked and what did not from their point of view of the first session in summer 2001. Phone interviews were conducted with returning presenters to the summer 2002 session to further identify aspects of content and delivery that could have been improved.

Participant selection for focus group sessions scheduled during the summer 2002 program was a critical consideration for this study. In contrast to random sampling methods used for quantitative research, qualitative methods make use of purposefully

selected cases. One sampling strategy particularly appropriate to this study is *maximum variation sampling* (Patton, 1990). This method cuts across a range of variation and searches for common patterns. Applied to this study, interviewees were selected on the basis of diverse professional roles and levels. Thus, the group sampled included upper, middle and entry level managers/administrators, and individuals drawn from diverse units, such as Student Services, Instruction, and Human Resources. Participants were selected from both single and multi-college districts, and were drawn from urban, rural and suburban institutions. While stratification criteria, such as ethnicity, gender, and educational attainment are frequently identified as significant in this type of study, given the specific focus on matters of program content and delivery and the type of research questions posed, such factors appeared secondary. By design, male and female respondents as well as ethnically diverse *Administration 101* participants were identified for interview. Sampling on the basis of positions, roles of the respondents, and level of experience appeared to offer the best avenue for insuring a diversity of perspective.

Data Collection

Central to qualitative research is the concept of using multiple data collection methods to contribute to the trustworthiness of the study. The practice of employing multiple methods to enhance validity is termed triangulation. This study makes use of diverse techniques, principally participant surveying by means of questionnaires administered at the end of the program sessions, selected participant interviewing, and follow-up participant surveying. Through these methods, appropriate data relevant to the research questions was identified. Each of these approaches provides distinct and complementary advantages. Analysis of the written evaluations completed by the 129

total participants of *Administration 101* and the follow-up surveys that were designed as part of this evaluation project provide breadth of feedback and data for comparative assessment. Selected participant interviewing, on the other hand, offers depth and specificity of feedback and contributes to the richness of description and analysis.

Evaluation questionnaires

Questionnaires were used and collected for each institute topic during both the summer 2001 and 2002 sessions. Participants were asked to rate each of the session presentations for content, presentation format, usefulness, and overall quality. Respondents checked options of “needs improvement,” “average,” or “excellent” for each measure. Additionally, respondents were given the opportunity to write comments in an open-ended way for each session.

Sample: Evaluation Rating Form

Measure	Needs Improvement	Average	Excellent
Content			
Presentation			
Usefulness			
Overall			

The final program evaluation form completed by participants at the conclusion of the program consisted of a number of open-ended questions. In general, the questions dealt with overall impressions of the program—favorable and unfavorable—and solicited suggestions for improvement.

Content analysis of comments was conducted to identify common themes. Since the purpose of this evaluation is to respond to questions related to the usefulness of concepts, suggestion for new topics, and input regarding how curriculum topics should be

expanded, deleted or modified, as well as how delivery formats could be improved, these questions formed the criteria for highlighting information. Comments related to perceptions about the quality of individual presenters were not a main emphasis, although clearly such views had an impact on how the content was perceived. Program organizers did use such data to determine which presenters were considered effective by participants and as one factor in determining who would be invited to return. Still, the purpose of this study is to evaluate feedback relative to program content and delivery formats.

It should be noted as described in previous sections that ACCCA staff and volunteers had developed the instrument. Rating summaries for each presentation and comments were compiled and transcribed by staff. Questionnaires were kept confidential; summaries and comments were transcribed and shared with presenters.

Focus Group Interviews—Summer, 2002

Another major research method used in this study was the use of small group interviews during the summer, 2002 program session. To provide immediate feedback regarding program content and delivery formats, small focus groups were formed. The activity was described during the program orientation conducted at the beginning of the session by Program Facilitator and this evaluator herself. Individuals were then invited to participate in 45-60 minute discussions to be conducted at various times during the institute (some at the end of the day and others at noon or before the day's session began). Sign up sheets were circulated to solicit participant volunteers.

Once the focus group participant/volunteers were identified, four small groups were organized, comprised of 6-8 persons each. There were representatives from diverse institutions (urban/ suburban/rural; single and multi-college districts; large/small

colleges), and each group incorporated a diverse set of administrative roles. Each group included a minimum of one representative from Instruction and Student Services and was balanced by the inclusion of representatives from Research, Finance, Human Resources, and typically one of the related areas, such as CalWORKS Manager, Information System Administrator or Director, Faculty Coordinator, etc. Additionally, ethnic diversity and years of administrative experience were factors taken into account in mixing groups as much as possible. The formation of these groups was accomplished by using the information provided by participants themselves as part of the "Participant Profile" that included name, education, previous and current employment, professional interests and expertise, and personal interests/expertise. (Profile of each group is included in the appendix).

At each of the four focus group sessions, the following questions were posed:

- In your estimation, what are the specific strengths and weaknesses of today's topic presentations?
- What are your overall impressions of the usefulness of content and materials (transferability to current assignment)?
- What delivery formats did you prefer (example: power point, guided discussion, case studies, collaborative work groups, etc.)? Why or why not?
- For future *Administration 101* programs, do you have any suggestions to add new topics or delete and topics that have been presented?

Since the questions were open-ended, it was anticipated that discussions would branch out to issues of individual presenters and other issues. Thus discussions as they actually occurred were replete with follow-up questions used to clarify and elaborate participant

points of view on many aspects of the sessions—not just the questions posed above. For instance, participants frequently de-briefed on the quality of specific presenters or the meeting room venues. By the very structure of focus group scheduling, it was inevitable that the impressions were cumulative, and the later groups commented more extensively than the first two groups and had more material and experiences to draw upon. At the start of each focus group session, a brief description of this evaluation project was given, and respondents signed consent forms.

As a result of this evaluation activity, it was possible to make in process program corrections. For instance, on the occasion when participants indicated a need for more documentation regarding a topic, presenters were informed and were able to subsequently send additional materials (specifically, handouts based on power point presentations or technical topic information). The greatest value of this activity, however, was in providing program planners with immediate feedback—while it was fresh and immediate for attendees--on program effectiveness for purposes of subsequent program improvement.

Follow-up Surveys—2002 Cohort

Follow-up surveys were sent to all members of the second cohort to query them on the value and usefulness of *Administration 101*. Three questions were included:

1. Please list up to five topics that you found to be of most use in your position as a community college administrative staff member. A one-page program schedule and presenters' list was appended to be used as a reference by respondents.

2. Do you actively employ any of the strategies or use specific materials presented in the *Administration 101* program? If yes, describe use; if no, why not?
3. Do you have any suggestions for new topics for *Administration 101* that you think would be of benefit to community college administrators?

Posing these questions gave participants an opportunity to assess in retrospect the impact of the *Administration 101* experience and to suggest new program topics. These follow-up questionnaires were designed to be brief and open-ended and were administered electronically.

Interviews with Presenters-Summer 2002

To derive a clear picture of program effectiveness, it was recognized that the perceptions and experiences of program presenters offered a different and important dimension. This group was queried in general about their impressions of the *Administration 101* experience. The program was focused on providing a survey of essential “nuts and bolts” information about California community college governance and regulation and on presenting exemplary practices related to different aspects of community college administration (e.g. budgeting, technology planning, etc.). In light of these program objectives, presenters were asked the following structured, open-ended questions:

- In preparing your presentations, what worked or did not work for you in terms of the topic assignment?
- What challenges did you encounter in presenting the topic to the program participants?

- Do you have any suggestions for future program orientations that would be of assistance in preparing for *Administration 101*?
- Do you have any recommendations in general to strengthen *Administration 101* in the future (Example: deletion of topics, new presentation activities, referrals of other presenters, etc.?).

Follow-up questions were used throughout the interviews simply to have presenters clarify or elaborate upon their answers. The purpose of the phone interviews was not only to query presenters but to provide support and orientation to them about the upcoming summer 2002 program and review program goals and objectives as well as give them information about the participant learning needs.

The method that was used to orient presenters and elicit responses to the points of inquiry was phone interviewing. Fifteen (15) presenters who comprised the entire faculty group scheduled for 2002 received phone orientations/interviews. It should be noted that one of the program faculty members, who was scheduled to present the topic on Technology Planning, was unable at the last minute to participate in the program and was replaced by an alternate presenter. Nonetheless, his interview has been included in the data as he had attended the year before and had fully planned and prepared his topic as well as accompanying materials in 2002.

Initially, the plan had been to develop focus groups of presenters, but this activity was eliminated by program organizers in spring of 2002 due to the fact that most of the presenters were returning to the program and did not require a full day of program orientation. Instead, during March and April of 2002, program organizers and this researcher conducted individual orientations/interviews by phone of all presenters. As

background for the study, ACCCA planning documents for the program were also studied as well as the actual program curriculum. Presenters' "syllabi" and handout materials were examined to understand curriculum (content) and instructional activities (delivery). Presenter profiles were also reviewed for background information on each presenter.

Data Analysis

The first goal of formative evaluation is to provide descriptive data of "what is" not "what should be." In evaluating *Administration 101*, attempts were made to understand the multiple relationships among data sources. As Patton notes, "An inductive approach to evaluation research means that an understanding of program activities and outcomes emerges from experiences with the program. Theories about what is happening in a program are grounded in the program experience" (1980, p. 41).

This study made use of both quantitative and qualitative data, and each of these required different treatment. As suggested by Patton (1997), quantitative methods strive for precision by focusing on items that can be counted. Quantitative data facilitates comparison because all program participants respond to the same questions and standardized scales within pre-determined categories. Qualitative data on the other hand offers detailed, rich description that requires a different analytical treatment that calls for a degree of judgment and is, by its nature, relatively more uncertain. Despite the differences, Patton (1997) stresses that the Standards on Analysis of Quantitative and Qualitative Information as established by the Joint Committee on Program Evaluation in 1994 uses identical wording for both:

[Quantitative and qualitative] information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed so that evaluation questions are effectively answered (p. 277).

In this study, analysis of the quantitative data derived from Evaluation Questionnaires for session I and II (summer 2001 and 2002) is based on simple statistical summaries (e.g. percentages and response rates) for each topic of each session. Patton makes the point that evaluation must be accessible to key stakeholders—in this case, the ACCCA Board and Management Development Commission. He stresses that findings need to be presented in a simple and straightforward fashion, avoiding unnecessary statistical information that may appear overly abstract (Patton, 1997). Simple does not imply simplemindedness, however. The summaries of results of session I and II questionnaires provide a picture of what content elements and which presentation formats proved most effective from the point of view of participants (consumers).

For other data collection activities—including focus group sessions with 2002 participants, follow-up survey results collected from the 2002 participant cohort, and phone interviews with presenters—qualitative data analysis approaches were used. Data analysis involved organizing what was heard and read in order to make sense of the experiences of participants and presenters. Analysis depended on a coding, categorizing and theme searching process. The open nature of the qualitative data (interviews, written comments, focus group

discussions) required sorting and selecting responses. In all cases, the lead organizers for the process consisted of the research questions themselves.

Interview and focus group material as well as written comments underwent content analysis that required identifying themes and patterns that gave sense to the data.. Coding consisted of putting like pieces together in “data clumps,” as described by Glesne (1999, p. 134). Frequency counts of recurring ideas or types of responses were used extensively to synthesize the data and identify key themes. It should be stressed that themes emphasized through analysis responded to the kinds of questions posed by the primary users of the evaluation—a practice that is encouraged by evaluators such as Patton and Rubin (1995). However, this organizing filter was not used exclusively, and on the occasion when other unexpected themes emerged, these were described also. One example of this is the theme that emerged from participants’ responses regarding one of the strengths of *Administration 101*. A number of respondents identified the UCLA university venue as a strength. This theme did not respond to the questions dealing with content or delivery, but the frequency of it merited mention. The following summarizes the analysis used for each evaluation activity:

1. *Focus group session of 2002 participants.*

Utilizing content analysis, responses to each of the four questions were examined for common themes, and these have been presented in both narrative and table form.

2. *Follow-up survey results collected from the 2002 participant cohort as to the usefulness of program content.*

As described earlier, surveys were designed to be brief and open-ended. Thus, data analysis consisted of identifying themes—where such existed—and presenting descriptive information of program strengths and weakness as viewed by program “consumers.”

3. Interviews with presenters.

Results of interviews with presenters were assessed using content analysis to identify themes.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to identify which aspects of the *Administration 101* content proved useful and which elements of the delivery formats proved effective. The research questions also sought to identify what aspects of the content and delivery should be modified or deleted and what new topics should be incorporated in future sessions of the program. Questions included: 1) Utilizing participant and presenter responses, how does the program content meet the goals of *Administration 101*? 2) What are the participant and presenter reactions to the format?

As noted in the previous chapter on research methods, this study can be characterized as a formative evaluation. Nonetheless, the overarching questions-- #1 and #2—reflect on-going evaluation concerns and could ultimately be used to address summative questions of overall program effectiveness and value.

This chapter presents the results of the study, and includes: 1) a description of the population; 2) data handling methods; and 3) the outcomes and results of the evaluation activities including analysis of the data gathering questionnaires completed by all participants in both the summer 2001 and 2002 sessions, participant focus group input from the summer 2002 session, follow-up surveys administered to the summer 2002 cohort, and presenter interviews. The results and analysis for each evaluation strategy is

presented separately and incorporate: 1) a brief description of the activity, 2) results, including response rates, and 3) a brief discussion and analysis of the data.

Population

The population of this study consisted of the participants (consumers) and 2002 presenters (providers) of *Administration 101*. It should be noted that presenters, for the most part, were comprised of experts who were returning for a second time to the program. Approximately 65 participants attended the 2001 session and 64 individuals attended the 2002 session. In terms of a profile, *Administration 101* participants could be described as a cross section of California community college administrators in general. Participants were drawn from a diversity of community colleges and districts--single and multi-campus districts as well as urban and rural institutions. The first cohort was drawn from the full range of community college administrative personnel, including a few faculty, program directors, instructional and student service administrators at all levels (chairs, deans and vice presidents), human resource and information system administrators, business officers of all types (including a Chief Financial Officer), a Trustee and a Chief Executive Officer (President/Superintendent). In terms of demographics, the group included 33 males and 32 females and was composed of representatives drawn from every major ethnic group within the system. Although ethnicity data were not specifically collected either in the application or as part of the participant profile information, it was evident, based on attendance and interactive group discussions, that the following ethnic groups were represented: African Americans, Latinos (including Mexican American, Central American, Cuban and Puerto Rican), Native Americans, Asian Americans (Japanese, Chinese and Pilipino), and Pacific

Islanders. The single largest group could be categorized as white. Overall, the *Administration 101* population reflects, on its face, the composition of California Community College administrators statewide, although percentages by ethnicity were not calculated. Of special note is that the first *Administration 101* cohort ranged widely in terms of years of experience. The range included individuals in their first year of administrative work to individuals with decades of experience within the system and at senior levels of community college organizations. There were a few instances of individuals who were only contemplating entry into administration from faculty ranks and had selected *Administration 101* with the intent of exploring the career move.

The second session cohort was made up of 28 males and 36 females. As in the case of the first cohort, participants were drawn from every type of college (large and small; rural, urban and suburban; single college districts and multi-college districts). In addition, a wide range of administrative positions was represented: Human Resources (2); Instruction (28); Finance and Business Services (5); Student Development Services (14); Research and Planning (3); and other related administrative positions, such as special or grant program administrators (12). The group included multiple levels of administrative positions: 28 individuals held titles of Dean or above, with several Assistant Superintendents and Vice Presidents of Student Services and Instruction represented. Of significance is the fact that 17 participants had more than ten years experience in community college administration. In terms of ethnicity, the second cohort was very similar to the first.

The general description of the *Administration 101* participant population is at some variance with what program organizers anticipated. The ACCCA Board fully

anticipated drawing from a wide diversity of institutions and from a broad range of professional positions and levels. However, there also existed a vague expectation that the program would attract primarily “new California community college administrators.” An examination of program participants indicates that this expectation was not fulfilled, and one of the secondary benefits of this evaluation may be to more fully describe the actual audience and program population for purposes of program development and marketing.

The 2002 program faculty was comprised of 15 individuals. As noted earlier, the program faculty was made up of recognized experts in their fields and of heads of key community college agencies and associations. Eight were returning presenters from the 2001 session.

Data Handling

The various evaluation components called for distinct forms of data handling:

1. *Evaluation questionnaires from Session I and II*

Questionnaires were collected and compiled. It has been the practice of ACCCA planners to share prepared summaries of specific presentation results and comments with the presenters themselves. Beyond this, however, questionnaire results were kept confidential and were analyzed and compiled by the researcher in collaboration with members of the planning sub-committee of the ACCCA Management Development Commission.

2. *Reactions from summer 2002 participants.*

Comments and key points made through focus group discussions held during the summer 2002 session were recorded, summarized and made available to participant groups for comment and/or corrections. Summaries were made immediately available to program organizers.

3. *Follow-up surveys collected from the 2002 participant cohort.*

Survey responses were kept confidential. Only a summary of participant responses will be shared with program planners and members of the ACCCA Management Development Commission. Specific illustrative comments were quoted within the evaluation without attribution. Original copies of participant responses will ultimately be forwarded to the ACCCA organization central offices.

4. *Presenter feedback via interviews.*

Phone interviews were conducted individually. Notes of phone interviews were drafted and were made available to presenters for comment and/or corrections, although none of them, in fact, asked for a copy of these.

Results of Evaluation Strategies

Evaluation Questionnaires

Results are presented by topic. In many cases, it is possible to compare the ratings and response themes from summer 2001 and 2002 participants, although this evaluation is not primarily about comparing cohort experiences. The program and curriculum were the same for the most part for each session, and where there were differences, the distinct or unique sessions were evaluated separately. Still, in instances where comparisons

appeared to shed light on questions of content and delivery, these are presented. (See below for comparison of 2001 and 2002 programs.)

Program Schedule	
2001	2002
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Community College Governance CCLC Representative Representative, CCC Board of Governors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Community College Governance CCLC Representative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of the Board of Trustees in College Governance Representative #2, CCLC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same Representative, CCLC (same as for Governance topic)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful Models of Participative Governance CEO, Large urban college
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financing Higher Education Associate Chancellor, Large urban College District 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and Student Services: Case Studies Executive CIO/VPSS, Large Suburban College CIO, Large urban College President, Medium size suburban college CIO, Large urban college President, Large urban college 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same Number of panelists reduced to three Same VPSS, Large suburban college
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Vice President Administrative Services, Large urban college Executive VP, Business and Administrative Services, medium sized suburban college 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same Same Vice Chancellor, Business and Fiscal Services, Large urban college district
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology Director, Educational Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology Services, Large urban district

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research/Strategic Planning
Executive Director Research and Planning,
Large urban district
Director of Planning, Large urban college | None |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Dynamics
Chancellor, Large urban district | Same
Same |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Resources: Problem Solving Scenarios
Vice Chancellor Human Resources,
Large suburban district.
Vice Chancellor Human Resources,
Large urban district
Vice President Human Resources
Large urban district
Vice Chancellor Human
Resources, Large suburban district | Same
Same

Vice President Human Resources,
Large urban district |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | Accreditation
Representative,
Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Community and Balancing Your
Life and Leadership Lessons from the Garden
President , Large suburban college | Student Services and Retention
Vice Provost,
Undergraduate Affairs, East Coast
University |

A wide range of response rates exist by topic. The reasons for this difference vary.

Since each session was evaluated separately at its conclusion, not all participants turned in evaluations for every session. Program staff and organizers observed various behaviors to account for this: participants left the meeting room immediately in order to go to meals or breaks; some congregated to socialize with peers, despite facilitators' efforts to keep participants from leaving before they completed the forms; and it may have been possible that some participants may simply have experienced "evaluation fatigue." Another significant factor in accounting for response rate fluctuations is that not all respondents rated each measure of "content," "presentation format," "usefulness," and "overall

rating.” In terms of overall program attrition, there were only a very few individuals that left prior to the end of the institute (only one or two in 2001 and two in 2002) due to personal emergencies.

The following analyses are focused on the evaluation of 13 distinct topics/presentations that comprise the *Administration 101* program; the 14th section summarizes and discusses the overall program evaluation information as gathered on the final evaluation instrument distributed to participants at the conclusion of the program. Particular emphasis is placed on analyzing the measure of “usefulness” for each topic session as this constituted the overarching element in evaluating the presentation; it reflects participants’ perceptions about the long term impact of each session. In a sense, it could be seen as a comment on the “summative” value of the presentations.

While desirable, it is not possible to aggregate the sessions; each session addressed a different topic, and each utilized a distinct delivery format. Most important, diverse individuals served as presenters for each session, and this fact had a major effect on evaluation results. A major purpose of the analysis is to provide information for ultimately determining the efficacy of the topic selection and delivery formats.

Session 1. California Community College Governance

Table 1

Topic: California Community College Governance

Measure	Summer 2001			
	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	N
Content	3	27	70	33
Presentation	19	44	36	36
Usefulness	3	38	59	34
Overall	3	47	50	34

Measure	Summer 2002		Excellent %	N
	Needs Improvement %	Average %		
Content	0	19	81	48
Presentation	2	25	73	48
Usefulness	6	21	72	47
Overall	6	19	74	47

There was a 55.4% response rate from the 2001 cohort and a 75% response rate

from the 2002 cohort on the topic of California Community College Governance. In terms of the usefulness of the topic, 59% of the 2001 respondents and 72% of the 2002 respondents assigned this topic the highest or "excellent" rating. Similarly, in ranking the overall quality of the session, 50% of the 2001 respondents and 74% of those in the 2002 cohort assigned the highest rating. One possible factor for this discrepancy between cohort I and II is the change made in presenters between the two program sessions. During summer 2001, two presenters of highly contrasting skills were scheduled while only one, the Executive Director of a recognized community college professional association, returned in 2002.

Excluding comments related to presenters, overall feedback related to the usefulness of the topic and suggestions for improving the delivery of the material is very similar from both groups. From the summer 2001 respondent group, 75% or 27 individuals offered written comments, while 58% or 28 respondents wrote comments in 2002.

Related to questions of curriculum/content, one major theme emerged: information about the historical development of community college governance, the California community college mission, legislation leading up to the watershed AB 1725 Law, and the role of the Board of Governors is highly appropriate and useful—

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are
unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript
was scanned as received.

75-76

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

format. Two representative comments made by participants in 2001 and 2002 articulate this theme:

- [She] was an effective presenter—and the overview is helpful. But since so few in the audience are CEO's who would literally interact with the Board, perhaps the overview could've been shortened to allow more time for case studies and questions. It may have helped to pose some scenarios that would clarify how to [manage board relations]. (2001 respondent)
- The material does not appear to have much relevance, and the presenter does not seem to have been in the "trenches." There needs to be more practical application of the material to make it relevant to participants. Three hours of lecture about legislation and governance in a freezing cold room definitely requires coffee. (2002 respondent)

The last comment was made in addition to very positive comments about the expertise and quality of the presenter by the same respondent. Additionally, others noted: "Excellent speaker/presenter" (2002 respondent); and "Gives some great insights as to how local boards fit into district policies" (2002 respondent.)

It is noteworthy that, presenters aside, respondents from both sessions commented on the need to incorporate more application oriented approaches as well as more opportunities for small group interaction. While almost unanimously appreciative of different presenters' expertise, participants nonetheless differentiated between the high value of the topic and information about it and the need for a more stimulating delivery. Failure to provide for more diversity in delivery leads to participant alienation as reflected in the following representative comment:

I do not yet know how I will use much of this. The presentation may have encouraged my participation in local areas, but in the end it made me feel like a useless cog in a machine that is pre-programmed. (2002 respondent)

While it is evident from the presenter's curriculum outline and materials that the goal was to provide relevant information, this comment makes clear that it is vital to clarify the presentation objectives for participants.

Session 3: Successful Models of Participatory Governance

Table 3

Topic: Successful Models of Participatory Governance (2002 Program topic only)

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002 Average	Excellent	N
		%	%	
Content	0	9	91	46
Presentation	2	4	93	46
Usefulness	0	9	91	44
Overall	0	11	89	45

One programmatic change made between the 2001 and 2002 programs was the addition of a session on participatory governance—partially in response to suggestions from the first cohort to explore this topic in greater depth. In 2002 there was a 71.8% response rate; 91% of respondents assigned the highest or “excellent” rating to the measure of “usefulness.” Comments likewise were nearly uniformly positive on both the value of the topic and the excellence of the presenter: A few examples from 2002 respondents:

- Absolutely superb presentation: packed with useful information—very inspirational presenter. Engrossing.

- Excellent information on a person's role as an administrator—motivated administrators to consider a higher role in the system.
- Very good overview of identifying your campus environment and culture as a way to help guide your decision making.

In 2002, 70% of respondents wrote comments about the session, indicating a high level of involvement with the subject. One evident thread in the many comments was an appreciation for the concrete applications of the topic made by the presenter. There was no question that participants recognized the implications of the presentation and the need for supporting effective participative governance models on their campuses. If anything, participants called for even more “actual models.”

Session 4: Financing Higher Education

Table 4

Topic: Financing Higher Education

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2001	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	0	20	80	40
Presentation	0	37	63	41
Usefulness	0	27	73	41
Overall	0	30	70	37

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	0	27	73	41
Presentation	33	44	23	43
Usefulness	5	28	67	43
Overall	5	46	49	39

There was a 63% response rate from the 2001 cohort and a 67% response rate from the 2002 cohort on the topic of Financing Higher Education. In terms of the

usefulness of the topic, 73% of the 2001 respondents and 67% of the 2002 respondents assigned this topic the highest or “excellent” rating. The presenter was the same for both the 2001 and 2002 program sessions. Participants from both sessions expressed concerns about the presentation format but were overwhelmingly positive about the expertise of the presenter and the quality of the information. Illustrative comments included:

- This is excellent, vital information. (2001 participant)
- [J’s] content was crucial in trying to group the Byzantine economic process.
Low-key approach helped the high level content.(2001 participant)
- Comprehensive coverage. He had lots of good experience to share! (2002 participant)
- Good. This is a very important topic. It should be given more time to understand jargon and complexity. (2002 participant)

In spite of strong ratings for the presenter, however, there exists a discrepancy in the themes that emerged from both cohorts’ commentary despite the fact that the presenter remained the same. In 2001, 73.1% of respondents offered written comments and in 2002, 76.5% of respondents added comments. The 2001 respondents not only valued the material but appeared to be “in tune” with the presenter. By and large, in the cases when 2001 respondents made suggestions, it was for “more” and “deeper” treatment of the material. Representative comments included:

- Excellent presenter. Should have gone a bit deeper on (sic) subject matter.
(2001 participant)

- A critically important area—FTE, FTES, WSCH, State 320 Report. Need more time spent in this area with clear handouts to help class understand concepts and how they are used (2001 participant)

In contrast, many 2002 participants expressed a level of frustration in following the organization and complexity of the presentation. Note representative examples of comments:

- Good presenter but assumed a level of knowledge that many participants did not have. (2002 participant)
- Good topic but confusing. Suggest he give us a glossary in unit/revenue. I did not get any idea of how financing is structured. For this topic, assume group knows nothing. (2002 participant)
- I did not have the background information to follow presentation. Might be good to have this presenter follow [the session on budget]. (2002 participant)

One possible explanation for the difference in cohort perceptions may lie in the make-up of the cohorts themselves. It is clear that the 2002 group included a greater number of entry and mid-level managers and that there appeared to be a wider range in terms of the years of experience in administrative positions as compared to the 2001 cohort. The focus group discussion conducted in 2002 provided insights and suggestions on the need to tailor information to the level of participants (and this data is presented in the section on focus groups). The last comment noted above hints at the need to re-think the format and sequencing of the topic—and it was not a unique comment.

Session 5: Instruction and Student Services

Table 5

Topic: Instruction and Student Services: Case Studies

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2001	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	2	34	63	41
Presentation	5	20	76	41
Usefulness	3	26	71	38
Overall	3	22	75	36

College-wide President/CEO Presenter-Case Study

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	2	13	85	47
Presentation	2	28	70	47
Usefulness	2	11	87	47
Overall	2	20	78	49

Instruction-CIO Presenter-Case Study

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	N
Content	9	42	49	45
Presentation	9	49	42	45
Usefulness	9	38	53	45
Overall	7	46	47	45

Student Services-CSSO Presenter-Case Study

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	N
Content	7	27	66	44
Presentation	7	39	54	44
Usefulness	5	37	58	45
Overall	4	40	56	45

There was a 58% response rate from the 2001 cohort and a 76.5% response rate from the 2002 cohort on the presentation dealing with the topic of Instruction and Student

Services. In terms of the usefulness of the topic, 71% of the 2001 respondents and 66% of the 2002 respondents assigned the topic the highest or “excellent” rating. In 2002, as can be seen in Table 5, separate evaluation forms were collected for each different presenter/component of the topic session (e.g CEO, CIO and CSSO perspectives). It should be noted that an interactive, case study approach was used for both sessions and that the presenters were mostly the same for both sessions with one difference: a panel of five presenters addressed the topic in 2001 while three panelists presented the topic in 2002. The two panelists for the Instruction portion were returning presenters from 2001, while the student service representative was new in 2002.

The interactive format used for this presentation proved to be a “crowd pleaser” for both groups as evidenced by comments:

- Terrific! This was an effective blend of lessons learned from experts; interactive opportunity to explore our problem solving skills and follow-up/review of group work to see the big picture, glean and take home ideas and identify areas that need further work. The speakers opening comments offered a great balanced perspective... (2001 participant)
- Need more hands-on such as this. This was very helpful and informative! Keep this type of session going! (2001 participant)
- Greatly enjoyed the interactivity; immense learning from colleagues. (2002 participant)
- The presenters were accomplished and wonderful. The format was great. (2002 participant)

The interactive format was appreciated by both groups as reflected in the fact that 81.6% of 2001 participants rated the presentation format “excellent.” In 2002, program participants rated each presenter separately, and the ratings varied from a high of 70.2% “excellent” to 42.2% “excellent” ratings.

Notwithstanding differences in panelists, however, similar concerns were raised about the delivery strategies by both cohorts—albeit with different levels of intensity. The issue centered on the use of case studies. While the case study method was appreciated, participants from both groups commented on the need for more context and background for the proposed scenarios. Once again, the 2001 cohort appeared to be more at ease with the complexity of the subjects and more able to absorb voluminous information. The following are representative comments from both groups:

- I wanted more context and nuts and bolts. I did not know enough to effectively participate in the scenarios. The case study of [a specific large urban college] was excellent. (2001 participant)
- The case studies were excellent. For administrators who are not in instruction and student services, it would be more helpful if the regulations were presented in the first part of the presentation. (2001 participant)
- While the small group discussions were helpful, I would have liked resource material. A list and brief description of the categorical programs and a copy of the program approval handbook would have been useful. (2002 participant)

Both groups also expressed a degree of frustration with the time allotted to this topic. One 2001 participant expressed a common concern:

- Need MORE time—content is too much to cover in ½ day when 85% of college functions fall into these units.

One modification made between the 2001 and 2002 sessions was the introduction in 2002 of small group assignments. Throughout the week-long program, participants were assigned to small groups in order to provide more opportunity for cooperative learning, networking and personal interaction. In response to this modification, responses by the 2002 participant group appeared favorable, and the strategy seemed to support student learning as reflected in the following representative comments:

- Keep the format of the [small group] presentations because it allowed us to interact with our colleagues and identify experts in specific areas. We were also able to learn about activities at other campuses. (2002 participant)
- Keep us in our pre-engineered groups—to insure a variety of expertise in each group (and to save time). J. might want to provide a little more context and information for the exercises. (2002 participant)

The large number of comments made by participants from both cohorts reflected a high level of involvement in this session: 81.5% of 2001 respondents offered comments and a range of 62%-71% of 2002 respondents wrote comments for each presenter.

Session 6: The Community College Accreditation Process

Table 6

Topic: Accreditation (2002 Program topic only).

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	9	53	38	45
Presentation	4	62	33	45
Usefulness	11	37	52	46
Overall	7	56	37	43

Another programmatic change made between the 2001 and 2002 session was the addition of a presentation on the Community College Accreditation Process. There was a response rate of 71.8%; 52% of respondents assigned a rating of excellent on the measure of “usefulness.” Two major themes emerged from the written comments made by 52.1% of respondents: 1) an acknowledgement of the value of the topic, and 2) a prevailing view that more specifics were needed regarding the new accreditation standards, particularly the incorporation of learning outcomes. A few illustrations support this observation:

- The information was good. Please be specific on the new standards. This topic could be longer and focused on techniques used in learning outcomes since this issue is so contentious right now.

While there were many expressions of appreciation for the presenter, a representative of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, several participants requested more instructional materials on both the new standards and the process of accreditation.

Session 7: Budget Development

Table 7

Topic: Budget

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2001	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	0	25	75	40
Presentation	10	41	49	41
Usefulness	0	24	76	41
Overall	0	29	71	41

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	0	6	94	48
Presentation	0	10	90	48
Usefulness	0	6	94	49
Overall	0	9	91	47

There was a 63% response rate from the 2001 cohort and a 76.5% response rate from the 2002 cohort on this session dealing with Budget Development. In terms of the usefulness of the topic 75.6% of the 2001 respondents and 93.8% of the 2002 respondents assigned the topic an “excellent” rating on the measure of “usefulness.” A change was made in presenter assignments between the two sessions, and only one speaker presented the topic in 2002.

While perceptions about the usefulness of the content were positive from both groups, there were many concerns expressed in 2001 about the presentation format and treatment of the subject. While the 2001 presenters were acknowledged as strong experts, the team-taught presentation did not flow well as reflected in a representative comment:

- One presenter would’ve been better. The two did not work all that well due to different styles, knowledge, and lack of sync. (2001 participant)

Participants who wrote comments—87.8% of respondents—were divided on whether too little or too much time had been allocated to the subject. The following comments are representative:

- Need more time because (sic) very helpful! Helped me straighten out WSCH/FTES formulas! (2001 respondent)
- Too short. Also would have liked more data analysis between student services and instruction and how budget [has] impact on decision making. (2001 participant)
- Too long. Should have covered the last few slides. Like to hear more of nuts and bolts. (2001 participant)

Respondents also commented on the need for coordination with other program topics, namely Finance.

- Some overlap with previous day's material. There should be some pre-communication between presenters. (2001 participant)
- Too much detail—repeat of prior day's overview. Recommendation: specific information about what areas we need to monitor [and] strategies to avoid budget pitfalls. (2001 participant)

Based on the evaluative feedback from 2002 participants, it is clear that most of these concerns had been addressed by programmatic changes. The level of participant satisfaction as expressed by “excellent” ratings on the overall ranking measure was higher (87.7% in 2002 compared to 70.7% in 2001). With 71.4% of 2002 respondents offering written comments, no one remarked on the selection of material or details. Still,

there surfaced a concern regarding the need for coordination of the budget topic with the one on Finance, as illustrated in the following representative comment:

- [Budget presenter – M.] should be before [Finance presenter – J.]. M’s concrete followed by J’s abstract. This would be better. (2002 participant)

There were resoundingly high marks for the Finance speaker, and his treatment of the topic and accompanying materials:

- M. was extremely impressive. Handout is a gem and will be at my desk when we get back. This was great foundational stuff to prepare for [Finance] presentation.

The delivery format was similarly praised for its interactive quality:

- Lively presentation of serious subject! Enjoyed that it was interactive and informative. (2002 participant)
- Useful, well paced, dynamic presentation. Audience questions were good idea. (2002 participant)

Session 8: Technology Planning

Table 8

Topic: Technology Planning

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2001	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	8	30	62	40
Presentation	2	25	73	40
Usefulness	5	33	62	40
Overall	0	33	66	39

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	4	50	46	46
Presentation	4	58	38	45
Usefulness	4	56	40	45
Overall	4	59	37	46

There was a 61.5% response rate from 2001 participants and a 71.8% response rate from the 2002 cohort on the topic of Technology Planning. In terms of usefulness of the topic, 62.5% of the 2001 respondents and 40% of the 2002 respondents assigned this topic an “excellent” rating. It bears note that the 2001 presenter, who had been highly rated and was scheduled to return, had a last-minute personal emergency and could not attend. A decision was made to provide a substitute, and this undoubtedly impacted evaluation ratings. Nonetheless, remarks made by participants allow for an assessment of the content/value of the topic.

In 2001, 77.5% of respondents and 69.5% of 2002 respondents wrote comments, and both groups offered perceptions about the quality of the content. Representative comments included:

- Good info (sic)! Good style on presentation and materials. (2001 participant)
- Very informative! Great job on such short notice. (2002 participant)

While many appreciative comments were made on the quality of the presentation, one major question emerged from both cohorts about the feasibility of incorporating such a broad topic given the constraints of time and the need to focus on more immediate administrative/ management matters in *Administration 101*. Illustrative comments included:

- Good presentation—but we need to use time for Administrative issues...(2001 participant)
- Fine speaker. Good info (sic)—but so quick! For this and the next session [Research and Strategic Planning], it may have been more effective to present one (rather than both) so more time could’ve been available for the session. There’s no way Admin. 101 can offer all we need in one “class”—some tough (less is more) decisions needed. (2001 participant)
- Hey it’s BIG, but what can you say about it that we don’t always hear. Some things should be (sic) personal responsibility to follow up. (2001 participant)

Also, a number of comments were made by participants from both cohorts relative to the need for more time in order to cover the topic adequately. Overall, the suggestion that emerged from written comments is that there was a need to assess the inclusion of this topic in the program curriculum.

Session 9: Research and Strategic Planning

Table 9

Topic: Research and Strategic Planning (2001 program topic only)

Measure	Summer 2001			N
	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	
Content	19	43	38	37
Presentation	34	39	26	38
Usefulness	29	39	32	38
Overall	33	44	23	39

In 2001, Research and Strategic Planning was included as a program topic. With a 60% response rate, only 30.7% of respondents rated the topic as “excellent” on the “usefulness” measure. On this basis, program organizers eliminated the topic in 2002. It

should be noted that written comments indicate an appreciation for the high quality of the presentation. Nonetheless, in light of the fact that the topic was eliminated, it does not appear useful to provide further evaluative comment on this topic.

Session 10: Institutional Dynamics

Table 10

Topic: Institutional Dynamics

Measure	Summer 2001			
	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	N
Content	3	24	74	34
Presentation	0	31	69	35
Usefulness	6	15	79	34
Overall	3	15	82	33

Measure	Summer 2002			
	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	N
Content	0	29	71	45
Presentation	4	28	67	46
Usefulness	2	26	72	46
Overall	0	29	71	45

There was a 53.8% response rate from 2001 participants and a 71.8% response rate from the 2002 cohort on the presentation dealing with Institutional Dynamics. The presentations were made in the evening for both program sessions. In terms of usefulness, 77.1% of the 2001 respondents and 71.7% of the 2002 respondents assigned this topic a rating of "excellent." It was particularly difficult to separate the topic from the charismatic personality of the presenter, the Chancellor of a large urban college district. The presenter offered a highly personalized view on the subject, and he brought a warm and personable style. One typical comment reflected this idea:

- [E] is an inspirational, motivational speaker. This topic is crucial, perhaps the most important for me. The slides were very clear with touches of humor. He certainly comes across as a real and approachable human being—and that was his whole point. (2001 participant)

One common perception that emerged from comments made by both groups was the view that the purpose of the session was to help participants decide if they wished to advance to higher level positions in their careers. The following example even suggests that the purpose of the entire *Administration 101* program was about professional upward mobility:

I didn't realize this conference was for administrators who wanted to go higher (foolish of me). This presentation clarified this for me. (2002 participant)

Another noted:

...Gave a good "to do" list to move up the institution. (2002 participant)

One last example illustrates the theme:

[E] really makes one think. Yes, I do still wish to be a president or chancellor. I just have a few things to work on. I just love [E] to death. I appreciate his desire to look for future leaders on their way in—the Keys to Dynamic Leadership. (2002 participant)

There was a relatively high rate of respondent commentary—82.8% of participants in 2001 wrote comments, and 76% of participants did likewise in 2002.

Overall, based on the many favorable comments made about this session, it is clear that the session proved to be enjoyable and personally affecting for most participants.

Session 11: Human Resources

Table 11

Human Resources

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2001 Average	Excellent	N
		%	%	
Content	0	27	73	41
Presentation	33	44	23	43
Usefulness	5	28	67	43
Overall	5	46	49	39

Human Resources--Presenter #1		Summer 2002 Average	Excellent	N
Measure	Needs Improvement %	%	%	
Content	2	21	77	48
Presentation	15	33	52	48
Usefulness	2	27	71	48
Overall	0	38	62	47

Human Resources--Presenter #2		Average	Excellent	N
Measure	Needs Improvement %	%	%	
Content	0	21	79	48
Presentation	10	35	54	48
Usefulness	2	19	79	48
Overall	0	36	64	47

There was a 66% response rate from the 2001 cohort and a 75% response rate from the 2002 cohort on this topic presentation dealing with Human Resource issues. In terms of the usefulness of the topic, 67% of the 2001 respondents rated the topic usefulness as "excellent." In 2002, 71% and 79% of the respondents who rated the two presenters respectively indicated the highest rating level of "excellent." Although the topic was retained for both program sessions, the delivery format was refined and clarified in 2002 in direct response to evaluative comments made in 2001. In the 2001

session, a panel comprised of four presenters covered the topic. Each was assigned a sub-topic (e.g. collective bargaining, personnel issues, etc.) and was asked to provide information and written material and to lead interactive exercises on their subject. However, the session felt “packed” to participants, and the presenters’ skills were deemed very uneven. One comment from the 2001 session summarized concerns:

- All four are experts. Poor delivery. Suggest: 1-hour overview, case studies format with real world cases on different topics; limit to a 1-hour session. Please don’t read Title 5 and Ed. Code. (2001 participant)

By 2002, the presenter panel had been culled down to two expert practitioners, and the topic was presented in a team-taught fashion using case studies, question/answer activities, and small group exercises. Overall, the content remained the same.

Participants from the 2002 cohort offered extensive commentary on this presentation; 79% of respondents wrote comments. There appeared to be a general consensus that the content was very valuable and appropriate to the learning needs of the group. Many participants more time be allocated to the topic. The following are representative comments:

- Helpful handout. Could use more time, especially because 80% of our jobs deal with personnel. The small groups were helpful, but we were not given clear instructions about how to group and what our tasks and timelines were. (2002 participant)
- Good cases but need more time! The time at the end was great! [Questions and answer] (2002 participant)
- Critical for administrators. (2002 participant)

One theme that clearly emerged from the comments about presenters was the need to strengthen what one respondent termed “classroom management skills.” While participants expressed satisfaction with “real world” applications, some were frustrated by the lack of preparation provided to participants for case study analysis:

- Negotiation section was not helpful—not enough information given prior (for those of us who were new to this). Sexual harassment [topic] good (sic), as was [employee] discipline (sic) and ADA [compliance] (sic). (2002 participant)

Many comments were made suggesting that the case study on collective bargaining needed re-thinking in contrast to the other sub-topics:

- The use of case studies was very effective for the discrimination issues. I would suggest not role playing negotiations. Instead, watching them being role played was far more beneficial, and then spend (sic) more time giving advice on how to conduct negotiations. We could have spent a full day on these issues. (2002 participant)
- Would have appreciated more on personnel issues and less on collective bargaining methods. (2002 participant)

Overall, however, participants expressed high levels of satisfaction with the material, content and presenters:

- Good material with practical applications included. (2002 participant)
- Best event of conference! Add more time to this session. We need at least two more hours of Human Resources. (2002 participant)

Session 12: Current Legislation Affecting Community Colleges

Table 12

Current Legislation

Measure	Needs Improvement %	Summer 2002	Excellent %	N
		Average %		
Content	4	47	49	45
Presentation	4	56	40	46
Usefulness	7	40	53	45
Overall	6	47	47	45

Included in both session of *Administration 101* was a “Legislative Update” presented by a professional community college lobbyist. In 2001, the presentation was made informally as part of the last day’s agenda. In 2002, the decision was made to continue the briefing and to formalize it as an integral part of the *Administration 101* program.

In 2002, there was a 71.8% response rate on the topic of Current Legislation that affected California Community Colleges, and 53% of respondents gave an “excellent” rating to this topic on the usefulness measure. Comments and ratings were mixed as to the delivery format, but respondents expressed uniformly positive views about the expertise of the presenter. Note two representative comments:

- Does a good job of translating the complexities in summary form. (2002 participant)
- His expertise in governmental affairs is quite obvious. (2002 participant)

A theme emerged from the comments offered in 2002 that the topic was potentially of great use but needed more development—either by exploring the question

of how administrators should get involved with the legislative process or delving more deeply into an analysis of how pending legislation could affect community colleges.

Session 13: Closing Presentations

Table 13

Closing Presentations

Topic: Building Community		Summer 2001		N
Measure	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	
Content	0	0	100	31
Presentation	0	0	100	31
Usefulness	0	13	86	30
Overall	0	3	97	30

Topic: Student Success and Retention		Summer 2002		N
Measure	Needs Improvement %	Average %	Excellent %	
Content	4	9	87	45
Presentation	4	30	65	46
Usefulness	2	13	85	46
Overall	2	11	86	44

The last presentation in each program session were designed to highlight major overarching issues related to institutional effectiveness and college leadership. In 2001, the closing session, presented by nationally recognized exemplary community college president from a large urban college in Texas, consisted of two presentations entitled “Building Community and Balancing your Life” and “Leadership Lessons from the Garden.” The first session was presented in the evening and the second on the following morning. In 2002, the closing session, “Student Success and Retention” likewise featured a nationally recognized authority/practitioner, a Vice Provost of Undergraduate Affairs of an east coast university. Because the topics and materials were so distinct for both program sessions, the evaluation data are presented separately for each topic.

A. Summer 2001-Building Community/ Leadership Lessons

There was a 48% response rate from the summer 2001 cohort on the topic of “Building Community.” Fully 84% of respondents rated this topic “excellent” in terms of usefulness. For the first session on “Building Community,” participants expressed high satisfaction along all measures reported on the rating form. The presentation format included a video, kinesthetic activities, and lecture. Respondents appeared highly involved with the presentation as reflected in the fact that 94% of all respondents wrote comments. Both of the related session topics were appreciated as integrative of many *Administration 101* concepts and subjects. The following are a few representative comments:

- Very refreshing, inspirational approach to wholeness in education. Creative use of a variety of media and activity. (2001 participant)
- I think his ideas would add to the overall week. I liked the combination of theory and personal wisdom. This wasn’t silly but it all made a point. (2001 participant)

The second session on “Leadership Lessons” was likewise very well received. Fully 90% of respondents wrote comments expressing uniformly positive reactions about this presentation. Representative comments included:

- A very nice ending to an intense, very worthwhile week! I am not a “touchy feely” but I’m convinced community is truly important. (2001 participant)
- Reminded us of the importance of balance. [I] appreciated the inclusion of this topic along with other technical information presented prior (sic). (2001 participant)

B. Student Success and Retention

There was a 71.8% response rate for the 2002 presentation dealing with Student Success and Retention; 85% of respondents rated the session “excellent” in terms of usefulness. As in the previous year, the topic was perceived as central to the work of community college administrators. The speaker was generally praised for his expertise and articulate speech. A few representative examples follow:

- This was one of the best presentations! We could have spent the entire workshop on this topic and develop (sic) strategies to implement these ideas when we return. (2002 participant)
- The tone and content should be the foundation of *Administration 101*. He is really giving us pertinent and important information that is relevant to our success. It is a shame he came at the end when people are tired. (2002 participant)

Despite many favorable comments, there was a theme of frustration expressed about the volume of information. Likewise, participants pointed to the need for better quality and session-appropriate handouts—particularly the need for handouts of the power point presentation. On the last day, as hinted in the previous comment example, participants were taxed by a presentation that demanded a high-energy synthesis of extensive and detailed information. Nonetheless, respondents appreciated the importance of the topic as suggested in the following representative comments:

- Recommend he give the power point handouts to us. Case studies for each exercise would be great. Great presentation! Good color code handouts. This

is a great presentation to wrap up the event; we just need more time. (2002 participant)

- Please invite him for *Administration 202*. Wonderful opening for “the last morning.” Content relative (sic) to our administrative lives. Timely topic. Articulate in speech. Thank you. Excellent interactive presentation on Decision making, How’s and Why’s. (2002 participant)

Overall evaluation questions for *Administration 101*:

The final program evaluation form completed by participants at the conclusion of the program consisted of a number of open-ended questions. While the focus of the questions was similar for the most part, significant revisions were made in the items between 2001 and 2002:

2001 Final Evaluation Questions

- What did you like best about *Administration 101*?
- What did you like least about *Administration 101*?
- Any suggestions about how the program could be improved?
- If you were going to recommend the program to a colleague what would you say?
- Any additional comments?
- *No analogous question*

2002 Final Evaluation Questions

- What did you like best about *Administration 101*?
- *No analogous question*
- What if any portion of *Administration 101* would you recommend improvement?
- Which topics did you find the most beneficial?
- *No analogous question*
- Were you satisfied with the location and overall accommodations of UCLA?

The revision eliminated redundant responses regarding program strengths: that is, the question “What did you like best?” elicited the same kind of answers as “If you were going to recommend the program, what would you say?”

Content analysis of responses for each major question yielded a number of themes. Respondents frequently identified a number of themes in a single comment; responses were therefore tallied separately for each theme. The following summarizes responses for the first question from the final evaluation questionnaire:

What did you like best about Administration 101?

<u>THEMES</u>	<u>2001 Cohort Number of responses</u>	<u>2002 Cohort Number of responses</u>
A. Array and variety of presentations	15	20
B. Networking	14	24
C. Conference Organization	12	5
D. Accommodations /meals /venue	9	3
E. Instructional materials	8	8
F. Presenters	7	10
G. Practical application of concepts	3	0
Total # Responses	48	49

There were large numbers of individual responses that were unique. Most frequently, these were comments indicating a special preference for a session or activity, such as a social event or group dinner. There was no consistent thread to such observations, and consequently these are not reported in the results.

In 2001, the question was posed: "What did you like least about *Administration 101*? In contrast to the question regarding "best likes" only a few common themes emerged.

What did you like least about Administration 101?

<u>Themes</u>	<u>2001 Cohort</u>
A. Lack of interaction in selected presentations	8
B. Lack of variety of formats/activities within a single presentation	3
C. Lack of visuals in selected presentations	2
D. Physical exhaustion from sitting too long in presentations	5
Total # responses	36

The single most articulated theme that emerged was the concern regarding the lack of interactive sessions. Note the following criticism:

- Almost all of the presenters were non-interactive. We preach about being a learning centered institution, and yet the presenters used the traditional lecture approach—ugh! (sic)

Many of the unique comments made by respondents about various matters relate tangentially to this issue. For instance, one respondent complained, “Did not like sitting for such a long period of time (vary program).”

Still, several participants responded that there was “nothing” that they disliked about the program. There was a distinct awareness about what the intensive format of the program entailed in terms of topics and materials, and on the whole participants were eager to retain the comprehensive curriculum *and* the short time frame. Nonetheless, presentation format emerged as a key area of focus.

In 2002, the question was asked “Which topics did you find the most beneficial?” Despite the fact that there was a 73.4% response rate on this item (47 responses), no clear theme emerges. Virtually every respondent enumerated multiple workshops; many indicated that “all” were of value. The two presentations that received the highest mention are Budget Development (22) and Participative Governance (15). Yet these two workshops were often singled out due to the humor and wit of the presenters rather than to the “beneficial” quality of the topics. There is a clear recognition that the entire curriculum is “beneficial” and that different presentations address distinct aspects of administrative functions. Here is a typical comment:

- I am glad to say that I have no preferences—they were all beneficial. The Student Learning outcomes talk (accreditation) was especially relevant to my work.

Beyond the two workshops mentioned above, there emerged no clear hierarchy of favorite or “most beneficial” workshops.

The last major item of the evaluation questionnaire deals with suggestions or recommended improvements. The following chart summarizes responses according to themes that emerged based on the content analysis of comments offered by both cohorts:

<u>Suggestions for Improvement:</u>	<u>2001 # of Responses</u>	<u>2002 # of Responses</u>
• Need for more interaction	13	7
• More use of teams	3	
• More need for Question/answer sessions	2	
• Need for more use of applications	4	
• Need for more use of case studies	3	
• Improve accommodations	2	
• Modify scheduling to provide for more “down time.”	10	
• Re-organize curriculum—fewer sessions but more in depth	2	3
• Provide handout that parallel all power point presentations.	9	4

It is not possible to provide a response rate for this question as the comments were transcribed in a way that did not allow for differentiating respondents. Thus, while 64 comments were listed for the 2001 cohort and 36 were listed for 2002, it is not clear for either cohort if a given respondent made more than one comment on any given factor or aspect of the program.

One unexpected difference that emerged in responses between the 2001 and 2002 cohorts is the fact that in the first year, respondents tended to comment more frequently on programmatic aspects and presentation formats. Respondents frequently expressed

concerns about the need for more opportunities to interact with peers outside the workshops as well as within workshops—that is, requesting more interactive delivery formats. There surfaced more preoccupation with the need to incorporate more case studies and opportunities for application. In 2002, responses appeared more diffused. While there was no consensus about the amount of materials—some requested more and others less—there appeared to be a strong thread of commentary requesting that materials be better coordinated with presentation and that the notebooks of resources material be sent earlier than two weeks before the start of the session.

A final analysis of the comparison of top rated sessions by each of the cohorts suggests a few additional insights. Using the measure of “Overall” ratings assigned for the sessions, the following chart summarizes the rankings awarded each session in priority order by the two cohorts and the percentage of respondents from each group that assigned an “excellent” rating to the session:

Comparison of Session Presentations in Order of Priority Rankings by Cohort Group

2001 Cohort Session Ratings (Based on “overall” measure)	% of “Excellent” Responses	2002 Cohort Session Ratings (Based on “overall” measure)	% of “Excellent” Responses
1. Building Community	97	1. Budget Development	91
2. Institutional Dynamics	82	2. Successful Participative Governance Models	89
3. Instruction/Student Services	75	3. Student Retention	86
4. Budget Development	71	4. Governance	74
5. Financing	70	5. Institutional Dynamics	71
6. Technology Planning	66	6. Role of Bd. of Trustees	70
7. Role of Bd. of Trustees	60	7. Human Resources	62
8. Governance	50	8. Instruction/Student Services	60*
9. Human Resources	49	9. Finance	49
10. Research/Planning	23	10. Legislative Update	47
		11. Accreditation and Technology Planning (Both sessions received same ratings)	37

* Ratings were averaged for three presenters

A comparison of the top five rated sessions show that two were selected in common by both cohorts: Budget Development and Institutional Dynamics. It is difficult to attribute any of the ratings solely to “content” or “usefulness” measures as there was no clear pattern that emerged from a comparative analysis of these measures. Rather, the factor that seems most obvious is the quality of the presenter/presentation itself. It is no accident that in 2002 both the Budget Development session and the one dealing with Participative Governance were given by two exceptionally articulate, witty and effective communicators. Similarly, in 2001, the presenter for the Building Community topic was a nationally renowned speaker who had a well established reputation for giving funny, stimulating, and effective presentations. As already mentioned, the Chancellor who presented the topic of Institutional Dynamics at both program sessions is a personable and highly approachable individual who extends himself very effectively to the audience. The conclusion could be drawn that the human factor—that is, the presenter himself/herself—greatly impacts how the session will be perceived and assessed regardless of the value of content or usefulness of the topic.

Focus Group Interviews

The following section summarizes the qualitative data derived from focus group discussions. Responses are organized by question. Content analysis of group responses resulted in identifying emergent themes; the number of groups that identified each theme is identified in the following summaries..

Strengths and weakness of topic presentations:

1. Strengths—Discussion of program strengths was not extensive in most groups—only one specifically spent a significant portion of time on this item. Rather, most groups appeared to accept the topics and formats as givens and spent the greater portion of time discussing ways of improving or strengthening presentations. Insofar as comments regarding strengths were explicit, the following common themes emerged from the focus groups:

- Expertise of presenters (1 group)
- Excellent resource materials (3 groups)
- Presenters who are good role models and address heart of leadership challenges (2 groups)
- “Real-world” case studies and applications (4 groups)

2. Weaknesses—It may be a reflection of the human condition to focus more extensively on perceived program weaknesses, and groups tended to elaborate in a more detailed fashion on these. It became apparent as discussion progressed that weakness were inextricably linked with recommendations and strategies for addressing these. The following therefore summarizes perceived weaknesses and recommendations for improvement:

- The perceived redundancy of presentations on the history of the system vis-à-vis governance, finance and budget topics emerged as a theme. While historical information was found to be useful in understanding “why things are the way they are,” two groups felt strongly that historical treatments repeated in various session took “too much time.” Commented one

participant, "It seemed that as soon as we were beginning to get into the current issues, we ran out of time."

Recommendation: Coordinate treatment of historical topics in budget, finance, and governance sessions so that the overview is presented once. This would allow presenters, in the words of one focus group participant to "Keep the focus on the here and now." Optionally, one group suggested that historical summaries be provided in written form as part of the *Administration 101* notebook material.

- The disjointed nature of the Finance and Budget sessions surfaced as another theme; improved coordination between presenters is needed to avoid overlap of topic material and to better provide insight into the relationship between the two. *Recommendation:* Coordinate presentations, perhaps by scheduling a dual presentation.
- Gaps in the Human Resource presentation were identified. Despite a strong consensus about the usefulness and critical importance of the topic in the *Administration 101* curriculum, three criticisms of the topic treatment emerged: 1) The presentation was not geared to the learning level of all participants; many felt that presenters had mistakenly assumed a degree of knowledge in the group that was not valid. 2) Many respondents expressed the perception that the initial interactive exercise about the collective bargaining negotiating process proved ineffective because there had been a lack of framework, explanations, or group rules for the simulation. Commented one participant: "Being turned loose on a case without grounding is very

frustrating. “ By contrast, the role playing done subsequently by presenters for other Human Resource topics was perceived as being more effective. 3) The appropriateness of including collective bargaining in the Human Resource overview appeared questionable. Several individuals articulated the point that other sub-topics such as employee discipline, sexual harassment, and discrimination fall in the purview of all college administrators while collective bargaining and negotiations do not usually involve mid-level managers.

Recommendations: Improve treatment of the collective bargaining sub-topic by a) providing more background information regarding the differences between interest-based and traditional bargaining; and b) re-think the focus of collective bargaining to one that emphasizes contract management issues and the roles of all administrators in collective bargaining—not just those directly involved in negotiations.

Usefulness of content and materials:

The following content areas and program materials were cited as particularly useful by focus group participants:

- Resource notebook compiled and distributed to participants in advance of the program (2 groups)
- Presenters’ examples of creativity in dealing with “real leadership” situations.

This dimension received comment in one form or another from all groups. The most frequently mentioned session was Instruction/Student Services and specifically the presentation made by the President who described the challenges and change strategies that he had employed at his institution.

- Technical information presented clearly and concisely (2 groups). The areas most often cited were those dealing with Attendance Accounting Requirements (Budget development), the State Program Approval process (Instruction/Student Services), and Apportionment mechanisms (Finance and Budget). Members of two groups commented that discussion of such aspects were new to many, especially entry-level or “new to California” administrators.

Delivery Formats

While there was a scattering of comments on diverse aspects of the program and delivery formats, three clear themes emerged based on focus group discussions:

- Use of case studies.

There was unanimous sentiment expressed in all four groups that case studies based on presenters’ professional/personal experiences were most effective. Proper use of these—that is, case studies presented with sufficient background and technical explanations—had a powerful learning impact. Inclusion and expanded use of this approach in all topic areas was viewed as highly desirable. Another aspect of the comments regarding the use of case studies was the suggestion that the interdependence of college organizational units (e.g. Instruction, Human Resources, Administrative Services, etc.) be stressed in terms of analyzing cases/situations and their resolutions.

- Elimination of straight lecture delivery formats.

This suggestion is captured in the comment of one participant, “No more talking heads.” At minimum, use of visual aids and power point presentations accompanied by appropriate handouts were viewed as essential for enhancing lecture presentations. All

groups expressed a preference for participating in various types of interactive formats: small group work, discussion, question/answer, and role playing/simulations.

- Promote the use of small groups.

In 2002 all participants had been assigned to small work groups for the entire program session. These were established in order to promote structured interactions throughout the program and to enhance networking and problem sharing among participants. Two groups expressed a preference that these work groups be maintained throughout the workshops as these had been initially designed with balanced representation from various administrative units (e.g. Instruction, Student Services, etc.). Two groups also mentioned the possibility of creating “break-out” sessions by groups for workshops that required dealing with complex topics (Instruction/Student Services and Human Resources). The option that was suggested for “breaking out” or clustering participants was by position level—that is, entry-level through mid-level deans could be constituted as one group, and senior administrators (e.g. vice presidents and senior district administrators) could be organized into another. The perceived benefit of this approach was that case studies and problems could best be discussed in groups that shared similar levels of expertise.

Resource materials and assigned work.

- Three groups strongly recommended that the resource notebook that contained program information, session outlines, handouts, and readings be distributed much earlier than two weeks before the start of the session.
- In cases where participants had been given reading assignments, it was strongly recommended that presenters fully integrate these into sessions.

Complained one respondent, “When I have taken the time to prepare carefully, I resent being placed through a process that was not well thought out.”

- The need to clarify assignments and guidelines was underscored. One group stressed at length the value of preparatory assignments and expressed a willingness to complete these in advance. Commented one participant, “I’d like more structured homework so there would be a level playing field.” Members of this group demonstrated a strong consensus for “perhaps even more preparatory homework.”

Proposals for new topics

The following table summarizes the suggested topics for future *Administration 101* programs.

Table 14

Proposals for New Topics

<u>Suggested topic</u>	<u># of Focus Groups that made recommendation</u>
Overview of categorical programs (e.g. VTEA, EOPS, DSPS, etc.)	1
Vocational Education: balancing vocational and transfer education within the instructional program and discussion of specialized resources for each such as VTEA.	2
Distance Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collective bargaining issues • Delivery formats for DE (e.g. hybrids) • Current research on quality issues and student retention 	2
Collective bargaining: roles and contract management strategies for all administrators	1
Political advocacy: how to impact the system effectively at legislative levels	1
Program Review: philosophy and model processes (not just presentation of Title 5 mandates)	1
Teambuilding within college organizations	1
Personal balance for administrators	1

The single unanimous recommendation made by all groups was for ACCCA to provide an “Administration 202” program, although there was no consensus regarding the structure of topics. Two group, for instance, recommended that all topics be repeated but at a much deeper level, and with a pre-requisite of *Administration 101*. Another group recommended that subsequent programs be organized by position level with appropriate topics selected for entry, mid-level, and senior administrators.

Follow-up Survey to 2002 Participants

There was a 34.3% response rate from 2002 participants; twenty-two surveys were returned. The survey, administered electronically, was primarily designed to elicit feedback related to the value of the topics and how participants have actually employed the materials and strategies presented in *Administration 101*.

Question #1: Please list up to five topics that you found to be of most use in your position as a community college administrator/staff member.

In descending order of choice, the following chart includes topics identified by respondents.

Table 15

Preferred Topics in Priority Order

Topic	# Responses	% Total Responses
1. Budget	17	17.5
2. Instruction/Student Services.	15	15.4
3. Accreditation	13	13.4
4. Community College Governance	10	10.3
5. Financing Higher Education	9	9.27
6. Human Resources	9	9.27

Total number of responses = 97

Question #2: Do you actively employ any of the strategies or use specific materials presented in *Administration 101*? If yes, describe use. If no, why not?

One hundred percent of all respondents checked "yes" to the query. Based on content analysis, the major themes that surfaced in descriptions of use included the following:

- The Program Resource Notebook was identified most frequently. Slightly over 30% of respondents commented on the value of these materials in general.

- Approximately 27% of respondents commented in various ways that the value of the program resided in the array of workshops. One illustrative comment referred to the “base knowledge of processes and procedures” that had promoted increased “awareness of the need to be creative in your solutions.” A comment that captures the impact of the curriculum and presentations is the following:

- I use *perspectives* [respondent’s italics]—they have allowed me to remain calmer and productive in the face of our highly politicized and contentious campus climate. I also have hopes for the future as a result of those perspectives. I see change can happen and in some cases happens quickly [respondent referenced case of large urban college restructure].

Individuals gave examples of specific topics/strategies that they employed or developed, including but not limited to accreditation, budget development, shared governance, and student retention. The most common reference that surfaced in descriptions was the emphasis on problem-solving as derived from case studies. Finally, respondents alluded, in several instances, to the value of contacts and networking; participants drew on peers and presenters for assistance after the program had ended.

Question #3: Do you have any suggestions for new topics for *Administration 101* that you think would be of benefit to community college administrators?

Again, based on content analysis, four major topic areas were recommended for inclusion in future programs:

1. Increased use of case studies and problem-solving approaches for all topics;
2. Coping with budget reductions;

3. Development of teambuilding and collaborative techniques;
4. Requests for a future “Administration 202” program.

A number of respondents (7) indicated that they had no suggestions for new topics. One illustrative comment that captures a common theme is the following:

- The curriculum is very complete and dense as it is. I appreciated the informational nature of *Administration 101*, how about a 201 that is more interactive and problem-solving?

The response rate was somewhat low --only 22 responded from a cohort of 64-- Nonetheless, the themes that emerged reinforced those that were identified through program participants’ written evaluations. It is noteworthy that the current community college fiscal environment prompted the identification of one needed new topic: how to implement budget reductions in colleges. This recommendation had been completely missing from evaluations conducted during the program itself and points to the need for program organizers to maintain currency in the curriculum.

Interviews with Program Presenters

During Spring, 2002, 15 program presenters received program orientations and were interviewed by phone and queried about four key points: what worked for each of them in terms of topic assignments, time allocations, and resource supports; what challenges did they encounter in presenting the topic to program participants; suggestions for future presenter orientation; and recommendations for strengthening the *Administration 101* program.

Without exception, presenters were vitally interested in understanding the learning needs of the group and discussed how to best present their topics to an audience made up of community college administrators. Given the variation of topics, however, there were few themes that emerged from the group as each presenter or team of presenters dealt with unique questions.

Results of interviews are presented separately for individual presenters and teams of presenters as follows:

Single-presenter Topic Presentations

Budget	Finance
Student Retention	Role of Trustees and System Governance
Accreditation	Successful Models for Participatory Governance
Current Legislation	Technology Planning
Institutional Dynamics	

None of the presenters charged with covering the above listed topics expressed concerns about topic assignments. This is not a surprising result as all are experts in their respective fields and, in most cases, seasoned presenters. Each had already organized their presentations and selected materials—if only in their own minds. Thus, no one reported issues related to topic assignment.

Certainly, the single major concern raised by four presenters was the time allocation to cover their subjects. For the topics on Accreditation and Student Retention, presenters were accustomed typically to a half or full day to cover the material. Both presenters had been nonetheless positively disposed to condensing the material but had worried about the level of specificity needed by the group. The Technology Planning

presenter best summed up the dilemma about time: "What can be said in an hour except the BIG [researcher's capitalization] points!"

A few recommendations were made for improving orientations and the program:

- 1) Consider scheduling one-day conferences or break-out sessions on topics to follow *Administration 101* programs designed to delve into dense topics such as Technology, Planning, and Accreditation.
- 2) Be sure to provide meeting rooms that allow for re-configuration of chairs and tables to facilitate group work.

Team-taught Presentations

Instruction and Student Services

Human Resources

Scheduled for a half-day session in the program, three presenters covered the topic of Instruction and Student Services. Two of the three presenters had participated in the program in 2001. The three presenters had communicated with each other by phone and reported that they felt comfortable with the team-taught format and were prepared to provide case studies and problem-based approaches to their assigned sub-topics. The first-time presenter reviewed her presentation key points with the interviewer to ensure these met program goals. None of the three co-presenters expressed any concerns regarding topic assignments or the time allocation. The Human Resource co-presenters had not had an opportunity to plan their presentations together, but each had a clear concept of the material to be covered.

Again, recommendations were few regarding the presenter orientations or the program in general:

1. Consider inviting legal consultants to provide an added dimension to the Human Resources topic (i.e. case law and legal guidelines).
2. Instruction and Student Services topics are limitless. Consider scheduling a drive-in conference on single issues such as categorical programs or enrollment management.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The general purpose of this study was to conduct a formative evaluation of ACCCA's *Administration 101* program designed to meet the unique professional development needs of California community college administrators.

The study employed a mixed research methodology that included both quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess content and delivery formats of the program. The following section describes major findings as well as recommendations for offering future *Administration 101* programs and for strengthening the curriculum content and delivery formats. As well, a discussion of the implications of the study in relation to the literature regarding administrative professional development programs is presented, especially as applied to California community colleges. Finally, conclusions and directions for future research are explored.

Major Findings

Research methods and results were presented in previous chapters. Major findings that surfaced on the basis of the data analysis are presented below and organized by research questions. Findings are based on the feedback and perceptions of program participants and presenters.

Question #1: Based on participant and presenter responses, how does the program content meet the goals of *Administration 101*?

- In what ways do these two groups perceive the usefulness of the concept presented in *Administration 101*?
 - Are there other topics that should be incorporated in future sessions?
 - Are there *Administration 101* curriculum elements that should be expanded or deleted or modified?
1. While it is critical to understand the historical development of the California community college mission, governance system, and budget/finance structures, historical treatments of these topics within the curriculum need to be streamlined and integrated.
 2. The need exists to fully integrate topics dealing with the California community college governance systems at both the statewide and local levels. (To a degree, this was accomplished in the second program session.)
 3. As evidenced particularly in responses to the sessions on Research and Planning and Technology Planning in 2001 and the session on Accreditation in 2002, participants and presenters largely concur that complex topics require more time—and by extension, deeper treatment. In seeking to present “nuts and bolts” information, specifics are viewed as essential by participants in order to understand applications of the topics and how to transfer information to the workplace.
 4. Participants clearly point to a need to coordinate and integrate Budget and Finance topics. The two sessions make use of similar concepts and technical

information. The need exists to link presentations in order to eliminate overlays of content. Additionally, streamlining information would allow more time to explore applications or case studies.

5. Participants recognized the usefulness of Human Resources as a topic. However, there exists a gap between the perceived value of sub-topics related to employee discipline, sexual harassment and related human resource issues and the topic dealing with collective bargaining. The latter appeared to be too general and removed from the preoccupations of mid-level administrators to satisfy the learning needs of this group. The need exists to explore or re-think the treatment of this topic, perhaps to a more generalized discussion of contract management, strategies.
6. Based on participant reactions, the need exists to clarify the goal of the presentation on Institutional Dynamics. The presentation was highly valued for its insights into “real world” leadership dynamics, and it is best appreciated as a personalized view of leadership challenges. A simple re-titling of the topic may be one strategy for addressing the questions that surfaced.
7. The session on Legislative Updates is viewed as a highly useful topic but the treatment of the subject needs to be aligned to the purposes of an administrative training program. An emphasis on the role of administrators in advocacy or linking the material to the broader educational goals of *Administration 101* would address the concerns.
8. While a number of suggestions for new topics surfaced through participant evaluation responses and focus groups, there was no clear consensus for the

addition of any one specific topic. Participants on the whole appeared to appreciate the need for inclusion of emergent and relevant topics as these surfaced within the community college system and appeared to rely on program organizers' expertise to identify new subjects.

Question #2: What are the participant and presenters reactions to the format and delivery formats used in *Administration 101*?

- Are there ways in which delivery strategies could be changed to facilitate participant learning?
1. One clear theme emerged based on participant reactions: the need to expand the use of more interactive approaches. The participant consensus is that "talking heads" are deadly. Participants are equally receptive to a variety of interactive methods such as question/answer; small group work; role playing and simulations; collaborative exercises; and whole group discussion. The incorporation of one or more of these techniques in all presentations is essential.
 2. On the whole, participants expressed a strong preference for the use of case studies as a method of presenting material—and the more detailed and specific the case the better. One major proviso exists for the effective use of case studies: sufficient context, materials and background must be provided to facilitate participant understanding.
 3. A theme that emerged from participant feedback is the need to gear information and material to the learning needs of entry and mid-level administrators. Major frustrations surfaced on the occasions when presenters assumed participant knowledge or experience with topics.

4. Reading materials and handouts were much valued, particularly when these were included in the resource binder that was sent to participants weeks before the start of the program. “Novice” administrators especially appreciated the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the materials ahead of time. Based on survey results, participants appeared to extensively utilize the program materials for reference purposes in their work.
5. The use of power point presentations was viewed as beneficial; the tool facilitated the organization of complex topics as well as note taking by participants. However, in instances where power point was employed, it was viewed as critical to provide handouts that paralleled the presentations.
6. Team taught presentations needed to be coordinated in order to ensure that the material did not overlap and that information was organized and flowed well.

Recommendations

Before presenting recommendations based on the findings of the study, it may be useful to reiterate the utilization-focused approach that informed this evaluation. The study may be of potential use to a wide array of stakeholders, including but not limited to the community of statewide college administrators as well as other professional associations and educational providers. However, the primary stakeholders consisted of the ACCCA Board and specifically the program organizers and members of the Management Development Commission who were charged with program implementation and oversight. As such, the focus of the study, to paraphrase terms used by Patton (1997, p. 326) has been on manipulable variables that are within the reach of program organizers and decision makers to control. In keeping with the objectives of a formative evaluation,

the study focused on in-process implementation questions regarding program content and delivery strategies.

Again, following guidelines suggested in the evaluation literature (Patton, 1997; Scriven, 2000), the following recommendations are presented in two sections: 1) recommendations that can be implemented by program organizers in the short term to strengthen the program, and 2) recommendations directed at decision makers aimed at long-term development of the program.

Short-term Recommendations

1. Link and integrate presentations of topics in Budget Development and Finance.
Consider the use of a dual or team-taught presentation that integrates resource materials and handouts. Additionally, unify and streamline the historical treatment of the subject by presenting a single overview of key legislation and regulatory milestones.
2. Ensure that topics are presented in alignment with program goals—namely to focus on the role of administrators in managing and/or dealing with vital functions. In certain cases, existing presentations need to be modified to emphasize this dimension:
 - a.) Topics on system wide governance and board relations need to be presented with an eye to highlighting the role of institutional managers—not just providing general information.
 - b.) Collective bargaining as a topic must be framed around the role of administrators as key players (e.g. by emphasizing contract management).

- c.) The Legislative Updates session needs to highlight the role of administrators in advocacy or, alternatively, discuss pending legislation within the framework of *Administration 101* topics.
 - d.) The topic of Institutional Dynamics needs to be expanded. The current presentation should be retained as it offers an excellent discussion and insight into the challenges of institutional leadership (and perhaps re-titled as that). However, a structured treatment of institutional dynamics around questions dealing with diverse governance groups, balancing community and institutional influences, and understanding and working with institutional culture needs to be developed.
3. Eliminate one-hour topic presentations. Once a decision is made to include a complex topic such as Accreditation or Technology Planning, sufficient time must be allocated to providing relevant information, case study or application activities, and interactive formats.
 4. Compile and distribute the program resource notebook three to four weeks in advance of the start of the program. Include preparatory readings and handouts on all topics. Selection of materials should be based on providing key reference materials and/or a current discussion of issues. Avoid distribution of voluminous handouts during sessions.
 5. Consider providing written “previews” of topics as part of the resource notebook. Case studies and/or assignments should be incorporated whenever possible. This will facilitate participants’ preparation and provide a “level start” for new or novice administrators.

6. Ensure that the following course management strategies are employed in all sessions: a.) case study treatments; b.) handouts that parallel power point presentations when used; and c.) opportunities for interaction.
7. Continue to utilize program evaluations from participants and presenters to identify and address implementation concerns.

Long Term Program Development Recommendations

1. Periodically reactivate the Curriculum Advisory Committee to review program curriculum and propose new topics based on a scan of community college system needs.
2. Consider employing a Lead Program Instructor(s) to provide an on-going discussion of how topics interrelate and to provide opportunities for framing upcoming presentations. By facilitating de-briefing discussions between sessions, a Lead Instructor would be in the position to assist participants to reflect on how the session content and strategies could be transferred to their workplaces. As well, such discussions promote large group “bonding” and peer interaction. In terms of content, the goal would be to enhance curriculum coherence and integration.
3. It is recognized that to-date, program presenters have in large part contributed their services as volunteers (although there has been expense reimbursements and in some cases speakers’ fees). Certainly this practice contributes to the cost effectiveness of the program. Nonetheless, under these circumstances, it is difficult to require attendance by presenters at day-long orientations or to require submission of materials and handouts in advance. It may be time to consider the

use of compensated “mini-contracts” with presenters to ensure that key program requirements are met.

4. Continue to explore and provide networking opportunities for both participants and providers. To date, the use of small groups has been tried, and it is recommended that this approach be evaluated to assess whether participants found it beneficial. Based on the study findings, it is clear that participants recognize and highly value the opportunities for professional networking that the program provides. Therefore, attention should be given to enhancing networking activities, such as structuring time for presenters and participants to socialize informally (during evenings, meal times, and special events). Already, ACCCA schedules *Administration 101* reunions as part of the annual conference; other strategies, such as web-based approaches, might be explored.
5. Develop a follow-up Administration 202 program—one that continues and builds upon the foundational program. While no single preference for program formats has clearly emerged based on participant feedback, it is clear that participants are interested in deepening their understanding of topics and enhancing their skills in various areas. It is recommended that program organizers explore approaches for program development and assess audience interest. There are many possibilities for program continuation, such as short term seminars on selected topics, specialized learning opportunities geared for entry, mid-level or senior administrators, and developing partnerships with higher education providers for formalized credit coursework in specific areas.

Because of the volatility of the economic and political climate in the state and the threat of decreasing financial support for programs such as *Administration 101*, it is imperative to continue exploring alternative methods for providing training and professional development to administrators in the field. For instance, partnerships with emerging programs such as Claremont Graduate School's Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) may be promising. The current CCLDI Academy curriculum emphasizes broader leadership frameworks and a national perspective on policy questions. Nonetheless, both programs focus on practitioner learning needs, and organizers may find program directions to be complimentary. Another avenue that merits exploration is the possibility of partnering with a four-year college or university to award formal study credit for *Administration 101* as an incentive for participants and a bridge to continued formal study.

Implications of the Study

At the outset of this research project, it had been anticipated that the study would contribute to a further understanding of administrative development needs in California community colleges. In view of the fact that *Administration 101* was designed and implemented in large part by members of the "collegial profession" of community college administrators, the program reflects practitioner perspectives on what constitutes a baseline curriculum appropriate for California community college administrators. Further, this study contributes to the practitioner-based literature as the evaluation draws from the empirical or examined experiences of California community college administrators in the field. Thus, the study adds to the literature rooted in qualitative

analysis that explores richer definitions of administrative skills/competencies and their applications to actual community college organizations.

Utilizing Townsend's (1997) framework of essential professional competencies—that is, conceptual, technical, contextual, interpersonal communication, integrative and adaptive—it is clear that the *Administration 101* program curriculum emphasizes “real world” applications and competencies essential for administrators who function in the California community college system—the largest of its kind in the world. For instance, the conceptual framework was addressed by Mission and Governance sessions; technical dimensions were addressed in Human Resource, Finance and Budget, and Instruction and Student Services components; interpersonal communication skills were emphasized in sessions dealing with governance and in case studies presented throughout the program; integrative and adaptive professional competencies were strongly in evidence in the Student Retention, Accreditation and Institutional Dynamics presentations. The experiences of *Administration 101* participants and the perspectives of presenters would appear to validate, in a sense, this typology as interpreted and applied by California community college practitioners.

As discussed by Walker and others, the distinction between practicality and theory is not one of rigor or effort but of perspective and emphasis (1981, p. xi). This study contributes to the literature on administrative skills and competencies through its analysis of the effectiveness of a program curriculum that “fleshes out” the managerial competencies essential for effective California community college administrators in such areas as personnel matters, enrollment management, budget development and others. Through the use of expert practitioner presenters, the program demonstrates how

administrative leaders manage dynamic processes and balance needs of stakeholders in order to fulfill community college institutional missions.

Based on program participant experiences, the value is underscored of utilizing role models to exemplify administrative leadership. Recognized experts, such as the president who presented the case study of change at his own institution, effectively demonstrate “risk taking” behaviors. As defined by Hammons and Keller, this is the ability “to make an assessment and take a chance, including the ability to cope with pressure from within and outside the organization (1990, p. 37).” The impact for participants of learning from such a role model constitutes a qualitatively different experience than learning the concept in a theoretical fashion.

This study also adds to the literature of community college leadership development approaches. McCauley (1986) pointed to the value of providing intermittent and limited training programs as one major pathway for facilitating acquisition of administrative skills and competencies. *Administration 101* represents a model for such a training concept, and this study points to the program elements that make it effective. One example is the program’s manageable short term intensive format. Similarly, the program’s emphasis on peer networking shows the impact, as suggested in the literature, of learning from colleagues. *Administration 101* thus offers a viable program model that substantiates selected professional development approaches discussed in the research literature.

Another dimension of *Administration 101* that adds to our understanding of the needs for professional development for California community college administrators is that the program sheds light on emergent leadership issues in California community

colleges. An analysis of the program curriculum highlights such challenges as approaches for developing effective student success models appropriate to the state's diverse student populations, the incorporation of non-traditional, on-line teaching methods and student support systems, the problems of developing long term strategic plans in a state fiscal environment of uncertain and decreased funding, and other decision areas.

Finally, the study offers an example of a formative evaluation research design that is appropriate for conducting research in the field. By describing and analyzing the perspectives of both presenters and participants and triangulating the data and results of the various methods, a picture emerged of *Administration 101*. Conducting an assessment of a dynamic program as it actually takes place poses unique challenges, and this study illustrates approaches for addressing these. Nonetheless, the value of conducting a formative evaluation to provide opportunities for mid-point corrections and in-process modifications in order to strengthen program quality is underscored.

Conclusions

While the study was designed as a formative evaluation rather than a summative study of whether *Administration 101* meets its intended goals and merits continuation, conclusions based primarily on participant feedback suggest answers to summative questions. Based on the results of various data collection activities—primarily the analysis of evaluation questionnaires and the follow-up surveys—it is clear that participants overwhelmingly found the *Administration 101* content to be highly “useful.” Such a finding supports the summative conclusion that *Administration 101* is meeting its goals. As evidenced by the data, the strengths of *Administration 101* were identified as follows:

1. Providing a concrete, applications-oriented program approach to presenting essential content related to California community college administration,
2. Providing recognized leaders and experts in California Community college governance and administration to serve as program presenters,
3. Offering the program in an intensive study format—and at a higher education location such as UCLA,
4. Incorporating networking activities as an integral part of the program experience,
5. Providing excellent and useful resource materials that can be used by participants upon their return to the workplace—especially the *Administration 101* resource notebook.

The one unanimous recommendation that emerged from all focus groups was to design and conduct a follow-up “Administration 202” program. This result leads to the conclusion that the program met the expressed needs of the California community college administrative field for “customized” professional development. Further, results based on the data collection, leads to the inference that the *Administration 101* program as currently structured accomplishes its stated goals for the main part.

Directions for Further Research

The study was designed as an in-process formative study of *Administration 101*. Beyond the implementation-oriented questions examined in this study, the need exists to enlarge the perspective of the evaluation model to determine long term programmatic results. Already, the ACCCA Board has received requests for providing the program in alternative formats such as on-line and modularized one-day seminars. Additionally, the Association has considered publishing the program resource materials as a handbook for

California community college administrators. Thus questions such as the following merit examination:

1. What is the long term value for participants of developing peer networks and contacts with other administrators and leaders (presenters) in the field?
2. How are program materials utilized?
3. What is the value to ACCCA and the California community college community of graduating two cohorts of formally trained administrators? ACCCA may well benefit from the ability to draw from this pool of graduates for volunteers and as appointees to commissions. As well, the State Chancellor's Office may likewise find it beneficial to recruit program graduates to serve on the various statewide system committees and work groups.
4. What actual changes have former participants made in their administrative practices after completing *Administration 101*?

In short, the need exists to carefully assess the benefits—short and long term—of the current program formats and materials as described in this study to analyze the implications of modifying program methods.

Another major question that begs exploration and falls outside the scope of this study is how a follow-up "Administration 202" program should be designed. Both participants and Association members have recommended program development along the lines of a continuation or advanced program. It is evident based on the evaluation results presented in this study that participants appreciate learner-centered approaches and problem-based instruction. Still, no clear consensus as to content or format emerged. To be considered are question of target population, curricular focus, format, and other

fundamental questions. Indeed, one specific question that needs to be addressed is whether *Administration 101* should be a pre-requisite for enrolling in a subsequent program.

As discussed earlier in the section on “Recommendations,” ACCCA may well be at a crossroads in determining the future course of *Administration 101*. The creation of an “Administration 202” is still an open question, and options should be carefully weighed: should ACCCA pursue program development on its own, or do the benefits of establishing partnerships with institutions of higher education offer another alternative? Are there advantages to linkage with CCLDI? Participants may benefit from a program that is affiliated with university-level formal study programs; earning course credit for enrolling in a demanding professional development program such as *Administration 101* would constitute a powerful incentive for potential participants. Nonetheless, there are also advantages for ACCCA in retaining “control” of a program that is shaped predominantly by its constituency of community college administrative practitioners.

As noted by Patton:

Evaluations are useful in ways that go beyond a narrow focus on implementing recommendations or making concrete specific decisions about immediate courses of action. Participation in an evaluation process affects ways of thinking about a program; it can clarify goals, increasing or decreasing particular commitments; and the process can stimulate insights, the consequences of which may not be evident until some time in the distant future (1997, p.324).

Some of the themes that emerged in this study may be useful in the development of the optimal in-service training model sought by administrative practitioners in the field.

Certainly continued research on the best methods and best practices for providing professional development to such a target population is needed.

REFERENCES

- Association of California Community College Administrators [ACCCA} (2000). Administration 101. Curriculum Outline. Sacramento, CA.
- Baker, G.A. (1992). Cultural Leadership: Inside America's Community Colleges. Washington, D.C. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Barnes, C. and Assoc. (1987). "Community College Leadership Programs." In Report of the Joint Committee of the California State University and the California Community Colleges on Leadership Programs. (18p.)
- Bensimon, E.M. (1994). "Understanding Administrative Work." In A.M. Cohen and F.B. Brawer, Managing Community Colleges: A Handbook of Effective Practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Blue, D. (1999). Emergent programs. Report presented on behalf of the Management Development Commission to the Association of California Community College Administrators.
- Bragg, D.D. (2000). "Preparing community college deans to lead change." In D. Robillard, Jr. (ed.), Dimensions of Managing Academic Affairs in the Community College. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 109. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, D.E., & Rodriguez, R.C. (1989). A valid self-appraisal instrument for community college administrators. Community/Junior College Journal, 13, 149-156.
- Bryant, D.W. (1992). New leadership considerations for old realities. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16, 77-84.
- Chancellor's Task Force on California Community College Leadership,. Draft Report. November, 2001. Sacramento, CA.
- Chieffo, A.M. (1992). "Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organization commitment of Community College leadership teams". Community College Review. 19 (2), 15-24.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. (1986). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988). Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

- Drucker, P.F. (1974). Management: tasks, responsibilities, practices. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ebbers, L.J., Callisath, G., Rockel, V. & Cohan, M.N. (2000). The leadership institute for a new century. LINCing women and minorities into tomorrow's community college leadership roles. Community College Journal of Research and Practice. 24, 375-81.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Eisner, P. (1984). Meeting the challenges with new leadership programs. Emerging Roles for Community College Leaders: New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Filan, G. L. (1999). The need for leadership training: The evolution of the Chair Academy. New Directions for Community Colleges. 27. 47-55.
- Fincher, C. (1998). The changing future of academic leadership. University Athens, Institute of Higher Education. Athens, GA.
- Gibson-Benninger, J., Ratcliff, J. & Rhoades, R. (1996). Diversity, discourse and democracy: needed attributes in the next generation of community college leadership programs. In J. C. Palmer & S.G. Katsinas (Eds.), New Directions for Community Colleges Digest (95) 44-62.
- Gillet-Karam, R. (1999). Mid level management in the community colleges: A rose garden? New Directions for Community Colleges. 27. 5-11.
- Glesne, C. (1998). Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Gmelch, W.H. (1994). Five Skills for Department Chairs. Bolton, MA: Anker. Gravalia, B., & Miller, M. (1996). Administrative perspectives on community college leadership. Information Analyses. 3-12.
- Gravalia, B., & Miller, M. (1996). Administrative perspectives on community college leadership. Information Analyses. 3-12.
- Green, M.F. (1988). Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Hammons, J. O., & Keller, L. (1990) Competencies and personal characteristics of future community college presidents. Community College Review. 18 (3), 35-41.

- Hawthorne, E.M. (1994). Leaders in teaching and learning: A profile of chief academic officers in 2-year colleges. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 18, 269-278.
- Heifetz, R.A. (1998). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kanter, M. & Viar, D. (1994). A framework for Change in California community colleges. Position paper of the Community College League.
- Kent, N. (1996). Reflecting the national face of community colleges. Community College Journal 66 (5), 32-36.
- Kerr, C. and Gade, M.L. (1986). The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place and Character. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Laden, B. (1995). "The Role of professional associations in developing academic and administrative leaders." In J. Palmer and S. Katsinas (eds.), Graduate and Continuing Education for Community College Leaders: What It Means Today. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 95. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeCroy, R.J. (1984). "Excellence in the making: The process of becoming a leader." In J.E. Rouche and G.A. Baker (Eds.), Community College Leadership for the 80's. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press,
- Levin, J. (1997). The cultures of the community college. ASHE annual meeting paper. (HE 030 950). Albuquerque, NM: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M. S. & Shufflebeam, D. L. (1983) Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Mayhew, L. (1979). Surveying the Eighties: Strategies and Procedure for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- McCauley, C.D. (1986). "Developmental experiences in managerial work: A literature review." Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership, Technical Report No. 26.
- McDade, S.A. (1987). Higher education leadership: enhancing skills through professional development programs. Report for the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
- Mondy, R.W., Holmes, R.E., & Flipppo, E.P. (1980). Management Concepts and Practices. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

- Murray, J.W., & Hammons, J.O. (1995). Assessing the managerial and leadership ability of community college administrative personnel. Community College Journal of Research and Practices, 19, (3), 207-216.
- O'Rourke, T. G. (1997). Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders. In J.C. Palmer & S.G. Katsinas (Eds.) New Directions for Community Colleges Digest (95) 1-3.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods, 2nd Ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2000). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. In D. L. Shufflebeam, G. F. Madaus & T. Kellaghan (Eds.) Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation (pp. 425-438). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Robles, H. (1998). Leadership in higher education . (JC 990 073).
- Roe, M. A. (1992). "Empowering the leadership team." In G. A. Baker (Ed.) Cultural Leadership: Inside America's Community Colleges. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Rouche, J.E. (1996). Leadership challenges for 2000. Community College Journal. 66 (5) 12-23.\
- Rubin, H.J., I.S. Rubin (1995). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scriven, M. (2000). Evaluation Ideologies. In D. L. Shufflebeam, G. F. Madaus & T. Kellaghan (Eds.) Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation (pp. 249-278). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Seagren, A.T. (1994). Academic leadership in community colleges. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Seagren, A.T., Wheeler, D., Creswell, J., Miller, M. & Van Horn-Gressmeyer, K. (1994). Academic Leadership in Community Colleges. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Shufflebeam, D. I. (2000). The CIPP Model for Evaluation. In D. L. Shufflebeam, G. F. Madaus & T. Kellaghan (Eds.) Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation (pp. 279-318). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In D. L. Shufflebeam, G. F. Madaus & T. Kellaghan (Eds.) Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation (pp. 343-362). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Townsend, B. (1996). Ideal community college academic affairs administrator. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Community College Research. Panama City, FL.
- Townsend, B.K. & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1997). The effective community college academic administrator: Necessary competencies and attitudes. Community College Review, 25 (2), 41-56.
- Vaughn, G.B. (1986). The Community College Presidency. New York: American Council on Education. Macmillan.
- Walker, D.E. (1979). The Effective Administrator. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
ADMINISTRATION 101 COURSE OUTLINE

ACCCA

Management Development Commission: Emerging Programs Committee

ADMINISTRATION 101

Course Outline

1. California Community College Governance

- a. Mission and goals of the California Community Colleges
- b. Governance structure at the State level
 - The role of the Legislature in community college governance
 - Financing higher education
 - State regulations: Education Code/Title 5
 - AB 1725 requirements
 - Minimum qualifications and equivalency
 - Affirmative action hiring regulations
 - Discrimination complaint regulations
 - Minimum standards required by Title 5
 - Board of Governors structure and role
 - State Chancellor's role vis-a-vis the legislature and local districts
- c. Community college governmental relations role vis-a-vis the legislature
- d. Governance structure at the local levels
 - The role of the Board of Trustees in college governance
- e. Consultation/Participatory Governance
 - AB 1725 Requirements, history, and intent
 - State and local level

2. Instruction and Student Services

- a. Mission and goals
 - How we address the mission
- b. The curriculum development process
- c. Distance education
 - Training
 - California Virtual College
 - Relationship to budget and facilities
- d. Enrollment management
 - Interdependency between Instruction and Student Services
 - Managing growth
- e. Matriculation/assessment
- f. Categorical programs and compliance
- g. Full-time equivalent students (FTES)
- h. Credit hours vs. non-credit
- i. Line of sight

- j. Admissions and Records
 - Drop policies
 - 320 Report (How you get that number)
 - Positive attendance
- k. Pertinent legislation
 - Title IX
 - Commission on Athletics, rules and regulations
- l. Student discipline

3. Institutional Dynamics/Strategic Planning and Administrative Roles

- a. The culture and politics of institutions
- b. Multi-college vs. single college structures
 - Multi-college district managers and managing
- c. Technology
 - Tech II Plan
 - Purpose and function of ERPs
 - Implications to budget, facilities, human resources (recruiting and retaining IT personnel)
- d. Community partnerships
- e. Research, assessment, and outcomes
 - Program Review
 - IPEDS/MIS reporting: When, what, why, and where?
 - Student Right to Know/Freedom of Information Act
- f. External agency reporting
 - WASC
 - Board of Registered Nursing
 - Police academies,
 - Etc.

4. Budget

- a. History of funding in the California Community Colleges
- b. Proposition 98
- c. Hard vs. soft money/Restricted vs. Non-restricted
 - Program-Based funding
 - Partnership for Excellence
 - VATEA
 - Chancellor's Office grants
- d. Categories of operation
 - Instruction (Credit)
 - Instructional Services (Credit)
 - Student Services (Credit)
 - Maintenance and Operations

- e. Facilities building Process
 - Scheduled maintenance
 - Capital Outlay projects
- f. Workload measures
- g. 50% Law
- h. Computing FTES/WSCH
 - Positive attendance
 - Census week
 - Daily census
 - Independent study/work experience
- i. Non-credit funding and computation
- j. AB 1725: 75/25 full-time/part-time faculty ratio
 - Plan requirement per Title 5
- k. Budget development/strategic planning and management
 - Budget/finance glossary
 - Budget and accounting manual overview
- l. Audits (internal and external)

5. Human Resources

- a. The recruitment and selection process
 - Faculty and Staff Diversity
 - Post 209
 - Creating diversity: Model programs
- b. Hiring limitations
 - Part-time faculty: 60% rule
 - Classified: 195 day rule
- c. Education Code tenure review regulations: Regular and contract
- d. Education Code retreat rights for administrators
- e. The evaluation process
- f. The progressive discipline process
- g. The grievance process: How to approach
- h. Conflict resolution: The necessary skills
- i. Contract administration
- j. Your role in collective bargaining
- k. Traditional vs. interest based bargaining
- l. Discrimination/sexual harassment
 - Definition
 - complaint handling
- m. ADA
- n. Staff development

6. Skills Implementation

- a. Defining the roles and responsibilities of leaders and managers
 - Your role in participatory governance
 - Your role as a manager in the accreditation process
 - Compliance and accountability
- b. Communicating for Your Institution
 - Meeting and planning techniques
 - Communicating organizational goals
- c. Ethics

Leading through change

- a. The process
 - "Who Moved My Cheese"

Balancing Your Life

APPENDIX B
FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOLS

Administration 101-2002
Participant Interview Protocol

To be conducted during the *Administration 101* Summer 2002 program (July 29-Aug 2)

1. Introduce myself.
2. Explain the purposes of the study.
3. Distribute and collect consent forms. Answer any questions from participants regarding study, project, etc.
4. The following structured, open-ended questions will be posed to initiate interview. Based on participants comments, branch-out, follow-up questions will be used to have participants clarify or elaborate upon their answers:
 - In your estimation, what are the specific strengths and weaknesses of today's topic presentations? (Review each presentation in turn.)
 - What are your overall impressions of the usefulness of content and materials (transferability to your current assignment)?
 - What delivery formats did you prefer (example: power point, guided discussion, case studies, collaborative group work, etc.)? Why or why not?
 - For future Administration 101 programs, do you have any suggestion to add new topics or delete any topics that have been presented?

**Administration 101 Evaluation
Research Consent Form**

1. I understand the purpose of this research is to provide ACCCA with participant feedback about the content, presentation formats and related program activities of *Administration 101*. Results will be used for future program planning and with the goal of enhancing program quality. Data gathered in this study will be compiled and analyzed in a report that will be given to the ACCCA Management Development Commission that oversees *Administration 101*.
2. The study is being conducted as a part of the doctoral dissertation work of the researcher through the University of San Diego.
3. Consent and participation in this project may be withdrawn at anytime during the interview or any other phase of the study.
4. Participation is strictly voluntary; there are no apparent adverse consequences for not participating.
5. An opportunity will be provided to ask questions and receive answers prior to signing this form.
6. Permission is granted to allow for notes of this interview to be used in drafting a report for evaluation of *Administration 101* for ACCCA.
7. The identity of interviewees will remain confidential. For purposes of reporting and data collection, comments will not be attributed to individuals nor will data be included in such a way that respondent identities will be revealed.
8. This consent form constitutes the only agreement.

Signature of Interviewee

Date

Signature of Interviewer

Date

Contact persons:

Cristina Chiriboga, Principal Investigator
cristina.chiriboga@gcccd.net
(619) 660-4226

Dan M. Miller, Professor USD
DanMMiller@aol.com
(619) 260-7444

APPENDIX C
PRESENTER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Administration 101

Presenter Interview Protocol

To be conducted during orientations of presenters prior to summer 2002 *Administration 101* program

1. Introduce myself.
2. Explain the purposes of the study.
3. Distribute and collect consent forms. Answer any questions from presenters regarding the study.
4. The following structured, open-ended questions will be posed to initiate discussions. Based on respondents' comments, branch-out or follow up questions will be used to have participants clarify or elaborate upon their answers:
 - In preparing your presentations, what worked or did not work for you in terms of topic assignments, time allocation, or resource/supports?
 - What challenges did you encounter in presenting the topic to the program participants?
 - Do you have any suggestions for future presenter orientations that would be of assistance in preparing for *Administration 101*?
 - Do you have any recommendations in general to strengthen *Administration 101* in the future (Example: addition or deletion of topics, new presentation activities, referrals of other presenters, etc.?)

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF PROTOCOL

February 6, 2003

Dear *Administration 101* Participant:

Last summer, you participated in ACCCA's *Administration 101* program at the UCLA Sunset Center. ACCCA is still very much committed to continuing the program and building upon the experiences of our participants. To assist us in this effort, I am soliciting your assistance by responding to a very brief, open-ended survey. In addition to using this information to improve the program, I will be using survey results as part of my dissertation research.

Your responses will help program organizers and members of the ACCCA Management Development Commission evaluate the usefulness of the *Administration 101* program. Your input will be of assistance in determining which program topics need to be retained, deleted, or modified in some way. Please be assured that your responses will be kept confidential.

In the attachments, please find two documents: 1) a one-page survey consisting of three items, and 2) a one-page summary of the topics and presenters included in the summer 2002 *Administration 101* program which you may use as a reference in completing the survey form.

The survey may be completed electronically. Please return your survey responses to me by reply e-mail (cristina.chiriboga@gcccd.net) no later than February 21.

If you have any questions about the survey, this research project, or the *Administration 101* program, do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (619) 660-4226 or by e-mail at cristina.chiriboga@gcccd.net.

Sincerely,

Cristina Chiriboga
Vice President, Instruction, Cuyamaca College

ADMINISTRATION 101 – SURVEY TO SUMMER 2002 PARTICIPANTS

To respond to the following questions, please refer to the attached list of Administration 101 topics and presenters. Please use topic numbers in your response to question #1:

1. Please list up to five topics that you found to be of most use in your position as a community college administrator/ staff member.

Please use topic number (see attached list of topics):

2. Do you actively employ any of the strategies or use specific materials presented in *Administration 101* program. Please describe your use.

Yes _____

Describe use: _____

No _____

Why not: _____

3. Do you have any suggestions for new topics for *Administration 101* that you think would be of benefit to community college administrators?

Check One: My current position is in:

Student Services _____ Instruction _____ Human Resources _____
Research & Planning _____ Computer Info/Technical Support Services _____
Business/Fiscal Service _____ Other _____