School of Education Articles

School of Education

2017

Preparing community college leaders to meet tomorrow's challenges

Pamela L. Eddy
College of William and Mary, pamela.eddy@wm.edu

Regina L. Garza Mitchell
Texas State Technical College - Harlingen, regina.garza-mitchell@harlingen.tstc.edu

Recommended Citation

PREPARING COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERS TO MEET TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES

Pamela L. Eddy*	The College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA, USA	pamela.eddy@wm.edu
Regina L. Garza Mitchell	Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA	regina.garzamitchell@wmich.edu

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This article reviews the leadership development literature and posits that a learning centered approach will best support the development of community college leaders. But, it is important to recognize that community colleges have differing needs due to size, location, and the communities they serve.
Background	American community colleges have received a great deal of attention over the last decade as institutions poised to contribute to the education of the workforce and to increase the number of citizens who possess a certificate or degree. Concurrently, community colleges also received attention due to the warnings about a pending presidential leadership crisis in the sector. As more and more sitting leaders retire, the demands of the job increase, and fewer individuals seek out top-level leadership positions, it is important to address how to develop community college leaders.
Contribution	The review of leadership development literature provides the backdrop for creating new programs to develop community college leaders. A multi-faceted approach is required in which succession planning occurs, graduate programs are revamped, and both individuals and organizations engage in the development of community college leaders.
Findings	It is important to recognize that community colleges have differing needs due to size, location, and the communities they serve. Graduate doctoral programs targeting community college leadership and national training programs can help prepare leaders, but they need curricular and program alignment targeting development of authentic leadership and ways to bridge theory with practice. Establishing succession planning can build a robust leadership pipeline that supports networked leadership and nurtures contextual competencies.

| Impact on Society | Understanding better how to prepare leaders to face the challenges now facing community colleges requires questioning current practices and building different leadership development programs. |
| Keywords | community colleges, leadership, leadership development, leaders, networks |

INTRODUCTION

American community colleges are unique institutions in the postsecondary landscape given their multiple missions of access, transfer, workforce development, and community development that are sometimes viewed as conflicting or competing (Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014). Community colleges offer associates degrees as their highest degree (Cohen et al., 2014). These institutions have historically provided terminal degrees, transfer to four-year institutions, occupational education, and economic development for their communities. This broad mission resulted in changes in classification over time. For example, the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/basic.php) now includes a blended category for those institutions offering both associate degrees and baccalaureate degrees. As Meier (2013) concluded, "multiple missions and multiple identities are inherent in the organizational and social design of community colleges" (p. 16). These institutions provide a variety of opportunities for students and their communities, but also for the leaders who guide them.

Preparing leaders in community college settings requires a broad skill set (Nevarez, Wood, & Penrose, 2013). Community colleges have the most diversity in leadership ranks (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012). But the heightened attention of the two-year sector to help meet national objectives (Eddy, 2012a), declining finances (Romano & Palmer, 2016), and increased complexity in managing and leading these institutions present leadership challenges that intensify the demands on preparation of new leaders. For example, a recent study in California highlights how community college presidential tenure is 3.5 years compared to 7 years for 4-year college presidents (Wheelhouse, 2016). Intensified pressures due to increased measures of accountability coupled with decreases in funding make leading these institutions and maintaining their missions both challenging and rewarding.

The Aspen Institute recently convened a task force on the future of the college presidency. Even though the intention of this convening was on the college presidency in general, because of the work of the Aspen Institute on identifying community colleges to receive their prestigious Community College Excellence awards, the findings of this task force serve as a good litmus test for needs in the two-year sector, too. The convening group summarized three key areas of foci needing the attention of college presidents, namely, (1) ensuring access and success for all students, (2) balancing student learning needs with institutional resources, declining public support, a focus on research, and economic development, and (3) advocating for the historic value of higher education as both a public and private good, especially in a time of increasing public skepticism (Aspen Institute, 2017, p. ii). Against this backdrop of leadership demands, the need for leadership development becomes more pressing.

There are about 1100 community colleges in America today (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2017), and leading these complex institutions is an important task. Calls of a leadership crisis in community colleges were first sounded in 2001 by the American Association of Community Colleges (Shults, 2001). At that time, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Leadership Survey indicated that half of presidents expected to retire within six years and that large numbers of chief academic officers faculty were also expected to retire, creating a potential void in the traditional leadership pipeline (Shults, 2001). These predictions abated to an extent due to the great recession of 2007-2009 as many sitting leaders delayed retirement when many of their personal retirement plans took a hit (TIAA-CREF, 2010). Yet, the most recent AACC report showed that a staggering 80% of college chief executive officers (CEOs) plan to retire within 10 years (Phil-

lipe, 2016). This number is consistent with the 2012 report that showed 75% of CEOs planned to retire within 10 years, with another 15% intending to retire within 11-15 years (Tekle, 2013). The average age for sitting community college presidents was 60 in both 2011 and 2016 (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012; Gagliardi, Espinosa, Turk, & Taylor, 2017), which means that the potential still exists for a mass turnover in leadership positions.

Although there are a number of pathways to the position of president, historically, the majority of community college presidents took a traditional trek that starts with a faculty position and rises through the ranks to the presidency (Amey, VanDerLinden, & Brown, 2002). The most recent pathway data indicated that under half (42%) of community college presidents served in the chief academic officer position prior to moving up to their current position and another 30% had been presidents at other institutions; of those presidents, 80% had teaching experience (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Thus, the intervening decade between these studies shows that the pathway to the corner office has not changed appreciably, though a growing number (17%) of presidents served in other executive positions and 11% came from outside of higher education (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Complicating discussions about the pathway to the top leadership position is the fact that half of those filling the chief academic officer position indicate a lack of desire to seek a presidency (Eckel, Cook, & King, 2009). The emerging picture is that of an aging leadership cadre at all levels and the beginning of a change in the traditional pathway to top-level positions. Rather than casting this scenario as a leadership crisis, we argue that the time is ripe to construct opportunities to cultivate a new group of leaders, and this occasion requires attention to revamping traditional leadership development programs and promotion processes.

Much has been written on what is needed to lead tomorrow's community colleges. Volumes point out the need for leaders to be multidimensional (Eddy, 2010), ethical (Hellmich, 2007; Hornak & Garza Mitchell, 2016; Wood & Nevarez, 2014), transformational (Boggs & McPhail, 2016), and adept at leading change (Kezar, 2014; Kotter, 2014). Developing tomorrow's leaders, however, requires an unconventional approach (Eddy, Sydow, Alfred, & Garza Mitchell, 2015). We argue that networked leadership builds on the capacity of a range of talent within the college, including mid-level leaders (Eddy, Garza Mitchell, & Amey, 2016).

Through an examination of the literature, we argue that several key points must be addressed by new leaders, and in turn what is required to develop these leaders. First, we review the current context of the two-year sector. Next, a review of the literature highlights what research and sitting leaders indicate is important for tomorrow's leaders. Finally, we offer some suggestions for the type of programming required to best prepare future leaders.

BACKGROUND ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT LITERATURE

Although they have been in existence for more than 100 years, community colleges are relatively young institutions, with the majority founded during the boom time of the 1960s (Cohen et al., 2014). From a curricular perspective, community colleges were originally intended to provide the first two years of postsecondary education (Kasper, 2002). They also provided "terminal education" (Eells, 1941), an alternative to transfer to four-year colleges that prepared students to enter the workforce. The vocational mission took hold and eventually expanded to include both credit- and non-credit bearing workforce development (Cohen et al., 2014). Throughout the 20th century, community colleges consistently functioned as low-cost, open-access institutions with democratic ideals that provide educational opportunity to everyone regardless of preparation, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, or gender. Although they have evolved to serve multiple missions, community colleges are driven by deeply democratic impulses that guide their missions (Mellow & Heelan, 2015) and, ultimately, their leadership (Boggs & McPhail, 2016; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Over time the purposes of community colleges have changed, requiring changes in approaches to leadership.

Mirroring this evolution of the community college over time is attention to leadership development in general (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). Day (2000) makes the distinction between developing leaders and developing leadership. The former focuses on individuals, whereas leadership development focuses on the process of developing skills and expertise, and may include multiple people. Therefore, central to leadership development is recognition that development is a process, takes place over time, and builds on individuals' previous experiences (Day et al., 2014). Becoming an expert takes time and practice, thus leadership development in community colleges must attend to the pipeline when contemplating preparing tomorrow's leaders.

In 2005 the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) presented their *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, which specified six broad competencies to use as a framework for leadership development. The competencies were revised and updated in 2013, providing illustrations of what each competency may look like at different stages of leadership development (emerging leaders, new CEOs within their first three years, new CEOs in their positions for more than three years). A guiding principle in both versions of the competencies was the premise that most leadership characteristics can be learned (AACC, 2005, 2013), which was reflected by the task orientation of the competencies provided. The second edition competencies included organizational strategy; institutional finance, research, fundraising, and resource management; communication; collaboration; and community college advocacy (AACC, 2013). These competencies reflect the changing environment and a change in leadership from being primarily internally focused to now becoming more externally oriented and responsive to external demands (McNair, 2010).

Competency checklists provide a convenient heuristic device, but Carroll, Levy, and Richmond (2008) argued that competency lists can serve to restrain leadership thinking. Instead, these authors argued that investigating leadership practice as discourse and the corresponding development of leadership identity provides more robust means to prepare leaders. Thus, while the AACC competencies provide a baseline for learning about the duties of leadership in a community college that are easily taught in leadership programs, they do not adequately address the concepts of what it means to be a leader or what it means to lead a community college. Pointedly, community colleges are adaptive institutions, but also operate as paradoxical organizations.

Alfred and Sydow (2013) describe a "condition of paradox" (p. 48) that adds to the complexity of leading community colleges. The overarching state of paradox is a desire and need to increase access, provide more and better services, and improve outcomes with fewer resources and decreased funding. In essence, leaders are attempting to move forward while confined to organizational structures that do not align with the college's needs and expectations (Alfred & Sydow, 2013; Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015; Eddy et al., 2015; McPhail, 2013). These tensions also arise from the multiple and sometimes contradictory institutional missions, as community colleges have been accused of attempting to be all things to all people (Vaughan, 2004). Alfred and Sydow (2013) identified four main areas of paradox impacting community college leadership: growth and reduction, abundance and scarcity, continuity and change, and access and completion. In their view, leaders shape the future through the decisions that they make around these contradictory states. "Leaders can choose to resolve the paradox by easing the tension between contradictory states, sustain it by permitting the contradiction to exist, or amplify it by resourcing opposing states" (Alfred & Sydow, 2013, p. 48). These paradoxes encompass external driving forces, structural elements, and the mindsets of people within and outside of the colleges. Thus in order to successfully lead a community college, leaders must not only be aware of these paradoxes, but must also be comfortable working within them.

To achieve the type of transformational change demanded today, leaders cannot merely overlay traditional approaches to leadership to current contexts. Instead, leaders at all levels must first transform their own notions of leading before being able to lead transformation change (Anderson & Anderson, 2010; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). Amey (2013) viewed community college leadership through individual and organizational perspectives. She suggested that moving beyond traditional management-based theories of leadership and focusing on cognition, emotional intelligence, change,

and other theories may "reflect more accurately the gender, race, and ethnic changes in community college leaders, and they offer alternative understandings through which leaders can effectively shape the directions of community colleges" (p. 135). Using these approaches and others, such as appreciative inquiry, may also assist in maintaining a sense of institutional memory and mission interpretation during leadership transitions (Royer & Latz, 2016). The majority of literature on community college leadership presents leaders from a limited perspective, primarily that of a White male hero leader with formal autocratic and bureaucratic authority (Amey, 2013). Although more inclusive leadership theories have emerged over the years, the primary image of a strong male leader remains the same (Amey, 2013; Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006; Wilson & Cox, 2012).

Cognitive approaches to leadership present leaders as learners, a more contemporary approach that would open the doors for more and different types of leaders. These approaches focus on individually-oriented leadership theories such as cognition, sensemaking, emotional intelligence, and intercultural competence with the goal of developing understanding across individual and cultural approaches that may differ from that of the traditional leader (Amey, 2013). Critical here is how individuals begin forming a leadership identity. Carroll and Levy (2010) argued how leadership development could be understood differently by participants and, therefore, influence the social construction of participants' leadership identities. Pointedly, the authors identified three responses or means of sensemaking for participants in leadership development programs: "reframing (assimilation), recursivity (complementarity), and polyphronic dialogue (rejection)" (p. 222). On the one hand, the assimilation of constructs of leadership portrayed in development programs aligns more with historic conceptions of leadership in which individuals adopted traditional forms of leading, whereas recursivity allows individuals to make sense of new ideas that complement their existing ideals of leadership identity by filtering the new learning in ways that make sense for the individual. The notion of polyphronic dialogue, on the other hand, keeps individual agency at the center and provides a means to test drive the new ideas first before accepting them and, because of the focus on dialogue, is more dependent on relational interactions in which the role of context and others takes on heightened importance. The conclusion here is that individuals participating in leadership development programs are making sense of their new learning through the actual practice of leadership and based on individual experiences and understanding of what it means to be a leader.

The complex environment in which community colleges operate requires leaders who are able to take risks, learn from mistakes, and identify areas of opportunity, while mediating tensions within the institution (Amey, 2005, 2013; Eddy et al., 2015; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Heifitz, 2004). Cognitive approaches to leadership move beyond mere problem-solving and management to focus on how leaders think about the role of leadership, the different ways in which leaders view problems, and the ways in which issues, challenges, and decisions may be understood by others in the organization. Although the focus is primarily on how leaders view things differently, leaders must take into account how others view things differently as well (Amey, 2013). Self-reflection is a necessary and important component of leadership from a cognitive perspective. Leaders must take the time for reflection on their own views of leadership, events that occur, how they addressed those events, and how they will address issues in the future (Day et al., 2014). Leading this way takes more time and involves another aspect of paradox, the ongoing negotiation between innovation and traditional thinking (Amey, 2005). In today's environment, rapid response and quick action is desired, but Amey (2013) argues that taking the time for this type of cognitive leadership allows for stronger outcomes because similar understandings of issues and opportunities will be developed among leaders and others in the college. This type of leadership will also lead to the development of understanding across individual and cultural approaches that may differ from that of sitting leaders. In Amey's (2013) view, culture encompasses differences in gender, socioeconomic, social identity, organizational types, technologies, global settings, in addition to race and ethnicity. Incorporating different cultural approaches requires leaders to utilize different leadership strategies that move beyond theoretical ideas to actual inclusive practices.

In addition to cognitive approaches, Amey (2013) argued that a broader approach to understanding leadership must include organizational development research and chaos theory. In particular, these perspectives provide tools to address the complexity of operating today's community colleges better. Given the influence of the external environment on college operations, leaders must be more adaptive and proactive regarding change (Heifetz, 2004). Change in this sense refers to the deep transformation of institutional vison and values that provide opportunity, innovation, and new initiatives that move the college forward (Amey, 2013). It is no longer sufficient for leaders to create small, incremental changes that leave core structures and viewpoints intact. Rather, there is a need for deep transformative change in order to adequately address the turbulent landscape. Leaders must have a good understanding of the organizational context (Amey, 2013; Eddy et al., 2015) and how others make sense of change (Eddy, 2003, 2010) in order to lead transformative change. Leadership throughout the college is required to undertake these types of organizational changes. Further, top-level leaders must focus on building networks both internally and with external stakeholders to address the type of challenges facing community colleges (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

Other than top-level leaders, the historic focus guiding leadership development was on the internal roles of leaders. However, the current environmental context requires all leaders to be adept at working with external stakeholders (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Nevarez et al., 2013). We argue that leadership development must focus on developing leadership skills that move beyond collaboration and short-term partnerships and instead towards fostering networks. Developing a networked approach to leadership will help leaders navigate complex environments (Eddy et al., 2015). Inherent in these burgeoning networks is a reliance on sensemaking and boundary-spanning throughout the college, not just at the top levels. Sensemaking helps all leaders frame understanding of complex change for others and supports buy-in (Kezar, 2014). Boundary-spanning roles generate connections between departments and units on campus and with external partners. The notion of networked leadership builds on the relationships leaders develop over time with a range of stakeholder groups.

Ongoing collaboration is a necessary element of networked leadership. Networked leadership aligns with cognitive approaches to leadership that focus on how leaders think. Here, leaders learn from their interactions with others and by reflecting on the outcomes of collaborative efforts. Importantly, networked leadership requires changing historic definitions of leadership and how organizations are structured. Traditional top-down, hierarchical structures limit building networks. Instead, organizational structures need to switch to a matrix format (McPhail, 2013) that is more flexible than traditional leadership reporting structures. In the matrix approach, people within the organization share power through both vertical and horizontal chains of command (McPhail, 2013). These multidirectional relationships mean that power associated with leadership must also be conceived differently. Heimans and Timms (2014) refer to old power and new power structures. Old power flows through a hierarchical format with top-level leaders in control, whereas new power is conceived as more fluid and accessible to others throughout the college. Instead of viewing power as a scarce and limited commodity, new power structures expand leadership influence to others throughout the institution.

Leading within networks is not as neat or easy as traditional leadership approaches. When more people are involved, the time needed to communicate and make decisions may increase. However, taking the time for these approaches will also result in substantive, long-term results (Amey, 2013). The turnover of leaders in community colleges can create barriers to building sustainable relationships. However, distributing leadership through organizational networks ensures that people in the mid- and lower-levels, who tend to remain longer in their positions (Baldwin, DeZure, Shaw, & Moretto, 2008), will help create a critical core leaders even when those at the top transition. Rethinking leadership development to focus on networked leadership requires a redesign of organizational architecture (Eddy et al., 2015; McPhail, 2013) and approaches to developing tomorrow's leaders.

HOW TO DEVELOP TOMORROW'S LEADERS

Developing tomorrow's leaders requires a multi-front approach. First, it is important for institutional fit to occur, with leaders matching the type of needs facing the college (Eddy, 2010). Second, the ways in which leaders learn new skills and practice leading requires attention to succession planning, which is not the norm for higher education (Bornstein, 2010). Third, graduate programs need to be revamped to provide opportunities for leaders to apply theory to practice and to deal will the real problems facing institutions. Finally, both organizations and individuals must take responsibility in training leaders.

COMPETENCIES, FIT, AND SUCCESSION PLANNING

When the AACC competencies were first unveiled in 2005, they provided an outline for the key areas of leadership work in community colleges. The six competencies (organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, professionalism) helped to focus attention on the main aspects of leading a college. The update to these competencies in 2013 acknowledged the need to address how leadership occurs at multiple levels in the institution, and included three delineations of the degree of competencies for emerging, new, and continuing leaders. In each of these phases, leaders can anticipate applying the competencies in differing ways ranging from acquisition of new skills to competency and confidence in a skill area. The passing of a decade between the updates for the AACC competencies recognized the need to address leadership development throughout the institution and the changing reality of community college operations in an increasingly resource poor environment.

Duree and Ebbers (2012) studied the AACC competencies from the perspective of sitting presidents. Their participants noted they were prepared for developing institutional plans, but not for oversight of fiscal operations. Sitting presidents remarked that their communication skills were ready for the top-level position, but that developing collaborations, in particular regarding cultural competencies were lacking. Looking at Chief Academic Officers (CAO) and the AACC competencies highlights similar results regarding their confidence and competencies, with CAOs noting communication and organizational strategy as the most important of the leadership competencies and professionalism and resource management as lower ranked (Price, 2012). Other research on the AACC competencies found rural leaders needing more development in resource development and organizational strategy (Eddy, 2013). The clear emerging pattern is that the competencies are important for leadership, but that leaders do not feel fully prepared in each of the competency arenas when they reach top-level leadership positions (McNair, 2010). Understanding more about leadership development is key for the future, and how leaders gain skills in leadership matters (Fulton-Calkins, & Milling, 2005).

Institutional fit for leaders has long been acknowledged in the literature (Bess & Dee, 2008), but increasingly the relevance of culture and contextual competencies have emerged (Eddy, 2012b; Tierney, 1988). How leadership ties to the culture and system of the community college builds on the notion of individual characteristics, leader schema, and leader affect (Bess & Dee, 2008). Eddy (2012b) argued that contextual competency links to leaders' past experiences and that the competencies necessary are not discrete, rather clustered. Contextual competency refers to the understanding of college culture and the context of what is valued (Eddy, 2012b). In this case, a set of holistic competencies emerge from the listings created by the AACC (2005, 2013), which include attention to the bottom line, systems thinking, inclusivity, and framing meaning. Leaders use their contextual competency to judge the best fit for the institution's current situation. This multi-perspective view develops for individuals over time (Neumann & Bensimon, 1990). Yet, a critique of the notion of fit is that the concept merely reifies hegemonic norms of who can or should be a leader (Tooms, Lugg, & Bogotch, 2010).

Obtaining a good leader-institution fit proves necessary for organizational effectiveness (Bess & Dee, 2008). As institutions and their boards look forward, it is critical to contemplate succession planning

and to contemplate how the transfer of institutional knowledge occurs (Bornstein, 2010; Grossman, 2014; Royer & Latz, 2016; Wallin, Cameron, & Sharples, 2005). Succession planning is more common in business (Conger & Fulmer, 2003; Mahler & Drotter, 1986), and less frequently observed in higher education (Long, Johnson, Faught, & Street, 2013). Succession planning can run the gamut of developing the talents of all employees to provide preparation when opportunities for advancement occur to a more targeted identification of a small pool of individuals to ascend to top-level positions. Given the espoused meritocracy of higher education, and the large number of public universities and colleges, this latter option is less viable. One strategy that can be employed in preparing future leaders is exposure to new skill sets through job rotations or administrative internships, for example. McMaster (2012) recommended a set of best practices regarding succession planning for community colleges based on a comprehensive review of the literature; these practices include:

- Incorporating succession planning into strategic planning and performance reviews
- Offering leadership education and leadership opportunities for potential leaders
- Mentoring potential leaders
- Creating more mid-level leadership positions
- Sharing decision making throughout the institution.

Deliberately including women and leaders of color is critical to succession planning (Wise, 2013) and provides an opportunity to move away from the longstanding notion of who is a leader (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006).

Higher education in general has been slow in thinking about succession planning. As the competencies required to lead community colleges expand, it is important to identify how best to prepare leaders throughout the institution. Professional development should focus on providing individuals responsibilities that are a challenging stretch to push their learning about leadership (Day et al., 2014). These opportunities may include work on task forces or committees (Garza Mitchell & Eddy, 2008; Price, 2012). Borrowing practices from business include strategies for developing new talent that use a variety of development techniques and advocating for casting a wide net of participants to tap for development programs (Fulmer, Stumpf, & Bleak, 2009). Including more in the pipeline for leadership development builds a stronger leadership network within the college.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Early support in the 1960s by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation jumpstarted specialized graduate programming for community college leadership. Today, the majority (70%) of community college presidents have a degree in education or higher education (Gagliardi et al., 2017), thus these programs provide a critical leadership development opportunity for those not able to attend a national program or for those at institutions without a Grow-Your-Own leadership program (Friedel, 2010). McNair (2010) highlighted how doctoral programs could develop the AACC competencies for community college leaders via their curriculum and program, thereby creating a tighter link between desired and espoused leadership competencies and learning opportunities in graduate programs. Universities also provide leadership programming beyond degree programs, though these training programs may also serve as an onramp to a doctoral degree program too.

In a study of perceptions of students enrolled in community college doctoral programs, Romano, Townsend, and Mamiseishvilli (2009) found that the majority of the survey participants were part-time (60.7%) with about half enrolled in Ph.D. programs (56.2%) relative to Ed.D. programs (42.5%). A slight majority (52.9%) indicated they had enrolled to qualify for an administrative/leadership position, whereas 22.9% were doing the degree for personal learning. The top influences on the participants' learning were their work in a community college (79.7%), classroom experiences and discussions with professors (62.7%), and reading connected to doctoral classes (56.2%). Critically, only half of the participants knew about the AACC competencies (51.7%) even though all of their doctoral programs had a leadership class. This finding makes the influence of the AACC

competencies on practice questionable, despite the focus on this listing as a means to develop future leaders. Understanding who enrolls in graduate doctoral programs for community college leadership is an important starting point to analyzing how they perceive these programs fulfilling their learning needs.

Research on the effectiveness of community college leadership training programs has received scant attention (Forthun & Freeman, 2017; Hull & Keim, 2007; Kirkland, 2016; Reille & Kezar, 2010). However, Brown, Martinez, and Daniel (2002) questioned graduates of community college doctoral programs (sample size 131) about their perceptions regarding preparation of a list of leadership skills. Respondents indicated that a full 31 of the 48 skills identified by the authors were underemphasized in their doctoral program. Further, only three of the respondents' top 10 skills for leaders were included in their doctoral curriculum. With similar intentions, Hammons and Miller (2006) surveyed 400 sitting presidents to ask about their assessment of doctoral preparation programs and found that a stronger connection to practice and real-world cases applications was desired. Their findings highlight that the leaders who participated in the survey perceived that the preparation programs were doing a good job, but that improvements could be made. In particular, graduate program faculty should be well versed in the context of community colleges and the program's curriculum should address new and emerging ideas. Yet, given the small number of community college-specific doctoral programs, it is important for more generalist programs to expose aspiring leaders to community colleges and their associated issues. Educating practitioners and future leaders requires a focus on real-world cases and opportunities for authentic learning.

Understanding the intentions of graduate programs was the focus of Amey's (2006) investigation into six university-based development programs. She found that the degree-based programs target mid- to upper-level administrators and use a cohort model for course delivery. Central to the success of these programs was a champion or small group of faculty, thus raising concerns regarding sustainability of these special degree offerings. A focus on practice was central in these programs, but at the time the specific AACC competencies were not incorporated into these programs' curricula. Even though a direct link does not exist between the respondents to Brown et al.'s (2002) study, Hammons and Miller's (2006) research, and the university programs studied by Amey (2006), it is apparent that a disconnection exists regarding the usefulness of graduate programs as sites for leadership development. On the one hand, Amey (2006) found an emphasis on links to practice in the university programs, whereas on the other hand, when graduates are queried about their experiences they are unequivocal in their conclusion that a mismatch exists between their needs and the program's curricula. This disconnection in perceptions may merely be one of degree (i.e., students desiring more practically based graduate programs) versus a total absence of applied research.

There are a number of doctoral programs with a focus on community college leadership (see http://www.cscconline.org/home/graduate-programs/). Yet, aspiring community college leaders often take part in doctoral programs not specifically focused on community college leadership, so students may not be exposed to applying what they are learning within a community college context. Programs offering a doctorate of education often focus on skills-based courses and are offered at regional universities, which provide increased access to individuals in more remote areas (Eddy & Rao, 2009; Friedel, 2010). Regardless of the degree type or focus, curriculum proves critical to preparation for future leaders and is a focus of the Carnegie project on the education doctorate (Perry, 2015).

University graduate programs often work in concert with state-wide community college associations to offer leadership academies for professional development. For example, the University of Alabama (see http://training.ua.edu/academy/index.php) offers a leadership academy outside of its graduate program options. This type of university based program provides an opportunity to match theory to practice and build professional networks. The use of reflective practice in graduate programs can begin to link theory to practice and create the habit of reflection among leaders (Sullivan & Palmer, 2014). As well, faculty and university professionals also work with individual community colleges or

system offices to build Grow-Your-Own (Jeandron, 2006) programming that can provide customized doctoral programming (Luna, 2010). When these programs focus on authentic learning (Herrington, 2006), they can bridge the theory to practice gap often found in graduate programs as noted above.

In contemplating what skill sets are required for today's community college leaders, it is important to provide leadership development that focuses on the ability to synthesize volumes of data and to deal with complex environments, like the ones community colleges now face. The ability to use multiple frames of reference to view problems can be learned in graduate programs and enhanced over time, and with experience (Day et al., 2014; Neumann & Bensimon, 1990). Aspiring leaders need exposure to and practice in dealing with today's complex problems (Rieckmann, 2012). True to the AACC competencies (2013), all leaders must learn how to communicate and frame solutions to issues facing their institutions (Eddy, 2010), learn how to deal with conflict, and how to take risks (Eddy et al., 2015). Without risk, and the accompanying failures, growth does not occur. Graduate programs provide a safe space to learn and practice new strategies, especially when they utilize case studies to provide real-life examples (Nevarez et al., 2013).

ORGANIZATIONAL PROGRAMS

As institutions and state systems look to create leadership development programs, it is important to consider what types of structures contribute the most to preparation and result in increased inclusion in leadership ranks. One study (Robinson, 2016) found that versatility in learner approaches translated to a wider range of leadership styles in practice. Knowing this, development programs should attend to matching learner styles with leadership training and move beyond singular models of leadership behaviors.

Several national associations have leadership development programs in place, some of which target aspiring leaders, mid-level leaders, or women leaders. As noted above, the AACC (2013) created a set of competencies to help prepare future leaders. The association offers a series of pre-conference workshops for the annual convention that incorporate these competencies. For example, a set of sessions are designed for new CEOs, another for aspiring leaders, and yet another for women and leaders of color. Special conference sessions also help leaders practice working with media and supporting transformational change. In addition to these conference associated sessions, the AACC offers a set of institutes. These institutes include the AACC John E. Roueche Future Leaders Institute (Roueche-FLI), the AACC Future Presidents Institute (FPI), and the Presidents Academy Summer Institute (see http://www.aacc.nche.edu/newsevents/Events/leadershipsuite/Pages/default.aspx). These summer programs provide a means for aspiring and current leaders to learn more about leading, typically in a structure that draws heavily on leaders in the field providing the training. Likewise, the League for Innovation in Community Colleges offers an Executive Leadership Institute that is aligned with the AACC Roueche-FLI. The League's seminar provides an alternative timing of December for its session, thus providing options for training at different times.

A number of the affiliated councils of the AACC also provide specialized leadership development programming. For example, the National Community College Hispanic Council hosts an annual leadership symposium and has a Leadership Fellows Program that provides a year-long program for aspiring leaders. This program boasts that 20 of the original 72 fellows are now serving as presidents, and several others have been promoted. A focused leadership development program for women is provided by the AACC council of the American Association of Women in Community Colleges. Likewise, the National Council on Black American Affairs, another council of the AACC, hosts a Leadership Development Institute for African American Midlevel Administrators. All of these national programs are hosted in major cities around the nation, which is likely intended to make the programs more accessible. However, the reality of budgets, particularly in smaller, rural colleges, may preclude some aspiring leaders from participating.

In 2016, the Aspen Institute started its Presidential Fellowship for Community College Excellence. This program is aligned with Stanford University's Excellence Leadership Initiative and centers on three main themes: leading for impact, leading transformational change, and partnering for collective action. Pointedly, the program highlights how the fellows look different from sitting presidents as 68% of the fellows are women (versus 36% of sitting presidents) and 35% are people of color (versus 20% of sitting presidents). In the group of 2017 fellows (29), only four (13%) do not already possess a doctorate or advanced degree, underscoring the continued need for an advanced degree as the currency for community college leadership.

Due to the expense of many of the national programs, Grow-Your-Own (GYO) programs are prevalent. These programs allow for the ability to train larger numbers of aspiring leaders and do not limit participation to only those seeking presidencies. A comprehensive listing of these programs does not exist, but the AACC highlights four programs located at community colleges across the country (see http://www.aacc21stcenturycenter.org/resources/resources_growyourownprograms/). Additional programs beyond those highlighted by the AACC include, San Diego Community College District which offers a series of academies for current and new managers, for supervisors, and for classified staff, and the Michigan Community College Association started a Leadership Academy that is open to mid- and senior-level administrators who may want to move up (http://www.mcca.org/content.cfm?ID=169). This broad based approach assures for a stronger talent pipeline in institutions and underscores how critical networked leadership is for increased effectiveness.

Bresso (2012) evaluated a Grow-Your-Own (GYO) community college leadership program and found that the participants experienced individual growth in their leadership skills. Pointedly, using Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory as a conceptual framework, she found that experiential learning was enhanced due to the interactions of self, workplace, organization, and macro-environment). These findings underscore how leveraging adult learning theory in GYO programs can result in greater development of participants. What is important in overall contribution of GYO programs to preparing tomorrow's community college leaders is the process for participant selection and the type of topics reviewed in these in-house development training sessions.

Given the track record of business in succession planning, it is helpful to contemplate what elements are most useful to include in GYO leadership development programs. Fulmer and colleagues (2009) outlined a set of strategies to develop high potential leaders that included:

- Build a set of specialized leadership tracks
- Utilize stretch assignments to develop new skill sets
- Provide specialized learning opportunities for training
- Leverage technology to create individualized developmental plans
- Engage in authentic learning opportunities
- Provide coaching/mentoring

Opening the pipeline for participation is critical to assuring that community colleges tap into the depth of talent available to help address the unique problems two-year colleges face.

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The AACC competencies (2013) provide a general roadmap for emerging and mid-level leaders regarding the types of skills needed for advancement. As noted above in succession planning, the creation of individual development plans is one means to begin planning for career advancement and leadership development. These plans can be created by individuals versus supervisors, and as individuals contemplate the type of experiences to acquire, it is important to consider stretch assignments, participation on task forces and committees, and other forms of on-the-job learning opportunities. These experiences should in particular focus on resource management and networking

skills. To date, the acquisition of a terminal degree is the basic requirement for advancement into top-level positions, and increasingly a requirement for other senior leadership openings, such as Chief Academic Officer (Forthun & Freeman, 2017).

As individuals acquire social capital through their work with others (Coleman, 1990), they begin to expand their network. In our increasingly connected world, it is important to build links to not only an array of individuals within the college, but also with external stakeholders. Serving on statewide committees, working on accreditation teams, or taking on leadership responsibilities in professional organizations all begin to expand an individual's network. This type of self-leadership relies on individuals to take a central role in their own development (Hardy, 2004/2005). What is especially clear in developing effective leadership is the need to get out of the silos created in institutions of higher education. Working on cross-unit teams helps in obtaining transferable skills, but also contributes to understanding more fully the work of the college.

Individuals within the college can begin to increase their agency and their learning about leadership by saying "yes" to opportunities. Even without formal internal grow-your-own leadership programs, aspiring leaders can build their competencies by engaging in work that pushes their thinking, exposes them to additional stakeholders of the college, and provides them with a chance to test-drive leadership. On the one hand, individuals can volunteer for these type opportunities, or, on the other hand, savvy senior leaders can tap others in recognition of the leadership they are providing in their current positions. Important in this work for stepping up is the need to consider how individuals have been marginalized in the past due to race, ethnicity, or gender. Sandberg (2013) argues that women in particular hold back from opportunities until they feel over-prepared or they opt out based on concerns of what might occur that challenges the delicate work-life balance they are trying to maintain. Likewise, some selective leadership development programs serve to reify hegemonic norms and are not broadly inclusive. To improve inclusivity in leadership ranks, it is important to recognize the talent of all employees and to open up development opportunities to all who are interested.

LOOKING FORWARD

The demands on leaders of community colleges are increasing as calls for accountability build, funding decreases, student demographics change, and employer's demand more from new hires. Corresponding to this shifting context are changes in views of leadership. As noted in the section on the background on leadership development literature, notions of hero leaders must be challenged, as the reality of leading today's complex organizations requires a more networked leadership approach (Eddy et al., 2015). To meet these leadership demands, it is imperative to rethink community college leadership development. These calls for change are not new (Eddy, 2009), but heighten uncertainty created as a result of the Great Recession (2007-2009) and the subsequent decline in community college enrollments (Romano & Palmer, 2016) have increased urgency for change (Aspen Institute, 2017; Kotter, 2014). The time is ripe to reevaluate the leadership development process for aspiring community college leaders.

We have argued in this review that new approaches to leading are emerging that call for leadership throughout the college (Eddy et al., 2016) and a networked approach to leadership (Eddy et al., 2015). In the review of current leadership development options, we traced how leadership competencies emerged (AACC, 2005, 2013), but noted that these skills lists fall short (Carroll et al., 2008; Duree & Ebbers, 2012). Instead, professional development for individuals should provide opportunities for individuals to stretch their roles and responsibilities as a process to learn how to lead (Day, 2000; Day et al., 2014; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). Aspiring leaders need to develop their contextual competency (Eddy, 2012b) via environmental scans, learning about the institution's culture, developing a management dashboard to guide decisions, and understanding the national landscape (Fowler, 2013). Likewise, graduate programs should reevaluate doctoral programs targeting community college leaders so that opportunities for practice and application of theory to real-world cases become central within curricula (Friedel, 2010; Hammons & Miller, 2006).

In their report on the college presidency, the Aspen Institute (2017) identified three areas of foci for preparing leaders of American institutions of higher education. The taskforce on this project used guiding questions to determine these outcomes as they sought to understand what enduring qualities of the presidency should remain, what new qualities were required of leaders, and what would best support the development of new leaders. The report concluded that to address the leadership demands in higher education, the focus should be on (1) expanding and improving professional development and peer learning opportunities for new and veteran presidents, (2) providing boards with greater and more integrated assistance to set institutional goals and to hire, support, and work with presidents, and (3) advancing new and expanded ways to identify and develop a diverse presidential talent pool (pp. iii-iv). Even though the focus of the work by the Aspen Institute was on the college presidency, the same needs exist for developing leadership talent throughout the institution. Onboarding of individuals to their new leadership position was noted as particularly important in the Aspen report.

To accomplish this range of change, we posit that four central changes in leadership development should occur in community colleges. First, it is important to recognize and address the diversity of needs in the nation's community college sector. Colleges range in size from 500 to over 30,000, and as a result, have varying needs for leaders. Thus, developing contextual competency is critical for success (Eddy, 2012b) as this leadership ability enables individuals' flexibility to align needed change within the college to the college context. One-sized solutions do not work. Further, recognizing the diversity aspiring leaders represent can help in refining leadership development programming given the different background experiences of those in the leadership pipeline (Day et al., 2014). Second, a learning-centered approach is needed in leadership development programs (AACC, 2013; Amey, 2013). Here, individuals must embrace the idea of lifelong learning, and organizers of training programs must recognize how adults learn best. Third, graduate programs targeting community college leadership need curricular and program alignment that matches the needs of leaders the requirements of community colleges. These changes to doctoral programs should aim to increase the application of course content to leadership practices needed on the job. Advanced degrees are still the pre-requisite for leadership positions, but increasingly alternative forms of credentialing via badges, previous experiences, and hiring outside of academics is occurring as colleges and their boards seek new solutions to today's challenging problems. Finally, succession planning should be employed that strengthens networked leaders throughout the community college.

Given the review of the literature and current leadership development programs, we contend that preparing to meet tomorrow's challenges requires a network of leaders working together. Networks provide a way to tap into diversity—in thinking, in experience, in worldviews—that allow for a wider consideration of solutions. To develop this cadre of leaders, it is important to first view all campus members as potential leaders, and next to provide them with continued opportunities for personal development. For example, James Lorenson, president of Gogebic Community College, offered how his college spends time training custodians and support staff. He reflected, "Custodians aren't just being trained on how to be good custodians. They're being trained to be good ambassadors for the college" (Eddy et al., 2015, p. 88). This view of inclusivity in leadership is important as all campus members are then working to support student success.

The opportunity to recast what community college leadership looks like is upon us. However, the pull of traditional, hero-like leaders remains strong despite evidence that new forms of leadership are required (Eddy & VanDerLinden, 2006; Wilson & Cox, 2012). Therefore, as we contemplate how to reconfigure leadership development to prepare community college leaders, we conclude that several changes are required. First, casting a wider net for whom to include in development programs provides a means to incorporate diverse conceptions of leadership (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Second, graduate doctoral programs require rethinking (Perry, 2015). As noted by Romano et al. (2009), the majority of students enrolled in community college doctoral programs are part-time, thus the bulk of what these students indicated influenced their learning was their current work in a community col-

lege. The students stated they received less value from the course readings, reinforcing the curricula disarray in many doctoral graduate programs (Hammons & Miller, 2006; Hull & Keim, 2007). Third, individuals, institutions, and states must intentionally plan for and support leadership development and leadership succession plans. For example, Martin and O'Meara (2017) showcased the way Maryland took an intentional approach to widening the leadership pipeline; the state now boasts women holding 63% of the state's college presidencies compared to the national average of 36% (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Thus, attention to the leadership pipeline can result in change. But, key here to obtaining a widening of the leadership ranks is intentionality.

In summary, we have highlighted several challenges inherent in current approaches to leadership development for community college leaders. The evolution of leadership theory over time points to an emerging focus on how cognitive leadership theory (Amey, 2013; Carroll et al., 2008), which requires recognizing that individuals will make sense of what they are learning differently as they form their leadership identity (Carroll & Levy, 2010). Current graduate doctoral programs and organizational training sessions fall short in providing authentic learning opportunities for aspiring leaders to apply what they are learning to practice. Work on the Carnegie project on the education doctorate (Perry, 2015) holds promise as at the core of the curricular design are courses that link theory to practice and the development of a dissertation of practice that provides students an authentic way to apply their learning. We assert that networked leadership (Eddy et al., 2015) and a matrix organizational design (McPhail, 2013) represent the future direction of leadership approaches. The heightened challenges facing community colleges and their leaders require new approaches to leading. We recommend institutions vested in grow-your-own leadership development programs create programming that allows for more hands-on stretch activities for participants, provides a means to develop the skills required to build networks, and builds institutional succession plans.

We recommend that chairs of community college doctoral programs conduct a curriculum audit of their current program of study that provides backward curriculum mapping of program learning outcomes to course objectives. Graduate doctoral programs should conduct surveys of their alumni to determine which courses had the most lasting impact on their practice and what the alumni identify as missing from their program. A focus on links with practice and real-world case problems should be embedded throughout the degree program. National and state leadership development programs should also conduct surveys of their program alumni to likewise determine what information has served participants well in practice. These programs should continue to work on supporting the networks developed when participating in these programs and to provide ongoing mentoring. Finally, we recommend that individuals become vested in their own learning and to say "yes" to opportunities to learn new skills. Because we advocate the need for leadership throughout the organization (Eddy et al., 2015; Eddy et al., 2016), it is important that everyone in the community college develop their own individualized professional development plan. Understanding better how to prepare leaders to face the challenges now facing community colleges requires questioning current practices and building different leadership development programs.

REFERENCES

Alfred, R. L., & Sydow, D. L. (2013). *Re-visioning community colleges: Positioning for innovation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies for community college leaders*. Washington, DC: author.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2013). *AACC competencies for community college leaders* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: author.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2017). *2016 fact sheet*. Retrieved from: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/AACCFactSheetsR2.pdf

American Council on Education. (2012). *The American college president 2012*. Washington, DC: Author.

Amey, M. J. (2005). Leadership as learning: Conceptualizing the process. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29* (9-10), 689-704. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920591006539

Amey, M. J. (2006). *Breaking traditions: New community college leadership programs meet 21ˢᵗ century needs.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Amey, M. J. (2013). Leadership: Community college transitions. In J. S. Levin & S. T. Kater (Eds.), *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 135-151). New York, NY: Routledge.

Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K., & Brown, D. F. (2002). Perspectives on community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(7), 573-590. https://doi.org/10.1080/106689202760181805

Anderson, D., & Anderson, L. A. (2010). *Beyond change management: How to achieve breakthrough results through conscious change leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Aspen Institute. (2017). *Renewal and progress: Strengthening higher education leadership in a time of rapid change.* Washington, DC: author. Retrieved from http://highered.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Renewal_Progress_CEP_05122017.pdf

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clear path to student success.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674425934

Baldwin, R., DeZure, D., Shaw, A., & Moretto, K. (2008). Mapping the terrain of mid-career faculty at a research university: Implications for faculty and academic leaders. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40*(5), 46-55. https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.40.5.46-55

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice, Vol. 1 – The State of the system.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Boggs, G. R., & McPhail, C. J. (2016). *Practical leadership in community colleges: Navigating today's challenges.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bornstein, R. (2010). Succession planning: The time has come. *Trusteeship, 18*(5), 28-33.

Bresso, M. (2012). *Building for the future: Community college leadership development program evaluation.* ProQuest #1697498130

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review, 30*(1), 45-73. https://doi.org/10.1177/009155210203000103

Carroll, B., & Levy, L. (2010). Leadership development as identity construction. *Management Communication Quarterly, 24*(2), 211-231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909358725

Carroll, B., Levy, L., & Richmond, D. (2008). Leadership as practice: Challenging the competency paradigm. *Leadership, 4*(4), 363-379. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008095186

Cohen, A. M., Brower, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college* (6ᵗʰ ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of social theory.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Conger, J. A., & Fulmer, R. M. (2003). Developing your leadership pipeline. *Harvard Business Review, 76*, 1-11.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581-613. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00061-8

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 63-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004

Duree, C., & Ebbers, L. (2012). The AACC competencies in action. In P. L. Eddy (Ed.), *Leading for the future: Alignment of AACC competencies with practice. New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 41-52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20025

Eckel P. D., Cook B. J., & King J. E. (2009). *The CAO census: A national profile of chief academic officers.* Washington, DC: The American Council on Education.

Eddy, P. L. (2003). Sensemaking on campus: How community college presidents frame change. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27*(6), 453-471. https://doi.org/10.1080/713838185

Eddy, P. L. (2009). Changing of the guard in community colleges: The role of leadership development. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Rethinking leadership in a complex, multicultural, and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education* (pp. 185-211). Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Eddy, P. L. (2010). *Community college leadership: A multidimensional model for leading change.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Eddy, P. L. (2012a). Guest editor's introduction. *Community College Review*, *40*(2), 99-105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552112444725

Eddy, P. L. (2012b). A holistic perspective of leadership competencies. In P. L. Eddy (Ed.), *Leading for the future: Alignment of AACC competencies with practice. New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 29-40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20024

Eddy, P. L. (2013). Developing leaders: The role of competencies in rural community colleges. *Community College Review, 41*(1), 20-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552112471557

Eddy, P. L., Garza Mitchell, R. L., & Amey, M. J. (2016, November 27). Leading from the middle. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from: http://www.chronicle.com/article/Leading-From-the-Middle/238503

Eddy, P. L., & Rao, M. S. (2009). Leadership development in higher education programs. [Editor's Choice]. *Community College Enterprise, 15*(2), 7-26.

Eddy, P. L., Sydow, D. L., Alfred, R. L., & Garza Mitchell, R. L. (2015). *Developing tomorrow's leaders: Context, challenges, and capabilities.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Eddy, P. L., & VanDerLinden, K. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education. *Community College Review, 34*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552106289703

Eells, W. C. (1941). *Why junior college terminal education?* Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Forthun, G., & Freeman, Jr., S. (2017). Community college leadership preparation programs: A review of the literature. *Community College Enterprise,* 14-26.

Fowler, F. C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Pearson.

Friedel, J. N. (2010). University-based community college leadership programs: Where future community college leaders are prepared. In D. L. Wallin (Ed.), *Leadership in an era of change. New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 51-58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.395

Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community-college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(3), 233-250. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920590901176

Fulmer, R. M.., Stumpf, S. A., & Bleak, J. (2009). The strategic development of high potential leaders. *Strategy and Leadership, 37*(3), 17-22. https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570910954600

Gagliardi, J. S., Espinosa, L. L., Turk, J. M., & Taylor, M. (2017). *American college president study 2017.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Garza Mitchell, R. L., & Eddy, P. L. (2008). In the middle: Career pathways of community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 32* (10), 793-811. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920802325739

Grossman, C. S. (2014). *Succession planning and knowledge transfer in higher education.* ProQuest dissertation, ED 556835.

Hardy, K. (2004/2005). Self-leadership as a tool in management succession planning. *Public Manager, 33*(3), 41-44.

Hammons, J. O., & Miller, M. T. (2006). Presidential perceptions about graduate-preparation programs for community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 30*(4), 373-381. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920500479275

Heifetz, R. A. (2004). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heimans, J., & Timms, H. (2014, December). Understanding "new power." *Harvard Business Review*, *92*(12), 48-56.

Hellmich, D. M. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Herrington, J. (2006). *Authentic learning environments in higher education.* London, England: Information Science Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-594-8

Hornak, A. M., & Garza Mitchell, R. L. (2016). Changing times, complex decisions: Presidential values and decision making. *Community College Review, 44*(2), 119-134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552116629548

Hull, J. R., & Keim, M. C. (2007). Nature and status of community college leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(9), 689-702. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920600851621

Jeandron, C. A. (2006). *Growing your own leaders: Community colleges step up, A leading forward report.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Kasper, H. T. (2002, Winter). The changing role of the community college. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 46*(4), 14-21.

Kezar, A. (2014). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Kirkland, K. L. (2016). *An assessment of a community college's grow-your-own leadership program: Perceptions of program graduates and community college staff members: A sequential mixed-method case study.* (Doctoral dissertation, Rowan University). Retrieved from http://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/977/

Kotter, J. P. (2014). *Accelerate: Building strategic agility for a faster moving world.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Long, J., Johnson, C., Faught, S., & Street, J. (2013). The need to practice what we teach: Succession management in higher education. *American Journal of Management, 13*(2), 73-78.

Luna, G. (2010). Succession planning: A doctoral program partnership for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(12), 977-990. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668921003723144

Mahler, W., & Drotter, S. (1986). *The succession planning handbook for the chief executive.* Midland Park, NJ: Mahler Publishing, Co.

Martin, A. & O'Meara, K. (2017). Conditions enabling women's leadership in community colleges. In P. L. Eddy, K. Ward, & T. Khwaja (Eds.), *Critical approaches to women and gender in higher education* (pp. 61-86). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59285-9_4

McMaster, S. M. (2012). *Succession planning for community colleges: A study of best practices.* ProQuest #1697498081

McNair, D. E. (2010). Preparing community college leaders: The AACC core competencies for effective leadership & doctoral education. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(1), 1-19.

McPhail, C. J. (2013). From tall to matrix: Redesigning organizational structures. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 48*(4), 55-62. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2016.1198189

Meier, K. (2013). Community college mission in historical perspective. In J. S. Levin & S. T. Kater (Eds.), *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 3-18). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mellow, G. O., & Heelan, C. M. (2015). *Minding the dream: The process and practice of the American community college* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Neumann, A., & Bensimon, E. M. (1990). Constructing the presidency: College presidents' images of their leadership roles, a comparative study. *Journal of Higher Education, 61*(6), 678-701. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1990.11775116

Nevarez, C., Wood, J. L., & Penrose, R. (2013). *Leadership theory and the community college: Applying theory to practice.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Perry, J. A. (2015). The Carnegie project on the education doctorate. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 47*(3), 56-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2015.1040712

Phillipe, K. (2016, April). *AACC CEO survey: Compensation.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Price, M. R. (2012). *Academic affairs officers: An application of the American Association of Community Colleges competencies for community college leaders.* ProQuest #1697490582

Reille, A., & Kezar, A. (2010). Balancing the pros and cons of community college "grow-your-own" leadership programs. *Community College Review, 38*(1), 59-81. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397110375597

Rieckmann, M. (2012). Future-oriented higher education: Which key competencies should be fostered through university teaching and learning? *Futures, 44*(2), 127-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.09.005

Robinson, J. L. (2016, March). Connecting leadership and learning: Do versatile learners make connective leaders? *Higher Learning Research Communications, 6*(1), 16.

Romano, R. M., & Palmer, J. (2016). The community college and the business cycle. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 48*(5), 52-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2016.1227676

Romano, R. M., Townsend, B., & Mamiseishvilli, K. (2009). Leaders in the making: Profile and perceptions of students in community college doctoral programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(3), 309-320. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920802580499

Royer, D. W., & Latz, A. O. (2016). Community college leadership transition through the framework of appreciative inquiry. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40*(8), 695-705. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1072594

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Sullivan, L. G., & Palmer, S. (2014). Preparing reflective community college leaders in a graduate leadership course. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 38*(6), 512-522. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2011.632749

Tekle, R. (2013). *Compensation and benefits of community college CEOS: 2012.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

TIAA-CREF. (2010). *Preparing a path forward for reluctant retirees.* Washington, DC: author. Retrieved from https://www.tiaa.org/public/pdf/C21232_Creating-a-path-forward-for-reluctant-retirees.pdf

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59*(1), 2-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1988.11778301

Tooms, A. K., Lugg, C. A., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Rethinking the politics of "fit" and educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(1), 96-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670509353044

Vaughan, G. V. (2004). How to keep open access in community colleges. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 69*(6), 52-55. Retrieved from https://proxy.wm.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/62078141?accountid=15053

Wallin, D., Cameron, D. W., & Sharples, K. (2005). Succession planning and targeted leadership development. *Community College Journal, 76*(1), 24-28.

Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Leadership development for the next generation. In. G. E. Watts (Ed.), *Enhancing community colleges through professional development. New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 59-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.90

Wheelhouse. (2016). *Tough job if you can keep it: What California community college CEOs say about their challenges and longevity. Research Brief, 1*(1). Davis, CA: University of California, Davis Wheelhouse The Center for Community College Leadership and Research.

Wilson, K. B., & Cox, E. (2012). A discourse analysis of portrayals of community college leadership in The Chronicle. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(4), 279-290. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2012.637866

Wise, C. B. (2013). *No crystal stair: Narratives of female community college presidents of color.* ProQuest ED 554534

Wood, J. L., & Nevarez, C. (2014). *Ethical leadership and the community college: paradigms, decision-making, and praxis.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

BIOGRAPHIES

Pamela L. Eddy is a professor of higher education and chair of the Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership department at the College of William & Mary. Her research focuses on community college leadership, gender issues in higher education, and faculty development. Eddy has served as a past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, and has authored and edited several books. Most recently, she edited *Constructions of Gender, New Directions for Community Colleges* (2017), and *Critical Approaches to Women and Gender in Higher Education* (2017) with Kelly Ward and Tehmina Khwaja.

Regina Garza Mitchell is an associate professor of higher education leadership at Western Michigan University. Her research focuses on organizational leadership, change, and technology, primarily in a community college setting. She has served in various administrative roles in community colleges and universities and is co-author of *Developing Tomorrow's Leaders: Context, Challenges, and Capabilities* (2015) with Pamela Eddy, Debbie Sydow, and Richard Alfred.