

The University of Southern Mississippi
The Aquila Digital Community

Dissertations

Spring 5-2017

Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chairperson

Jason Carl Ross
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ross, Jason Carl, "Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chairperson" (2017). *Dissertations*. 1208.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/1208>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES FOR THE COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

by

Jason Carl Ross

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
and the Department of Educational Research and Administration
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Dr. Richard Mohn, Committee Chair
Associate Professor, Educational Research and Administration

Dr. Aubrey Lucas, Committee Member
President Emeritus, Educational Research and Administration

Dr. Kyna Shelley, Committee Member
Professor, Educational Research and Administration

Dr. David Lee, Committee Member
Associate Professor, Educational Research and Administration

Dr. Karen S. Coats
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2017

COPYRIGHT BY

Jason Carl Ross

2017

Published by the Graduate School



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN
MISSISSIPPI.

ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

by Jason Carl Ross

May 2017

Published in 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges developed a list of six leadership competencies deemed by stakeholders as essential to a community college leadership position. The six AACCC leadership competencies include organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism, and they have been well researched with upper-level community college leadership, student services personnel, and boards of trustees. This research examined these competencies as they relate to the community college department chairperson.

Often viewed as a path to upper level leadership, the community college chairperson is both a faculty member and administrator, and chairpersons must represent their department or division to both internal constituents (students, other departments, administrators) and external constituents (communities, legislative groups). In addition, faculty members becoming chairpersons learn the position in several recurring ways: graduate programs, in-house leadership programs, on-the-job training, learning from others in a similar position, previous/progressive responsibilities, formal professional development opportunities, challenging job assignments, and mentoring relationships.

The researcher was interested in determining if there were differences in the importance rating of each competency between community college chairpersons and

upper level leadership within the community college institution. In addition, the researcher questioned if new chairpersons had similar opinions about the competencies as veteran chairpersons. The researcher also sought to determine if any formal or non-formal experiences allowed the chairperson opportunities to develop the six AACC leadership competencies.

Department chairpersons and upper level administrators at all fifteen community colleges in Mississippi (n = 115) were invited to participate in this research by completing a Qualtrics administered survey to assess the importance rating of each competency as evidenced by six different questions per competency. Additionally, respondents were asked if they were trained on each competency, and, if they were trained, to identify the methods utilized in the training.

It was determined that no differences existed between the importance rating of each competency by department chairpersons or upper level administrators. There was also no difference in the importance rating of each competency by new chairpersons and veteran chairpersons, and chairpersons most often learned about the competencies by on-the-job training or by learning from a colleague in a similar position.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to my committee members, Drs. Richard Mohn, Aubrey Lucas, Kyna Shelley, and David Lee, for their patience and advice. I have been fortunate to learn from your experiences and expertise. Dr. Mohn, I cannot thank you enough for agreeing to take over this project. You have been a never-ending source of motivation, and I am forever in your debt.

Thanks also to Dr. Jalynn Roberts of William Carey University for his assistance with SPSS.

DEDICATION

I am so grateful to my wife, Angelia Ross, for her support and encouragement in this endeavor. She has been my cheerleader, proofreader, and confidant throughout this journey, and, I am fortunate to have chosen her as my wife twenty years ago. I am also thankful for my children, Foster, Eli, and Ryan, for their patience and understanding when I was working and writing, and I hope they see the value in higher education through my experience. I love you all.

I am indebted to my parents for their love and support (emotional and financial) in my returning to school. Thanks for cheering me on for the past forty years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER I – PROBLEM	1
Introduction.....	1
Brief History of the Community College.....	1
The Importance of the Community College	2
The Leadership Gap	2
The Community College Department Chair and Leadership	4
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Research Questions	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Delimitations.....	8
Assumptions.....	8
Justification	9
Chapter Summary	10
CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Introduction.....	11

Theoretical Framework.....	11
Situated Learning.....	11
Contingency Theory.....	13
The Exodus of Leadership	14
The American Association of Community Colleges Leadership Competencies.....	15
Current Research on the AACC Leadership Competencies	20
The Community College Department Chair	25
Learning the Role of the Chair.....	26
Department Chair as Leader	30
Chapter Summary	30
CHAPTER III - METHOD.....	32
Introduction.....	32
Design	33
Participants.....	33
Instrumentation	34
Validation.....	35
Reliability.....	36
Procedures.....	37
Analysis.....	38
Chapter Summary	38

CHAPTER IV – RESULTS.....	39
Introduction.....	39
Descriptive Analysis.....	39
Statistical Analysis.....	41
Research Question One.....	41
Research Question Two.....	41
Research Question Three.....	42
Organizational Strategy.....	42
Resource Management.....	43
Communication.....	44
Collaboration.....	45
Community College Advocacy.....	46
Professionalism.....	47
Research Question Four.....	48
Ancillary Findings.....	49
Competency Rankings.....	49
Developing the Competencies.....	50
Summary.....	56
CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION.....	57
Introduction.....	57

Conclusions.....	57
Chairpersons and Upper-Level Administrators	57
New and Veteran Chairpersons	58
Obtaining the Leadership Competencies	59
Limitations	61
Recommendations for Practice	61
Recommendations for Future Research	62
APPENDIX A – Survey Instrument	63
APPENDIX B – IRB Approval Letter	72
APPENDIX C – MACJC Approval for Research Request.....	73
APPENDIX D – MGCCC Research Request Approval	80
APPENDIX E – Consent Form.....	87
REFERENCES	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Cronbach’s Alpha for Each Competency	36
Table 2 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Organizational Strategy	43
Table 3 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Resource Management.....	44
Table 4 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Communication.....	45
Table 5 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Collaboration.....	46
Table 6 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Community College Advocacy.	47
Table 7 Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Professionalism	48
Table 8 Number of Chairpersons Trained on the AACC Leadership Competencies	49
Table 9 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Organizational Strategy.....	51
Table 10 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Resource Management.....	52
Table 11 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Communication	53
Table 12 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Collaboration.....	54
Table 13 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Community College Advocacy ..	55
Table 14 Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Professionalism	56

CHAPTER I – PROBLEM

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the importance of the American Association of Community College’s leadership competencies to community college department chairperson as well as the attainment of these competencies by the chairperson. Current literature reveals a growing trend in finding competent leaders to replace a retiring generation of community college leadership, and the department chair is considered a natural pipeline to effective administration. This chapter explains the importance of the community college system, the purpose and significance of the study, defines key terms, and states the research questions.

Brief History of the Community College

During the early part of the twentieth century, the United States found itself in a unique situation: no longer was the educational status quo sufficient to survive in an increasingly global economy. However, only a small percentage of individuals were willing to travel a long distance to seek higher education. At the same time, many of the nation’s high schools were seeking new ways to serve their community. What emerged during the early 1900s was the beginnings of today’s community college system. With the establishment of Joliet Junior College, the nation’s oldest public junior college, in Illinois in 1901, these institutions began with a focus on the general education curriculum and, by the end of the Great Depression, gradually began to increase offerings to include job training. In the early 1900s, California passed legislation authorizing high schools to offer post-secondary classes and provided state support and the organization of local governing boards to run the newly created public junior colleges. After World War II,

the community college system found itself primed to meet the needs of returning soldiers supplied with the money to pay for post-secondary education in the form of the GI Bill, and community and junior colleges graduated many of these former soldiers into the workforce. During the 1960s, education was viewed as a solution to many of the social problems of that decade, and community college enrollment continued to climb (AACC, 2013). Today, community colleges represent more than half of all institutions of higher education and educate nearly half of all students seeking an education past high-school (Eddy, 2013).

The Importance of the Community College

In the fall of 2008, 44% of all undergraduates in the United States were classified as community college students, and community colleges accounted for 43% of all first-time freshmen in the United States, as well as almost half of the minority populations attending an institution of higher learning. In 2010, the average cost to attend a community college was \$2713 compared to the average cost for the in-state rate of a public 4-year school of \$7605 (AACC, 2011). In fact, cost, accessibility, flexibility, and the economic crisis of the first decade of this 21st century have been major factors in sending individuals back to school, many of whom chose to attend a community college. Community colleges have also responded to increased enrollment with new programs, new facilities, and flexibility in course offerings.

The Leadership Gap

As the importance of the community college system continues to grow, so does the need to replace the cadre of retiring leadership creating the so-called *leadership gap*. In a paper published in 2007 by the American Association of Community Colleges

(AACC), researchers Weisman and Vaughan (2007) reported 84% of current community college presidents were planning to retire by 2015, a significant increase of the 68% of potential retirees reported in 1996. Furthermore, with an average age of 58 – the oldest average age of presidents since 1984 – almost one-fourth of sitting presidents had planned to retire by 2010 (Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). O’Banion (2007) asserted that, with the pending retirement of community college presidents and academic deans, 1,500 individuals will need the necessary training and preparation required to fill vacant leader positions. In addition, Reille and Kezar (2010) wrote that the vacancy problem is compounded when individuals are promoted, resulting in lower-level administrative vacancies.

This *leadership gap* continues to grow as the mission of the community college organization continues to evolve. Enrolling a student population with increasingly diverse needs and backgrounds, increased technological advances and initiatives, and additional accountability requirements, the traditional leadership role has changed from what it was when the community college system was first formed (AACC, 2005). Romero (2004) identified two trends that drive leadership challenges: growth and institutional mission. Increases in student enrollment, job retraining, and employer requirements impact community colleges more than other higher education institutions. The institutional mission not only includes preparing students academically but now includes student options for career and technical programs as well as non-credit programs. Romero observes that agile leadership is required as well as is a move away from traditional leadership models.

Watts and Hammons (2002) and Wallin (2006) suggested that, with the retirement of those in upper leadership positions, those in the *traditional pipeline* for advancement are also retiring. Thus, individuals in the role of department or division chair are finding opportunities for advancement into mid-level leaders as well as upper level administrators. Hence, the need for competent and qualified leadership is compounded, and the leadership gap continues to grow.

The Community College Department Chair and Leadership

Smith and Stewart (1999) examined community colleges in Texas. Findings from this study showed that most chairs (59%) remained in their position for more than two years; however, 41% did not serve more than two years after being appointed. Smith and Stewart suggested extensive training might be required to help this remaining 41% become effective leaders. In addition, the majority of chairs were not subject to any term-limit, a difference in the culture of community college chairs and that of the university chairs (Smith & Stewart, 1999), further compounding the need for a capable department chair who is also an administrator.

Many of the department chairs surveyed reported they were given little formal training to prepare for this position. In fact, the most common method by which individuals were trained was through informal training by other individuals already in similar positions or through some self-guided program (e.g. previous administrative duties, learning by doing) (Smith & Stewart, 1999). Some researchers (Sessa & Taylor (2000) and Jackson (1999) reported most institutions of higher learning provided little training to new chairs, and, as a result, many new chairs have little understanding of the expectations of their position.

In addition, Wolverton, Ackerman, and Holt (2005) suggested an inherent tension between department chairs; that is, these individuals are now administrators while also remaining faculty members. Often there is an expectation to perform administrative duties in addition to a research agenda and quality teaching. Current chairs surveyed in Wolverton's study reported the dichotomy in decision making as it related to faculty in their departments as well as deans and other administrators in the chair's chain of command. Other leadership issues reported by current chairs include budgeting, managing personnel, and balancing roles. Wolverton et al. (2005) contrasts leadership and training in the corporate world with the academic world. Often, leaders in the corporate workplace are identified several years in advance and are specifically mentored to assume administrative duties. In academia, faculty members are often thrust into their role and expected to perform with little or no preparation or training.

Statement of the Problem

Developed in 2004, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) wrote *A Competency Framework for Community College Leaders*, a document which detailed six leadership competencies (organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism) identified as essential for effective leadership at all levels of the community college (AACC, 2005). The literature identifies the six AACC leadership competencies as important to upper-level administrators (Duree, 2007; Hassan, Dellow, & Jackson, 2010; McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011;). Therefore, this research will investigate the importance of the six AACC leadership competencies as they relate to the department chair [identified by McNair as a gap in the literature (personal communication, March 8,

2012)], and the role of professional development as it relates to the competencies. That is, does the importance ranking of the six AACC leadership competencies differ when ranked by the chair as compared to the ranking by the upper-level administrator? In addition, this study will determine if there is a difference in importance ranking of the six AACC leadership competencies when ranked by new chairs when compared with veteran chairs. Finally, this study will determine what methods and experiences, if any, are utilized in training the community college department chair with regard to the six AACC leadership competencies.

Research Questions

Specifically, there are four research questions:

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in the reported importance rating of the six AACC leadership competencies as rated by community college department chairs and upper level administrators?

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference between the importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by the veteran community college chair and the new community college chair?

Research Question 3: What professional development experiences, both formal and informal, have been utilized in the leadership training of community college department chairs?

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the identified formal and informal leadership training of community college chairs and the AACC leadership competencies?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used:

AACC – the American Association of Community Colleges, a non-profit organization that represents almost 1,200 two-year, associate degree-granting institutions and seeks to “build a nation of learners by advancing America’s community colleges” (AACC, 2013).

AACC Leadership Competencies – The six leadership competencies as identified by the AACC: organization, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005).

Community College – a community college is one of the fifteen two-year, associate degree-granting institutions in the State of Mississippi affiliated with the Mississippi Board for Community Colleges (Mississippi Community College Board, 2013).

Department Chair – a department chair is a faculty member who directly supervises other faculty members, usually of similar disciplines, within the community college. Generally, this individual has some administrative oversight with regards to departmental budgets and faculty evaluations and may also be called a division chair.

Formal Leadership Experience – a formal leadership experience is an event or occurrence that was intentionally designed to impact a participant’s leadership skill-set. This is usually found in the form of graduate coursework or planned professional development activities such as workshops or informal mentoring relationships.

Informal Leadership experience – an informal leadership experience is an event, job, interaction, or role that impacted a chair’s leadership skill-set, often unintentionally.

Examples include on-the-job training and learning from others who hold a similar position.

Lower-Level Administrator – a lower-level administrator is also known as a department or division chair.

New Department Chair – a new department chair is an individual currently serving as the department/division chair with three or less years of experience in this role.

Upper-Level Administrator – an upper-level administrator has authority over the department chair or division chair. Common titles include dean, vice-president, or president.

Veteran Department Chair – a veteran department chair is an individual currently serving as the department/division

Delimitations

1. Only community and junior colleges in Mississippi will be considered for this
2. Only community and junior colleges in Mississippi will be considered for this study.
3. Only participants who give informed consent will be used to conduct this research.
4. Only lower and upper level administrators employed at a community college in Mississippi during 2015-2016 will be considered.

Responses will be gathered using a survey instrument.

Assumptions

1. All division/department chairs have similar responsibilities regardless of the institution where employed or the academic discipline.

2. Participants will respond truthfully and honestly in their opinions regarding the importance of the AACC competencies.
3. All community college websites accurately and completely list their department chairs and administrators.

Justification

This study will fill a gap in the literature as it relates to the leadership preparation of the community college department chair. With the increase in enrollment at the community college and the increase of services from the community college, it is important that the community college chair be adequately trained as an administrator with regard to the AACC leadership competencies. The literature suggests that the department chair role is a very practical position to consider when identifying and promoting individuals into higher-level leadership positions (Filan, 1999). However, several studies reported that new department chairs have little formal training in general (Gillet-Karam, 1999a; Pettitt, 1999; Smith & Stewart, 1999). Several studies have explored the leadership competencies as they relate to upper level administrators and student services personnel (Duree, 2007; Hassan et al., 2010; Rodkin, 2011), but a review of the literature provided no new information on the inclusion of the competencies in preparing the department chair as a leader, an increasingly important role in the community college institution.

Eddy (2010) advocated the AACC leadership competencies serve as a “framework for identifying essential skills for community college leaders” (p. 5). In addition, Eddy found these competencies had not been fully utilized as a doctoral curriculum in community college leadership or other professional development

experiences. Likewise, McNair and colleagues (2011) wrote that the AACC competencies should be a foundation in professional development opportunities, in hiring, in development of succession plans, and in evaluating community college leaders. This suggests that lower level administrators (i.e., department chairs) must be familiar with the AACC leadership competencies in order to perform their administrative jobs effectively and that any professional development experiences will utilize the competencies.

Chapter Summary

The chapter introduces the need to find capable, qualified community college leadership to replace aging leadership. The literature suggested that the community college department chair is a natural place to promote into upper-level administrators. As such, it is vital that the community college chair be prepared to take over leadership responsibilities. The six AACC leadership competencies were introduced as a framework for identifying and training leaders. The study's research questions were identified as well as terms used during this study. A justification for this research was provided.

CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the theoretical framework that guides this study, the importance of the community college system, the increasing need to fill leadership positions, the development of the AACC leadership competencies, current leadership frameworks that support the AACC leadership competencies, and the current literature relating to the AACC leadership competencies. This chapter will also discuss the community college department chair position and responsibilities.

Theoretical Framework

Two theories will drive this research: Situated Learning theory and Contingency Leadership Theory. Situated Learning Theory suggests that learning to be a leader in a community college takes place over time and in a community of practice. Contingency Leadership Theory suggests that different leadership opportunities require a different leadership skill set.

Situated Learning

The situated theory emphasizes that learning is based on the environment and situations in which a person is involved, not necessarily as strictly *head knowledge*. Fenwick (2003) wrote that “knowledge and learning are defined as changing processes of social activity” (p. 25). That is, learning and knowledge are not something that is taught and applied, but rather they are part of the process of actually participating in the event.

The origins of situated learning are found in the work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. Learning, according to Lave and Wenger (1993), takes place not in the individual mind of the participant but in the process of social interactions. Learning and

knowledge are not discrete entities that are transferred to new situations. Learning is not something that people *do*. When learning, participants actually engage in a situation and gain the necessary skills to be successful. In the preface to *Situated Learning* (1993), William Hanks writes that “learning is a process that takes place in a participation framework, not in an individual mind” (Lave & Wenger, 1993, p. 15).

A defining characteristic of situated learning is a process that Lave and Wenger (1993) called *legitimate peripheral participation*. Reminiscent of the apprenticeship concept, learners learn by participating with other practitioners in a community of learning. This social component is critical to situated learning. By becoming involved in a community of practice, participants become increasingly engaged in the community as well as becoming more active. As the participant advances toward the center of the community, learning unintentionally takes place. These communities of practice may be varied and vast, and participants may belong to several at once depending on our environment (work, home, church, civic, leisure) (Smith, 2009). Wenger (2006) defines a community of practice as those individuals in a common endeavor. It involves those individuals who “share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, 2006).

A community of practice is more than learning by doing; participants not only “do” but become “full participants in the world and in generating meaning” (Smith, 2009). Learning and practice are completely intertwined. Situated learning theory proposes that participants are involved in activities that are similar to real applications. Fenwick (2003) writes that individuals learn *as* they participate and interact with others in a shared endeavor. This interaction involves the history, values, rules, tools,

technology, and language of the community. Knowledge is found by the interaction of these elements.

This framework suggests that the training for being a department chair takes place in a learning community. By being a chair, new chairs begin to understand their role in the community college hierarchy and their place in the learning community. It also suggests that new and veteran chairs may perceive differences in how the role is learned. Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) found that administrators developed their skills “incrementally; that is, the administrators used previous positions to acquire and develop skills required for higher level administrative positions” (p. 203), and this concept seems to follow the idea of learning communities.

Contingency Theory

Additionally, this research study seeks to understand the views on leadership qualities, specifically those qualities as identified by the AACCC (2005). A second theory for this part of the study is couched in the theory of contingency leadership theory first introduced by Fielder in 1964. Contingency leadership theory recognizes that there is no single or best way to lead an organization. In fact, a successful style of leadership may be deemed successful only in certain situations or environments and ineffective in others. Therefore, this theory surmises that a leader’s ability to lead effectively is based on various external and internal factors. These factors include the leader’s preferred leadership style, the abilities and weaknesses of the organization, and the environment and culture of the organization. The effectiveness of the leader is dependent upon the personality of the leader and the needs of the situation. The needs of the situation, in turn, influence the relationship between the leader and followers (the attitudes and

feelings of trust and credibility), the degree of structure regarding the task (whether highly defined and explicit or unpredictable and creative), and the leader's position of power (whether high or low). Although this theory appears rather intuitive, it is still utilized as an alternative to very strict or rigid ideas about leadership. Fielder argues that a leader should be placed in a situation that lends itself to his or her leadership style; a "good fit" should be achieved between the leader and the job to be performed (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

If one assumes all community college department chairs feel similarly about what it takes to be a good leader at the chair level and that similar situational variables exist within the various departments, do differences exist based on the level of administration (upper level administrators/mid-level administrators; i.e. position of power)? Hassan, Dellow, and Jackson (2010) noted that the AACC leadership competencies are important at the top of the administrative hierarchy; the contingency framework will allow the researcher to determine what differences exist, if any, in the importance ranking of leadership skills for both low-level administrators and high-level administrators and will help determine if lower-level administrators also value the AACC leadership competencies in their leadership role as chair.

The Exodus of Leadership

Brawer (2003, as cited in Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005) recognized the 1960s and 1970s as a period of tremendous growth in community colleges. Since the middle of the twentieth century, community college leaders have often been employed for years and even decades in their leadership position. These same administrators are now reaching retirement age (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). McNair (2010) wrote that the shortage

in qualified administrators is imminent; Weisman and Vaughan (2007) reported that 84% of current community college presidents were planning to retire by 2015. O'Banion (2007) asserted that, with the pending retirement of community college presidents and academic deans, 1,500 individuals would need the necessary training and preparation to fill vacant leadership positions. Reille and Kezar (2010) wrote that when lower management is promoted to upper management, the leadership gap is exacerbated by the creation of leadership vacancies along the entire leadership spectrum. Hardy and Katsinas (2007) wrote that the leadership problem is worse for community colleges located in rural communities. Almost 60% of all community colleges are located in regions with economic downturn, high levels of poverty, and constricted state and local resources. It is, therefore, challenging to attract qualified and capable candidates to these institutions.

The American Association of Community Colleges Leadership Competencies

Prior to the development of the AACC leadership competencies, Wallin (2006) remarked that community college administrators did not have “an identifiable, recognizable, and agreed-upon body of knowledge that all who enter the field must possess” (p.514), and questioned how individuals could prepare themselves to become successful community college leaders. As a response to the growing community college leadership crisis and to the lack of a clear skill-set for community college leadership, the AACC attempted to outline such a framework for current and future leaders. This resulting document, *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, is a multi-faceted document: it should inform a current leader of his or her own status in regard to the necessary competencies, it should enhance leadership development programs with a

curricular underpinning, and it should enhance the hiring and promotion processes. (AACC, 2005). The six leadership competencies as developed by the AACC are generally considered by scholars to be necessary for successful community college leaders (Duree, 2007; Hassan et al., 2010; McNair, 2010; McNair et al., 2011).

The leadership competencies identified by the AACC are organization, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005), and were developed beginning in 2003 at the AACC Leading Forward summit attended by community college stakeholders. These groups began the development of a body of common knowledge and skills required for successful community college leadership, and this information was further refined and summarized in the 2004 document, *A Competency Framework for Community College Leaders*.

In the fall of 2004, the AACC surveyed community college leadership across the United States to see if the skills identified were indeed vital to the leadership role and to see if respondents were being offered opportunities to enhance these abilities. All respondents (100%) ranked all six competencies either “very” or “extremely” important. (AACC, 2012). In addition, all respondents were asked to identify how well they were trained on the application of a given competency. Results showed very little formal training on these previously identified *essential* competencies was available. That is, survey participants overwhelmingly stated that each of the six competencies was essential for community college leadership; however, a disconnect existed between this rating and the professional development preparation for utilizing the competency. The AACC reports “these findings provide evidence for the crucial need to establish this framework

and to promote these competencies in the curricula of the community college leadership programs” (AACCC, 2012, Part A).

The six leadership competencies as identified by the AACCC (2005) are:

1. **Organizational strategy.** Successful and effective leaders plan strategically to move the institution forward. This includes seeking student success, protecting the investment (financial and otherwise) in the institution, promoting the mission of the college, and making preparations for the future of the college. Leaders accomplish this through strategic planning, making data-driven decisions, creating a culture of teamwork and innovation, and making prudent financial decisions.
2. **Resource management.** Successful and effective leaders manage the college’s resources ethically and wisely. This includes the management of people and finances. The leader ensures that the institution follows laws regarding fiscal management, seeks alternative sources of revenue, and guarantees the human resources department utilizes procedures that promote best hiring practices, recruitment of new employees, and a reward system for performance management.
3. **Communication.** Successful and effective leaders can articulate the mission, vision, and values of the organization to both internal and external stakeholders. The leader understands that communication is not limited to speaking and writing. Effective leaders also understand the need to listen to constituents and seek to be open and honest with internal and external customers.

4. Collaboration. Successful and effective leaders understand the necessity to develop relationships that advance the institution and its students. Leaders should be able to motivate employees and students toward the common good and seek to make the institution a player on the global stage. The strengths of various groups (legislative, board, community leaders) are incorporated into these relationships.
5. Community college advocacy. Successful and effective leaders are committed to the mission, vision, and goals of the institution, and seek to promote these goals. The leader understands and expects high-quality teaching and learning. The local community understands the goals of the local community college. The leader promotes the ideals of open access to education and life-long learning. The effective leader represents the institution in the local community as well as the broader community in which the institution resides.
6. Professionalism. Successful and effective leaders lead by example, and this example includes high standards for all employees and a desire to continuously improve the institution and protect its long-term viability. Effective leaders are leaders of vision as it relates to the history and culture of the institution. They regularly employ self-reflection and other techniques of evaluation. In addition, they contribute back to the profession through employee development programs as well as research and publication.

To further understand the six AACC leadership competencies, the American Association of Community Colleges suggested the following principles (AACC, 2005):

1. Leaders can learn to be leaders. Although complemented by one's own natural abilities and personality, leaders are more effective when allowed to interact with theory, case studies, and methodologies in the context of graduate studies, in-house leadership programs, and other professional development opportunities.
2. Leaders can be found at many levels of responsibility. There are many individuals in the community college community who can lead. The AACCC suggests the importance of the competency is determined by the level of the leader. That is, presidents may require extensive knowledge and abilities in one area, and department chairs may require knowledge and skills in another.
3. Leaders effectively manage people and communicate vision. Regardless of the leader's position in the organization, all effective administrators require skills in successfully managing subordinates and in effectively communicating the organization's goals to those subordinates.
4. Leaders hone their skills over the life of a career. Each professional experience, whether formal or informal, contributes to the skill-set of an effective leader. Leaders should seek new opportunities and experiences to foster and enhance their abilities.

Sinady, Floyd, and Mulder (2010) stated that the six leadership competencies should be the basis for graduate programs in higher education leadership: "The competencies...provide a sound template that university personnel can now use to address the revision or development of curriculum and programs relevant to the development of community college professionals" (p.225), and indeed this seems to be

one of the intentions from the AACC itself (AACC, 2005). Eddy (2013) advocated using the competencies as a road map for future leaders and allowing potential leaders to have experiences that seek to enhance and develop the competencies.

Current Research on the AACC Leadership Competencies

The six AACC leadership competencies have been the focus of few research inquiries into community college leadership. Duree (2007) noted a small body of literature regarding the AACC leadership competencies. However, the studies included here strengthen the idea that the six leadership competencies are vital to effective leadership, and that individuals can utilize the competencies to enhance and improve their skills as a leader.

McNair (2010) investigated graduate preparation programs in higher education administration. Although these types of programs had been previously researched, McNair's work used the AACC competencies as a framework for program curricula. Specifically, she looked at community college leadership in California and which leadership skills could be acquired through doctoral-level coursework. Individuals surveyed included one academic senate president, four presidents, four chief institutional officers, two chief business officers, and three chief student services officers. Respondents agreed all six leadership competencies were essential, and several of the competencies (organizational strategy, resource management, and communication) could be learned through advanced coursework; however, the participants generally agreed the other competencies (collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism) were developed through on-the-job training, mentoring, and a variety of professional development activities (McNair, 2010).

Using a sample of 58 presidents and board chairs from New York and Florida, Hassan et al. (2010) investigated the board of trustee chairs' importance rankings of the AACC leadership competencies as compared with community college presidents' importance rankings. In addition, this study attempted to identify the leadership experiences that community college presidents valued as significant in their leadership preparation and utilization of the AACC competencies. Hassan noted two significant findings. First, many presidents identified some experiences as positively impacting the development of all six competencies (e.g. progressive job responsibilities). Second, specific experiences impacted specific competencies. Organizational strategy was impacted by progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, and graduate degree programs. Resource management was developed by progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, and networking with colleagues. Communication and collaboration were influenced by feedback, challenging job assignments, and hardships, and collaboration was again additionally impacted by progressive job responsibilities. Professionalism and community college advocacy were developed via mentor relationships, but community college advocacy was also influenced by networking and workshops (Hassan et al., 2010).

Additionally, Hassan et al. (2010) found that individuals serving as community college presidents in the two states studied, Florida and New York, rated the competencies similarly even though the role of the president is different within the different systems. They noted that even though differences in responsibilities exist, the AACC seemed successful at identifying a core set of leadership skills applicable in practically all community college environments. Their findings indicated that trustees

and presidents agreed on the relative importance of each of the six competencies, and noted this “overlapping perspective supports an institutional alignment critical for the success of their respective colleges” (Hassan et al., 2010, p. 188). The findings of the study prompted the authors to advocate the use of the AACC competencies in the hiring process of community college leaders as well as in identifying potential leadership.

Price (2012) examined the AACC leadership competencies as they relate to 603 academic affairs officers in public community colleges in the United States. Price found that academic affairs officers ranked the communication competency as the most important of the six AACC competencies, followed by community college advocacy, collaboration, professionalism, and resource management, and it was noted that these results mimicked the results of other studies including Hassan (2010). In addition, communication was identified as the competency in which the academic affairs officer was most often prepared by professional development or graduate programs, but it was noted that this competency was also developed over the life of the career. Price also identified progressive job responsibilities as the most utilized and beneficial leadership development experience. This reflects the results of previous studies (e.g. Hassan et al., 2010, Kools, 2010). Each of these studies identified progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, networking, graduate programs, and professional development workshops as contributing the most to learning and acquiring the AACC leadership competencies.

Duree (2007) investigated 391 community college presidents’ leadership preparation in developing the AACC leadership competencies. His findings indicated presidents viewed themselves as prepared or well prepared in the AACC competencies,

and formal educational preparation played the most significant role in this preparation. Duree did find, however, that leaders often considered themselves ill-prepared for some aspects of their leadership position, particularly in the areas of resource management and organizational strategy. He also noted that the body of literature associated with the AACC competencies is extremely limited.

McNair's (2010) findings show that most leaders within the community college institution similarly ranked the necessity of these competencies for the effective leader; some minor differences in rankings were found which could most likely be attributed to differences in leadership responsibilities. She recommended that the competencies should continue to be studied. McNair (2010) wrote the following about the competencies:

While the respondents generally agreed throughout the survey, some subtle differences, as noted above, suggest the need to continue to study the core competencies from a variety of institutional perspectives; this could help aspiring administrators determine if different competencies are essential for the specific administrative position they are seeking. (p. 215)

Eddy (2013) attempted to understand how leaders in rural community colleges developed skills as identified by the six AACC competencies and how professional development affected the manner in which leaders (in this study, 10 presidents and 10 deans) carried out the competencies within their institution. The rural leader tended to utilize the competencies of advocacy, collaboration, and communication. In fact, many of the current presidents and deans had been promoted through the ranks at the institution and had strong ties and relationships with previous leadership. In fact, participants in this

study held a variety of positions within the institution throughout their careers, most frequently in the form of a faculty member advancing into instructional leadership. However, it was noted that this resulted in many individuals being familiar only with the organizational strategies of the home institution. That is, participants were lacking in the competency of organization strategy because they were unfamiliar with any other organizational structure.

Eddy (2013) stated that rural leaders primarily learned to lead while on the job and that skills were enhanced through interactions with others and relationship-building. These same leaders did seek formal leadership training on a regional or state level. However, when they referenced training, it was not these state or regional experiences that were mentioned; rather, it was formal experiences at the institutional level.

These same leaders noted that resource management was important; however, it usually took the form of achieving the same or better results in spite of a smaller budget or fewer resources. Rural institutions were faced with declining or plateauing property values which resulted in a small tax base. These same rural areas are often affected by the closure of manufacturing plants and dislocated workers – workers that frequently seek retraining at the local community college.

Rodkin (2011) surveyed student affairs personnel (n=308) to determine if the six AACC leadership competencies were valued in these student services or student affairs arenas. In addition, Rodkin attempted to determine if the competencies could be learned via graduate programs as well as through various informal learning experiences. His results indicated that most student affairs personnel were certainly prepared in the competencies by graduate programs, most often the doctorate in education degree for the

student services officer (as opposed to the doctorate in philosophy). Participants responded that mentoring programs were valuable in learning to be leaders and in learning to utilize the leadership competencies. It was also noted that leadership programs did not warrant a similar perception of usefulness although many of the leaders had participated in such programs. Rodkin also recommended that student affairs leaders seek experiences in financial management including budgets and the budgetary process.

The Community College Department Chair

The community college academic or technical department may contain a single discipline or a conglomeration of many disciplines; the latter case is usually present for convenience only, and these arrangements may have little commonalities. The department chair is then the link between faculty and students, faculty and administration, and other external entities related to the institution (Gillette-Karram, 1999b; McArthur, 2002). Filan (1999) wrote the department chair is vital to sustaining the institution as many issues germane to community colleges take place at the departmental level. Most chairs have no term limit (Smith & Stewart, 1999). In addition, the chair position is a natural place to develop new leadership.

Foote (1999) included the chair role in that of a mid-level manager whose responsibilities include training and managing staff and faculty as well as other administrative and teaching duties. She claims “chairs are essential to the daily operation of these colleges” (p. 75). Others propose the chair to be both administrator and faculty, but not fully either one (Gillett-Karam, 1999a). This duality of responsibilities causes an inherent tension between both administrators and faculty – a divided loyalty (Czech & Forward, 2010). Wolverton et al. (2005) wrote that this dual role is particular to the

chair; one does not usually see upper-level administrative responsibilities with teaching responsibilities.

Dr. Donald Cameron, as interviewed by Gillett-Karam (1999b), listed 27 complex duties belonging to the mid-level manager including the department chair. These duties included a variety of responsibilities: scheduling working and class assignments, maintaining syllabi, provide professional development opportunities, handling grievances, and providing leadership. Because of a chair's multitude of responsibilities, their position is critical – a “front-line position – to the college (Gillette-Karam, 1999b, p. 45).

Learning the Role of the Chair

Perhaps due to the multitude of responsibilities, chairs often have difficulty in the transition from faculty member to quasi-administrator, and little formal training is offered by the institution to prepare a new chair to perform the job (Smith & Stewart, 1999). Common methods for learning the job included bringing skills from prior experiences, serving on committees, observing role models, gaining an advanced degree, participating in professional development, and participating in a grow-your-own leadership program or academy (Duree, 2007; Hull & Keim, 2007; Smith & Stewart, 1999). Filan (1999) found leadership training was most often made available for upper-level administrators with little opportunity for the chair, essentially neglecting the role of the mid-level manager. Gillett-Karam (1999a) reported that many chairs seldom, if ever, receive any formal training on performing the chair responsibilities. Pettitt (1999) reported that a chair learns to *be* chair by *doing* the job instead of *training* for the job. Smith and Stewart (1999) advocate the development of policies that require initial and on-going training and

development for department chairs. Some chairs reported it took six months to feel confident in the chair role; others report not feeling competent until having served as chair for two or more years.

Wallin (2006) investigated the areas in which midlevel managers considered themselves unprepared, and found three main concerns being evident. Most frequently mentioned, participants listed a lack of understanding of budget and financial matters including the seeking of outside revenue. Secondly, the building and maintaining of internal relationships was identified. These internal relationships ran the gamut from team building to conflict resolution to diversity. Thirdly, participants were concerned about their abilities to maintain and develop external relationships including community and familial relationships. Thus, Wallin (2006) recommends short-term leadership development programs that focus on these three areas and involve primarily an active-learning component and the use of a mentor/coach.

As identified from the literature (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Duree, 2007; Hull & Keim, 2007; McNair, 2010), there appear to be several broad commonalities among the leadership preparation pathways for chairs: career pathways, professional development, formal education, and mentoring.

1. Career Pathways. Leadership skills are developed over time and in small amounts – the culmination of previous experiences and positions that allow the chair to develop required skills. This involves *on-the-job* training and is usually informal training.
2. Professional development. These are formal, planned experiences to improve the skills of employees in general; specifically, these are leadership trainings

that are directed toward administrators. The range of professional development activities may be a short, one-hour session, a conference opportunity, or participation in a *grow-your-own-leader* program.

3. Formal education. Some chairs have received advanced degrees in higher education administration, and, ideally, the formal coursework for these degrees should assist the chair in attaining a leadership skill set.
4. Mentoring. Many chairs learn to be chair by utilizing an informal network of *asking the chair down the hall* as well as formal mentoring/mentee relationships.

Cejda and Jolley (2013) examined the development of the competencies among community college leaders in rural community colleges. Test subjects included 70 presidents, 70 chief student affairs officers, and 70 chief academic officers randomly selected from 210 of the 524 community college districts identified as rural by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Each of the 115 participants that responded was asked to identify both external and internal professional development experiences and whether these experiences were useful in developing any of the six AACC leadership competencies. The majority of professional development experiences were ranked as very important in developing the competencies, and Cejda and Jolley stated that responses supported what was being found in the literature – that there are multiple ways that a leader can enhance and develop the competencies. In addition, participants value accepting additional responsibilities and service to the institution as most practical in contributing to the development of the competencies. This study was

limited to senior-level administrators, and the mid-level administrators were not considered.

El-Ashmawy and Weasenforth (2010) examined the in-house leadership program at Collin County Community College, a large, multi-campus institution in Texas that has experienced the necessity of developing leaders. After examining the inaugural year of Collin's program, El-Ashmawy and Weasenforth (2010) made several recommendations. A mentoring component of an in-house program was effective; however, careful consideration should be given in matching individuals with a mentor; clear expectations regarding expected outcomes should be given to both. Important, deep topics should be discussed using a half- or full-day workshop. Other recommendations include the importance of using current, research-based reading assignments and suggested attendance at board meetings. All of these findings seem to support the four broad categories stated earlier.

Campbell, Syeed, and Morris (2010) comment that current research suggests the need for partnerships to form between community colleges, professional organizations, and university leadership programs to provide programs that target these necessary skills. George Boggs, former president of the AACC, states that "future leaders need opportunities to learn, develop, and practice leadership skills through simulations, internships, and mentorships; consequently, leadership programs should be structured to provide opportunities for skills development" (Boggs, 2003).

McNair (2010) found that all of the six core leadership competencies seem to be developed through career pathways, professional development, and mentoring except one: organizational strategy. Her study also suggests that all six leadership competencies

could be developed through the use of formal education (i.e. doctoral programs), although three of the six (organizational strategy, resource management, and communication) seem to be ripe for inclusion in a doctoral program. That is, although these may be learned or developed while in the leadership position, a doctoral program inherently lends itself to a full unpacking of these leadership qualities and their effectiveness in a position of leadership. McNair (2010) also found that many leaders have a preference toward developing their skills in a manner other than the doctoral program. Smith and Stewart (1999) found that most new community college department chairs have never taken a university course to assist in learning their role, and they advocate the need for formal training for prospective chairs to include an in-house leadership program.

Department Chair as Leader

Due to the large number of community college leaders retiring, being able to find, and in turn, being able to train, the department chair as a leader is important. This mid-level leadership role is a very practical place to find the next dean, vice-president, or president of the institution (Filan, 1999). Watts and Hammons (2002) listed faculty and division chairs as one of the “traditional pipelines to the presidency” (p. 60). Therefore, finding capable, trained chairs is important for advancing the college (Gillette-Karam, 1999b). Others believe the chair to be overlooked in terms of leadership (Sessa & Taylor, as cited in Wolverton, 2005).

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the development of the AACCC leadership competencies and current research related to these competencies. In addition, the leadership

preparation of department chairs was discussed as well as the perceptions of the position itself. Two theories, situational learning theory, and contingency theory provide the framework for this study.

CHAPTER III - METHOD

Introduction

The American Association of Community Colleges has identified six competencies as essential to the leadership role in a community college (AACC, 2005). This study examined four research objectives as related to these competencies. The first objective sought to determine if the community college department chair and the community college upper-level administrator ranked the importance of the leadership competencies as identified by the AACC in a similar manner. The second objective sought to understand if new community college chairs and veteran community college chairs had differing views on the importance of the AACC leadership competencies. The third objective was to determine the training(s) and experience(s) used in preparing the community college chair to perform the tasks and duties of being chair and, in turn, a mid-level administrator. The fourth objective was to determine if there was a relationship between this leadership preparation and the AACC leadership competencies.

This chapter will address the design, the participants in the study, and the research instrument, and the process of collecting data. Four research questions guided this study:

Research Question 1: Is there a difference between the importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by community college department chairs and upper level administrators?

Research Hypothesis 1: There is a difference in the importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by the community college department chair and the upper level administrator.

Research Question 2: Is there a difference between the importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by the veteran community college chair and the new community college chair?

Research Hypothesis 2: There is a difference between the importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by the veteran community college chair and the new community college chair.

Research Question 3: What formal and informal training has been utilized in the leadership training of community college department chairs?

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between the identifiable formal and informal leadership training of community college chairs and the AACC leadership competencies?

Design

Descriptive, nonexperimental research is defined by Sullivan (2010) as research that tends to answer the underlying question of “what is....?” In addition, this study has no control group or no variable that is being manipulated. Descriptive, nonexperimental research, therefore, was appropriate for this study. Following the lead of Hussan (2010), who utilized a survey questionnaire to study the ranking of the AACC leadership competencies as ranked by sitting community college presidents and board members, this study used a survey questionnaire to address the four research questions.

Participants

The state of Mississippi supports fifteen public community and junior colleges. The mid-level administrators were comprised of community college chairs at each of the fifteen institutions. Likewise, all upper-level administrators (e.g. deans, vice-presidents,

and presidents) were surveyed from each of the fifteen public institutions. The state of Mississippi was selected because of its historical significance as one of the first community/junior college systems as well as its current emphasis on the role that community colleges play in higher education.

Since individual institutional research requirements differ at the community college level, permission to conduct this research was obtained from the necessary individuals or committees prior to this survey being distributed. In an effort to have an optimal survey return, permission to conduct research was sought from the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness, a group affiliated with the Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the first approval needed to conduct research at individual institutions statewide. In addition, permission to conduct research was sought from the Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College Executive Council, the researcher's home institution, which functions as the college's version of an Institutional Review Board.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was used for data collection and was designed based upon the AACC leadership competencies. The competency descriptions and language were taken from the AACC document (AACC, 2005). Participants were provided a list of each competency and its definition, and they were asked to rate its relative importance to his or her current position as a mid-level or upper-level administrator within the institution. Additionally, community college department chairs were asked to self-identify any formal or informal experiences that prepared them to appropriately utilize a given competency in their position. Demographic information was collected to assist in

identifying individuals as a veteran or new department chair. No personally identifying information was collected.

Validation

The researcher-created instrument utilized the vocabulary and language from the AACC document, *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (AACC, 2005), the initial document developed by the American Association of Community Colleges on the competencies. In addition, the survey was examined for content by two persons in leadership positions within the community college system: a former associate executive director of academic and student affairs at the Mississippi Community College Board; and a current president of a Mississippi community college.

The former associate director has experience in all levels of leadership at the community college level. In addition to the role of associate executive director, this individual has served as a classroom instructor, assistant dean of career/technical education, dean of business services, and a vice-president of instruction. This person helped establish the in-house leadership class for Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College and published research on the success of this leadership class as it relates to the six AACC leadership competencies (see Haynes, 2009). This person holds a Ph.D. in community college leadership from Mississippi State University.

The current community college president has had a career at the community college level, having served as workforce director, vice president of the community campus, vice-president of a comprehensive campus, and, currently, as a president. This individual has professional interests in leadership and has made numerous state and

national conference presentations on leadership. This individual holds a Ph.D. in higher education administration from the University of Southern Mississippi.

These two individuals reviewed the researcher-created survey instrument to be sure it adequately surveys the six AACC leadership competencies and elicits responses that indicate how the department chair understands and utilizes the competencies.

Comments provided to the researcher regarding the instrument were incorporated into the survey. The reviewers had no survey readability concerns.

Reliability

Reliability was established via a pilot study. One comprehensive campus, one satellite center, and the district office of one of the fifteen Mississippi community colleges was used for the pilot study (n = 38). Each of the six AACC competencies was measured using six different questions. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for each competency as listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha for Each Competency

	α
Organizational Strategy	.889
Resource Management	.881
Communication	.784
Collaboration	.912
Community College Advocacy	.908
Professionalism	.842

Procedures

The researcher submitted the survey instrument, consent form, and procedures to the University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board for approval to conduct research prior to any data being collected. Additionally, the researcher used the following procedures:

The researcher sought approval from the Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College Executive Council to conduct research. In addition, the researcher sought approval from the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness. This is the first approval-granting body prior to seeking approval from individual community college institutions.

The pilot study was completed utilizing one comprehensive campus, one center, and the district office for one Mississippi community college. Reliability statistics were analyzed prior to sending the survey out state-wide.

The researcher constructed a master list of appropriate mid-level and upper-level administrators at the fifteen community colleges in Mississippi. This list was constructed using college websites, personal contacts, or a list of contacts submitted by the institution. This list contained participant email addresses.

Participants were informed via email of the project and the survey to be emailed, and a survey packet was emailed in May 2016 to all upper-level administrators and mid-level administrators. The survey packet contained electronic copies of appropriate letters of permission to conduct research, a letter from the researcher outlining the risks involved, and a link to the appropriate survey. Participants were assigned a non-identifying token so that individuals who had not completed the survey could be issued a

reminder. The researcher used Qualtrics through the University of Southern Mississippi to house the survey and resulting data, and to send reminders to invited participants that had not yet participated. At no time was the participant's name available to the researcher. After two weeks, individuals who had not completed the survey were emailed a reminder to complete it. The researcher entered the data into the SPSS program for statistical analysis.

Analysis

For research hypotheses one and two, the researcher used a *t*-test to determine if differences existed between rankings of mid-level and upper-level administrators and to determine if differences existed between a veteran and a non-veteran department chair. For research questions three and four, the researcher recorded descriptive statistics for the department chairs' trainings as it relates to the individual AACC competencies. Furthermore, the researcher recorded descriptive statistics on the types of training utilized by the faculty member and the institution to prepare the department chair to lead effectively.

Chapter Summary

This chapter details the procedures used to complete this research. A researcher-created instrument was validated by recognized leaders in the field of community college leadership, and assessed for reliability using a pilot study. The instrument was distributed to chairs and administrators employed at community colleges within Mississippi. The results were analyzed and the research questions answered.

CHAPTER IV – RESULTS

Introduction

Questionnaires were sent via Qualtrics to thirteen of the fifteen community and junior colleges in Mississippi (two institutions decided not to participate). Participants were department chairpersons and other administrators as identified by their own institution or by themselves. One hundred twenty-one questionnaires yielded a completed survey response rate of one hundred fifteen ($n = 115$). For statistical analysis, only those participants who self-identified as a president, vice-president, dean, assistant dean, or department chairperson were analyzed.

Descriptive Analysis

Individuals responding had a variety of experiences within their institution. Recognizing that some individuals have held multiple positions, the following is the breakdown of experiences:

Nine individuals have served as president of a community college with a mean service time of 2.89 years. There were six individuals that were new to the presidency, and one president had served sixteen years.

Seventeen individuals have served as a vice-president with an average service time of 8.59 years. Of these, 47.1% of those had served five years or less. There were three vice-presidents serving more than 20 years, and one has served for 30 years.

Twenty-five individuals indicated they have served at the dean level with a mean of 3.48 years in that position. Of those, 40% have worked two years or fewer, and only 8% had worked 10 years or more.

Thirteen individuals had worked at the assistant dean level. Five of those were new in 2016, and only 1 of those (7.7%) had worked more than 10 years.

Thirty-six individuals identified as a department or division chairperson with an average time in that position of 6.86 years. The bulk of those were veteran chairpersons (greater than three years of experience, 66.7%); 12 of those were new chairpersons (three or fewer years of experience, 33.3%).

Sixteen individuals reported serving in another administrative capacity and self-identified their positions as business manager, academic counselor, career-technical counselor, athletic coach, workforce project manager, program director, and office manager.

One hundred fifteen identified their current position as 2 presidents, 12 vice presidents, 17 deans, 4 assistant deans, and 24 department chairpersons; 56 indicated directors, coordinators, or other as their current position.

Individuals who had served as a faculty member self-identified their academic discipline: 9 mathematics instructors (11.84%), 0 fine arts instructors, 6 English/language arts instructors (7.89%), 3 developmental education instructors (3.95%), 14 career/technical instructors (18.42%), 6 science instructors (7.89%), 7 health/physical education instructors (9.21%), 2 history instructors (2.63%), 7 social science instructors including economics, political science, and sociology (9.21%), 1 humanities instructor (speech, foreign language, philosophy, religion; 1.32%); 1 computer science instructor (1.32%), 9 business instructors (11.84%), and 11 other disciplines (14.47%) identified as graduate education, leadership, journalism, adult education, and nursing.

Statistical Analysis

Research Question One

The first research question asked: was there a significant difference in the reported importance rating of the six AACC leadership competencies as rated by community college department chairs and upper level administrators? The independent variables were community college department chairpersons and upper level administrators. The dependent variable was the importance ranking of six different leadership competencies. Each leadership competency was surveyed via six different questions in a 36-question survey.

For organizational strategy, communication, and community college advocacy, Levene's test showed equal variances assumed. For resource management, collaboration, and professionalism, Levene's test showed equal variances could not be assumed. There was no difference between department chairperson's rankings and upper-level administrator's rankings on any competency:

Organizational Strategy, $t(54) = -.553$, $p = .582$, $d = 0.15$

Resource Management, $t(32.798) = .885$, $p = .382$, $d = 0.27$

Communication, $t(54) = -.430$, $p = .669$, $d = 0.12$

Collaboration, $t(33.047) = .057$, $p = .995$, $d = 0.02$

Community College Advocacy, $t(54) = -1.720$, $p = 0.091$, $d = 0.48$

Professionalism, $t(31.896) = -.062$, $p = .951$, $d = 0.02$

Research Question Two

The second research question asked: was there a significant difference between the reported importance rating of the AACC leadership competencies as rated by the

veteran community college chair and the new community college chair? Twenty-one individuals responded to this question; four were new chairpersons, and seventeen were veteran chairpersons. The independent variable was new or veteran department chairperson; the dependent variable was the importance ranking of six different leadership competencies surveyed via six different questions in a 36-question survey.

Organizational Strategy, $t(18) = -.903, p = .379, d = 0.6$

Resource Management, $t(18) = -1.075, p = .297, d = 0.71$

Communication, $t(18) = -.776, p = .448, d = 0.51$

Collaboration, $t(18) = -.590, p = .562, d = 0.39$

Community College Advocacy, $t(18) = -.371, p = .715, d = 0.24$

Professionalism, $t(18) = -.643, p = .528, d = 0.42$

Research Question Three

Research question three asked: what professional development experiences, both formal and informal, have been utilized in the leadership training of community college department chairs? That is, what methods are used to develop these skills?

Organizational Strategy. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons ($n = 24$) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of organizational strategy. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Organizational Strategy

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	2	8.3%
In-House Leadership Programs	7	29.2%
On-the-Job Training	16	66.7%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	11	0.912
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	7	29.2%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	8	33.3%
Challenging Job Assignment	4	16.7%
Mentoring Relationships	4	16.7%
Other	0	0.0%
None	1	4.2%

Resource Management. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons (n = 24) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of resource management. Results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Resource Management

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	3	12.5%
In-House Leadership Programs	3	12.5%
On-the-Job Training	17	70.3%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	6	25.0%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	6	25.0%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	5	20.8%
Challenging Job Assignment	2	8.3%
Mentoring Relationships	3	8.3%
Other	0.	0.0%
None	1	4.2%

Communication. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons (n = 24) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of communication. Results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Communication

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	7	29.2%
In-House Leadership Programs	5	20.3%
On-the-Job Training	18	75.0%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	12	50.0%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	16	66.7%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	8	33.3%
Challenging Job Assignment	7	29.2%
Mentoring Relationships	4	16.7%
Other	1	4.2%
None	0	0.0%

One respondent indicated the competency of communication was developed by being forced to publish in professional journals as a requirement of their position.

Collaboration. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons (n = 24) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of collaboration. Results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Collaboration

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	5	20.8%
In-House Leadership Programs	7	29.2%
On-the-Job Training	16	66.7%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	10	41.7%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	12	50.0%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	6	25.0%
Challenging Job Assignment	7	29.2%
Mentoring Relationships	7	29.2%
Other	1	4.2%
None	0	0.0%

One respondent indicated the competency of collaboration was developed via past work experiences in an acute care facility and in continuing education at this facility.

Community College Advocacy. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons (n = 24) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of organizational strategy. Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Community College Advocacy

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	3	12.5%
In-House Leadership Programs	6	25.0%
On-the-Job Training	14	58.3%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	10	41.7%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	6	25.0%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	6	25.0%
Challenging Job Assignment	3	12.5%
Mentoring Relationships	4	16.7%
Other	2	8.3%
None	0	0.0%

Although two respondents indicated other ways of developing the skill of community college advocacy, no specific additional methods of developing this skill were reported.

Professionalism. Survey participants identified as department chairpersons (n = 24) selected the method(s) utilized in developing the skill of professionalism. Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency of Methods Utilized in Developing Professionalism

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	7	29.2%
In-House Leadership Programs	5	20.8%
On-the-Job Training	13	54.2%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	12	50.0%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	11	45.8%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	6	25.0%
Challenging Job Assignment	5	20.8%
Mentoring Relationships	6	25.0%
Other	2	8.3%
None	0	0.0%

Two respondents indicated additional methods for developing the skill of professionalism; however, only one additional response was recorded: “This is part of my basic training and upbringing.”

Research Question Four

Research question four asked: is there a relationship between the identifiable formal and informal leadership training of community college chairs and the AACC leadership competencies? That is, do all participants feel that professional development opportunities include opportunities to enhance or improve the AACC leadership competency skill set in some manner.

Table 8 lists the number of chairpersons (n = 24) that indicated they had an opportunity via some formal or informal training to develop the skill indicated.

Table 8

Number of Chairpersons Trained on the AACC Leadership Competencies

	Formal/Informal Training	None
Organizational Strategy	23	1
Resource Management	2	1
Communication	24	0
Collaboration	24	0
Community College Advocacy	24	0
Professionalism	24	0

Almost without exception, community college chairpersons were provided opportunities, formal and informal, to develop the skill set associated with the AACC leadership competencies.

Ancillary Findings

Competency Rankings

Survey participants (n = 83) were asked to rank the AACC Leadership Competencies in order from most important (ranking of 1) relative to their present position to least important (ranking of 6) relative to their present position.

Organizational strategy was ranked in every position and occurred in the top three positions for 59.04% of rankings and in the bottom three positions for 40.96% of rankings. It had a mean ranking of 3.12 (SD = 1.65).

Resource management was ranked in every position and occurred in the top three positions for 37.35% of rankings and in the bottom three positions for 62.65% of rankings. It had a mean ranking of 3.93 (SD = 1.53).

Communication was consistently ranked in one of the three most important rankings and was never ranked as the least important competencies by any respondents. The rankings for communication (M = 2.47) was also less variable (SD = 1.11) than any other competency.

Collaboration was ranked in every position, but most often was placed in the bottom three positions (78.31%). It had a mean ranking of 4.04 (SD = 1.38).

Community college advocacy was ranked in every category with a mean ranking of 4.65 (SD = 1.59). It was ranked in the bottom three rankings 78.31% of the time.

Professionalism had a mean ranking of 2.80 (SD = 1.80). And, although this rank had more variability, it was ranked in the top three categories 68.67% of all rankings.

Developing the Competencies

Table 9 indicates the methods by which all respondents (n = 103) developed the competency of organizational strategy.

Table 9

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Organizational Strategy

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	45	43.7%
In-House Leadership Programs	34	33.0%
On-the-Job Training	72	69.9%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	58	56.3%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	52	50.5%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	37	35.9%
Challenging Job Assignment	30	29.1%
Mentoring Relationships	33	32.0%
Other	1	1.0%
None	2	1.9%

Table 10 indicates the methods by which all respondents (n = 103) developed the competency of resource management.

Table 10

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Resource Management

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	29	28.2%
In-House Leadership Programs	17	16.5%
On-the-Job Training	79	79.7%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	44	42.7%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	43	41.7%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	24	23.3%
Challenging Job Assignment	27	26.2%
Mentoring Relationships	21	20.4%
Other	2	1.9%
None	2	1.9%

Table 11 indicates the methods by which all respondents (n = 103) developed the competency of communication.

Table 11

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Communication

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	45	43.7%
In-House Leadership Programs	35	34.0%
On-the-Job Training	71	68.9%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	59	57.3%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	62	60.2%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	34	33.0%
Challenging Job Assignment	38	36.9%
Mentoring Relationships	33	32.0%
Other	6	5.8%
None	1	1.0%

In addition to the other methods identified by department chairpersons, other administrative participants indicated they developed communication by moderating sessions at conferences, by building on lifelong experiences, by reading current literature in the field of communication, by emulating respected colleagues and former professors, and by enrollment in undergraduate classes.

Table 12 indicates the methods by which all respondents (n = 103) developed the competency of collaboration.

Table 12

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Collaboration

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	34	33.0%
In-House Leadership Programs	34	33.0%
On-the-Job Training	61	59.2%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	52	50.5%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	52	50.5%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	29	28.2%
Challenging Job Assignment	42	40.8%
Mentoring Relationships	29	28.2%
Other	1	1.0%
None	1	1.0%

Table 13 indicates the methods by which all respondents (n = 103) developed the competency of community college advocacy.

Table 13

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Community College Advocacy

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	25	24.3%
In-House Leadership Programs	32	31.1%
On-the-Job Training	59	57.3%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	48	46.6%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	35	34.0%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	30	29.1%
Challenging Job Assignment	19	18.4%
Mentoring Relationships	27	26.2%
Other	5	4.9%
None	1	1.0%

Only one participant commented on the “other” category: “As you work in this setting on a daily basis, you see the successes that wouldn’t be available to the student in other ways.”

Table 14 indicates the methods by which all respondents developed the competency of professionalism.

Table 14

Frequency of Methods Used for Developing Professionalism

	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Programs	47	45.6%
In-House Leadership Programs	34	33.0%
On-the-Job Training	67	65.0%
Learning from Another in Similar Position	63	61.2%
Previous/Progressive Responsibilities	62	60.2%
Formal Professional Development Workshop	37	35.9%
Challenging Job Assignment	28	27.2%
Mentoring Relationships	45	43.7%
Other	10	9.7%
None	1	1.0%

Those responding with “other” indicated professionalism was developed by reading and self-study, by being instilled by parents, by being a result of an ethical background learned from parents and family, and by being familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the position.

Summary

This chapter gave descriptive statistics for survey respondents and addressed the statistical results for the first two research questions. In addition, qualitative results were given for the last two research questions. Ancillary findings to be discussed were presented.

CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings and conclusions resulting from the study, any limitations on the study, and the recommendations for future research.

Conclusions

The findings of this study seem to be consistent with other similar studies using other populations (Duree, 2007; Hassan et al., 2010; McNair, 2010; Price, 2012).

Chairpersons and Upper-Level Administrators

Community college department chairpersons' rankings of the AACCC Leadership Competencies were not statistically different from other administrators' rankings within the community college institution. That is, all administrators, upper-level administrators as well mid-level administrators (department chairpersons), valued all six of the AACCC leadership competencies and deemed them equally important in performing their job responsibilities. The researcher supposed that some competencies (e.g., community college advocacy and resource management) would be deemed more important by members of the college community (presidents, vice-presidents) who, as a consequence of their position, were required to promote the institution to constituents and stakeholders. However, community college chairpersons recognize a role to play alongside upper level leadership. Gillette-Karam (1999b) concluded that the chair position was critical and was a front-line position to the college. It seems that chairpersons in this study would agree with that conclusion. They deem it important to be an advocate for the community college system – a front-line advocate with the same level of advocacy as a president. Foote (1999) believed the chair to be essential to the

daily operation of colleges, and this study seems to support that idea. Chairpersons seem to be in the trenches with faculty and top-level administrators, finding a balance as a teacher/administrator in their responsibilities as they relate to the AACCC leadership competencies.

New and Veteran Chairpersons

There was also no significant difference in the rankings of the six leadership competencies as ranked by new department chairpersons and veteran chairpersons. One would surmise that spending a significant amount of time as a chairperson might change a chairperson's outlook on their job and responsibilities. This does not seem to be the case. Perhaps not immediately upon appointment, but soon thereafter, a chairperson understands the role of the chair as it relates to the six AACCC leadership competencies. The responsibilities of managing a department and supervising faculty members seem to make the chairperson more cognizant of the need to be an advocate for the institution and its resources and to conduct oneself as a professional. It seems that new chairpersons quickly realize that the skills of organization, managing resources, etc., however, dormant as a faculty member, become crucial to the success as a manager and leader of an academic unit.

It would also seem that a department chairperson would have served for some period of time as a junior faculty member. During that time, a faculty member would form opinions about qualities that are liked and appreciated in a supervisor as well as leadership characteristics that are lacking or should be replaced. The AACCC leadership competencies have been acknowledged as core set of leadership skills applicable to levels of community college leaders (Hassan et al., 2010). This research seems to support the

idea that new department chairpersons come into the position having already recognized competencies that are valuable in being successful in that position.

Obtaining the Leadership Competencies

Several researchers (Hassan et al., 2010; McNair, 2010) have investigated not only the perceived importance of the competencies, but the methods utilized by individuals in increasing their understanding and skill-sets related to the competencies. This research instrument suggested eight methods gleaned from previous research – graduate programs, in-house leadership programs, on-the-job training, learning from another person in a similar position, previous/progressive responsibilities, formal professional development/workshops, challenging job assignments, and mentoring (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Cejda & Joelley, 2013; Duree, 2007; Hull & Keim, 2007; McNair, 2010). Respondents were given opportunities to suggest other methods they have utilized that may have not been listed. All eight training categories were evidenced in all six leadership competencies. That is, there is a plethora of ways to develop the skills associated with any one competency. However, the one method that is consistently ranked higher than any other method for all six competencies was on-the-job training. This idea seems to reflect the AACCC (2005) position that leaders can learn to be leaders, and leaders hone their skills over the life of their career. In fact, there seems to be little substitute for developing the leadership competencies than that of *having* to lead a unit and utilizing the competencies while doing so. Chairpersons develop the competencies of leadership by *being* leaders.

Similarly, a second common way of developing the six competencies was by learning from another person in a similar position. This seems to support the findings of

previous research (Filan, 1999; Gillet-Karam, 1999a; Pettitt, 1999) that chairpersons are not taught to be a faculty supervisor/leader, but often learn to perform the job by either *doing* the job (on-the-job training) or learning from someone already in that position. Perhaps not formalized as a mentor/mentee relationship, chairpersons seek out the advice and wisdom of other chairpersons or former chairpersons as they perform administrative duties relative to their department. In fact, this relationship of *asking the chair down the hall* would suggest a more valuable relationship than that of a formal mentor assignment – chairpersons seek out colleagues that are trusted and capable. Colleagues are chosen as advisors and *keepers of knowledge* based on, perhaps, different criteria and perceptions than those criteria observed by top-level administrators.

In addition, the commonality of learning the AACC competencies by on-the-job training and learning from another in a similar position seems to suggest that there are not valuable in-service programs that speak to the development of the competencies. Formal professional development/workshops were methods found in developing all six competencies. However, they were usually ranked as a less-utilized method. Institutions with in-house leadership programs as well as institutions requiring professional development should examine offerings in light of the competencies. McNair (2010) advocated for these six competencies to provide a framework for professional development and graduate programs in higher education. Department chairpersons would benefit from redesigned professional development opportunities that would speak to the six AACC competencies rather than professional development programs that do not directly relate to that of leadership as a mid-level manager.

Limitations

Although this study provided some valuable findings for department chairpersons consistent with findings in the literature, one should be aware of the following limitations:

1. Only department chairpersons in Mississippi were surveyed.
2. A small number of new department chairpersons was used. Differences may exist when the sample size is increased, although Cohen's D was small or negligible for four of the competencies and showed a medium effect size for two of the competencies (resource management and communication).
3. Participants were provided an email link in order to respond. In cases where the researcher could directly identify respondents by a list provided by the institution or information gleaned from the institutional website, these participants could be sent a reminder email. In other cases, the college itself emailed a link to the survey.

Recommendations for Practice

The following are recommendations for practice:

1. Chairpersons should be provided with opportunities to network with other chairpersons across campuses and institutions.
2. Current professional development and in-service opportunities should utilize the six AACC leadership competencies as a framework. Opportunities for more formal experiences guided by the AACC leadership competency framework specific to chairpersons should be considered and provided as professional development.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for additional research:

1. The methods used in developing the competencies should be further explored. Although some were regularly used (on-the-job training), there was no indication of why others methods were not utilized. Future research could consider the usefulness and practicality of the other methods and the resource limitations for attending/not attending conferences and workshops.
2. Future studies can examine the importance of the AACC leadership competencies as they relate to non-administrative positions (i.e., faculty). This study considered mid-level management, and other studies considered top-level management.
3. Future research should continue to consider the inclusion the AACC leadership competencies as it informs leadership programs at colleges and universities.

APPENDIX A – Survey Instrument

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. How long have you served in each of the following positions? If you have not served in a position, indicate none.

President _____years _____none

Vice President _____years _____none

Dean _____years _____none

Department/Division Chair _____years _____none

Other (please specify) _____years _____none

2. Which best describes your current position (mark only one)?

_____President

_____Vice President

_____Dean

_____Department/Division Chair

_____Other (please specify)_____

3. If you marked Department/Division, please indicate to which academic or career/technical department best describes your area:

_____Mathematics

_____Fine Arts

_____English/Language Arts

_____Developmental Education

_____Technical Programs

_____Career Programs

- _____ Science
- _____ Health/Physical Education
- _____ Social Sciences
- _____ Other (Please specify)_____

AACC Leadership Competencies

The following questions address the six Leadership Competencies developed by the American Association of Community Colleges. For each item, please rate each statement as to its importance (not at all important, very unimportant, somewhat unimportant, somewhat important, very important, extremely important) in being effective and/or successful in your present position.

As an effective community college administrator, I should

4. Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to monitor and improve the quality of the education and the long-term health of the organization.
5. Ensure accountability in reporting practices.
6. Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences.
7. Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.
8. Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.
9. Demonstrate transformational leadership through authenticity, creativity, and vision.

10. Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders to solve problems, makes decisions, and plan strategically.
11. Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of reporting systems and databases.
12. Disseminate and support policies and strategies.
13. Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.
14. Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.
15. Understand and enforce the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.
16. Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization; changing demographics; and to the economic, political, and public health needs of students and the community.
17. Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition, and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and the local, state, and national policies.
18. Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.
19. Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.

20. Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college, seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.
21. Self-assess performance regularly using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.
22. Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.
23. Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.
24. Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies and stakeholders.
25. Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.
26. Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.
27. Support lifelong learning for self and others.
28. Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources and assets.
29. Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.
30. Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.

31. Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.
32. Advance life-long learning and support a learner-centered and learning-centered environment.
33. Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.
34. Align organization mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.
35. Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems and that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.
36. Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.
37. Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.
38. Represent the community college in the local community, in the border educational community, at various levels of government, and as a model of higher education that can be replication in international settings.
39. Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decision, and accept responsibility.

Each of the six AACCC leadership competencies is defined below.

Organizational Strategy - An effective community college leader strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization,

promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends.

Resource Management - An effective community college leader equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community college

Communication - An effective community college leader uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission.

Collaboration - An effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of all students and sustain the community college mission.

Community College Advocacy - An effective community college leader understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.

Professionalism – An effective community college leader works ethically to set high standards for self and others, continuously improve self and surroundings, demonstrate accountability to and for the institution, and ensure the long-term viability of the college and community.

40. Please rank each of the following competencies in order from most important to least important relative to your present position:

_____ Organizational Strategy

_____Resource Management

_____Communication

_____Collaboration

_____Community College Advocacy

_____Professionalism

41. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in
Organizational Strategy (Check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

42. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in resource
management (check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

43. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in
communication (check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

44. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in collaboration (check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

45. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in community college advocacy (check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

46. To what extent have you utilized the following to develop skills in professionalism (check all that apply):

Graduate programs (doctoral or otherwise)	
In-house leadership program	
On-the-job training	
Learning from another person in a similar position	
Previous position/progressive responsibilities	
Formal professional development/specific workshop	
Challenging job assignments	
Mentoring relationship	
OTHER (please specify):	
NONE	

APPENDIX B – IRB Approval Letter



INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 15072803

PROJECT TITLE: Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chair

PROJECT TYPE: New Project

RESEARCHER(S): Jason C. Ross

COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology

DEPARTMENT: Educational Studies and Research

FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval

PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 07/31/2015 to 07/30/2016

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.

Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX C – MACJC Approval for Research Request

Application to Conduct Research on MACJC Institutions

Thank you for your interest in the Mississippi community college system (MACJC) and your desire to conduct research within the system. Individuals wishing to conduct research at institutions within the system must seek prior approval through the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness (CIRE) subcommittee on External Research Approval.

To request approval, individuals should complete the attached form and submit it and all supporting documentation to the chair of the CIRE subcommittee on External Research Approval, David Case at dcase@eccc.edu. Upon submission of a complete application, the requestor can expect a response within 7 days.

To submit the form electronically, you may use the following format as your signature: first initial, last initial, and 6 digit date of birth. Your research advisor may also use this format.

Remember that submission of a complete application does not imply approval. Please do not begin research or contact individual institutions until given permission to do so.

Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (MACJC) Application to Conduct Research on MACJC Institutions		<u>LEAVE BLANK – FOR MACJC USE ONLY.</u> PROJECT NUMBER: DATE RECEIVED: CIRE Recommendation (Check One): <input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approve <input type="checkbox"/> Approve with Stipulations <input type="checkbox"/> Table for Further Review – Review Date: Comments:	
DIRECTIONS: Individuals conducting research on Mississippi's community and junior colleges must complete this application. Individuals should also review the checklist following this application for more details. Submission of application does not equal approval. Research cannot begin before approval is granted. Applications are typically responded to within 30 days of receipt.			
Purpose - Individuals conducting research on Mississippi's community and junior colleges must complete this application and obtain approval from the CIRE Sub-committee on Outside Research prior to conducting any research. This Application serves the following purposes:			
(1) requires the researcher to summarize the proposed research and provide supporting documentation ensuring that research is performed in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and institutional and federal policies regarding human subjects research, (2) ensures the proposed research has institutional support through IRB approval and the endorsement of a qualified research advisor (i.e. faculty member) who assumes responsibility for the project, (3) provides the applicant with appropriate documentation that the proposed study has been reviewed and approved.			
Principal Investigator (PI) Contact Information – The PI for the purposes of this application is the individual who will personally conduct this research study. Under most circumstances, the PI will be the student researcher.			
Name:	Jason C. Ross	Phone:	601-310-8215
Email:	jason.ross@mgccc.edu	Fax:	601-528-8945
Address:	65 Sallie Rd.	City:	Wiggins
		State:	MS
		Zip:	39577
Is the PI a current employee of one of the MCCB or one of the MACJC institutions? x <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Institution <u>MGCCC</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Research Advisor (RA) Contact Information – The RA for the purposes of this application is the individual who will personally supervise and oversee this research study. Under most circumstances, the RA will be the faculty member working with the student researcher.			
Name:	Dr. Rich Mohn	Phone:	601-266-6179
Email:	Richard.Mohn@usm.edu	Fax:	
Address:	118 College Dr. #5023	City:	Hattiesburg
		State:	MS
		Zip:	39406
Sponsoring Institution or Agency: University of Southern Mississippi			
Sponsoring Academic Division/Department: Educational Studies and Research			
Source of funding for research: NA			
Start Date of Research:	September 7, 2015	End Date of Research:	May 30, 2016
Has the study obtained IRB approval from sponsoring institution?			

Yes, Approval Date July 31, 2015 If Yes, was Study Exempt or Expedited (deemed minimal risk to human subjects)

No Full Board (deemed greater than minimal risk or work with special populations of human subjects)

Not Applicable, Explain:

What is the college of interest for the study?
 Select more than one, if applicable.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All MACJC Institutions <input type="checkbox"/> Coahoma Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Copiah-Lincoln Community College <input type="checkbox"/> East Central Community College <input type="checkbox"/> East Mississippi Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Hinds Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Holmes Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Itawamba Community College	<input type="checkbox"/> Jones County Junior College <input type="checkbox"/> Meridian Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippi Delta Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast Mississippi Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest Mississippi Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Pearl River Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest Mississippi Community College
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Approval by the MACJC does not imply approval of individual institutions. After receiving MACJC approval, the PI should contact the appropriate personnel at each of the institutions for institutional level approval.

I. Title. Provide the title of the research study.
 Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chairperson

II. Research Summary. Please answer the questions below and provide a brief, non-technical description of the study. Typical summaries are less than 150 words.

(a) Purpose. Define the purpose of the research (professional/dissertation/etc.)
 Doctoral Dissertation Master Thesis Course Research Project Professional, for publication
 Professional, for internal use Other, please specify _____

(b) Nature. Is the research Primary or Secondary? Primary Secondary

(c) Mode. How will data be collected?
 Survey Data Extraction Interview(s) Focus Group(s) Other Professional, for publication

(d) Rationale. State research questions and/or hypotheses and tell why the study is needed.

Developed in 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges describe six competencies deemed essential for community college leaders. This project seeks to understand these competencies as they relate to the success and needs of the community college department chair. In addition, this project will seek to determine the most common way that skills related to these competencies are acquired by the community college department chair. Specifically, this study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between the perceived importance of the AACC leadership competencies as ranked by the community college department chairs and upper level administrators?
2. Is there a difference between the perceived importance of the AACC leadership competencies as ranked by the veteran community college chair and the new community college chair?
3. What formal and informal training has been utilized in the leadership training of community college department chairs?
4. Is there a relationship between the identifiable formal and informal leadership training of community college chairs and the AACC leadership competencies?

(e) *Institutional Burden.* Provide an estimate of the classroom or individual time and/or institutional resources required to conduct study. Include any institutional resources requested such as faculty/staff, computer labs, equipment, supplies, and/or administrative support.

An electronic survey will be administered to faculty chairpersons and administrators using Qualtrics. Participants may use their office computer to complete the survey which is approximately 20 minutes in length.

(f) *Use of Data/Anonymity.* Please answer the following questions about how the data will be presented.

Is the data comparative? Yes No

If yes, will the included institutions be compared against each other or against institutions outside of the MACJC? Will the MACJC be compared against other state systems?

Institutions within MACJC will be compared against each other.

Institutions will be compared with institutions outside of the MACJC.

The MACJC will be compared against other state systems.

The data will be used comparatively in a different manner.

Describe entities to be compared: _____

The data will not be used as comparative data.

Will the institutions involved in the research be anonymous in the published result? Anonymous Not Anonymous

Please provide a summary of data security measures to be employed in connection with the research:

Although demographic information will be surveyed, no identifying information will be available. Participants will be invited via email to take the survey. Qualtrics has the capability to remind individuals that have completed the survey to do so, but the researcher will have no knowledge of who has completed the survey or not. The researcher will keep a spreadsheet of all responses and data for a period of one-year. The data will be permanently deleted after this time

Note: Section III below applies to survey, interview, and other research methods that include direct or indirect contact with human subjects. Researchers using data limited to databases may skip Section III and move on to Section IV.

III. Participants. Provide a brief, non-technical description of the human subjects of the study. This summary should readily identify the following:

(a) *Participants.* Specify number of participants and their gender, ethnicity, race, and age. Clearly state any inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as identify any select populations such as minors, pregnant women, non-English speaking, remedial, elderly, specific major, etc. If any vulnerable populations are included (i.e. minors, adults with cognitive impairment, non-English speaking persons, etc.) identify additional precautions for their protection.

All department chairpersons and upper-level administrators (deans, directors, vice-presidents) within MGCCC will be invited to participate. No select populations will be used.

(b) *Recruitment.* Describe how potential subjects will be made aware of the study and outline any recruitment procedures (email, letters, class announcements, newspaper ads, etc.), including any compensation or incentives.

Participants will be identified using personal contacts and information posted on the college website. Participants will be invited via email to participate in the study. Those individuals that have not

responded will be invited again after one week to complete the study. No compensation or incentives will be offered

(c) *Informed Consent.* Identify the process of gaining participant consent. Attach a copy of any consent forms used in the study. Provide any necessary explanation if informed consent is waived or not applicable.



long_form_consent
_template_8-28-14.d

Invited participants will be given a statement regarding the purpose and nature of the study, the time it will take to complete the survey, and the anticipated use of the data. Utilizing Qualtrics, participants must choose the "I give my consent to participate in this research. I am 18 years or age or older" link to access the survey instrument; those individuals that choose the "I do not give my consent to participate in this research" link will not be allowed to take the survey.

(d) *Risks and Deception.* Describe any immediate or long-term risks to participants that may arise from participation in this study (physical, emotional, social, occupational, financial, legal, etc.). Indicate if these risks are greater than those faced in normal life, and provide justification for any deception of participants.

There are no immediate or long-term risks to participants.

Signatures	
<p>Principal Investigator – I certify that the information in this application is complete and correct. As Principal Investigator, I have the ultimate responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.</p>	
JR092672	September 2, 2015
Signature of Principal Investigator	Date
<p>Research Advisor – I certify that the information in this application is complete and correct, and that this proposed research has been approved by the IRB of the sponsoring institution. As Research Advisor, I confirm that the student researcher under my guidance is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects, and has sufficient training and experience to conduct the research outlined in this application.</p> <p>I further agree to regularly meet with the student researcher to monitor his or her progress; and if problems arise, I will become personally available to help the student researcher resolve those problems. As an advisor on this project, I will assure the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.</p>	
RM040365	September 2, 2015
Signature of Research Advisor	Date
<p>Department Chair – I acknowledge that this research is in keeping with the standards set by our department and our institutional IRB or its equivalent. I also certify that the Principal Investigator has met all the departmental and institutional requirements for approval of this research.</p>	
Signature of Department Chair	Date
<p>CIRE subcommittee chair – I acknowledge on behalf of the Council on Institutional Research and Effectiveness (CIRE) that this research has been reviewed and has subsequently received the following recommendation by consensus of the membership:</p> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Tabled for Further Review <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Approved with Stipulations: </p>	

Paul Martin Cesa 9/22/2015
Signature of CIRE Subcommittee Chair Date

APPENDIX D – MGCCC Research Request Approval

Ross, Jason

From: Pugh, Jason
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 11:41 AM
To: Ross, Jason
Subject: Re: MGCCC Research Request

The Executive Council has approved your research. I will forward you a signed copy of the request in a few days, but in the meantime, please proceed.

Good luck! -- JP

Jason V. Pugh, Ph. D.
Vice President
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College
Teaching & Learning/Community Campus/Student Services
10298 Express Drive
Gulfport, MS 39503
ph: 601-928-6233
email: jason.pugh@mgccc.edu

From: "Ross, Jason" <jason.ross@mgccc.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2015 9:14 AM
To: Jason Pugh <jason.pugh@mgccc.edu>
Subject: MGCCC Research Request

Hi Dr. Pugh,

I have received IRB approval from USM, and I am ready to conduct my doctoral dissertation research. I am using a researcher-created instrument, so I will need to validate it first. I am hoping to validate it using DO and JD administrators and faculty. I would like to use PK and JC administrators and faculty in my actual research.

At any rate, attached is a request for research for EC approval. I look forward to hearing from you.


Jason




Jason C. Ross
Mathematics Instructor
MGCCC - Perkinston Campus
P.O. Box 548
51 Main St.
Perkinston, MS 39573
(601) 928-6375 (office)
(601) 528-8945 (fax)
jason.ross@mgccc.edu

Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College		LEAVE BLANK FOR MGCCC USE ONLY.	
Request to Conduct Research at MGCCC		PROJECT NUMBER: 672	
		DATE RECEIVED: 8/15/15	
DIRECTIONS: Individuals who wish to conduct research utilizing MGCCC students or employees must complete this application and email to jason.pugh@mgccc.edu .		<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL (PI/PI APPROVING)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL WITH SUPERVISOR	
		<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVAL THROUGH REVIEW BOARD/SUBCOMMITTEE	
		<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	
Purpose – This application must be completed and approval granted by the MGCCC Executive Council prior to conducting any research utilizing college students or employees. The purpose of this application is to ensure that the researcher complies with the following conditions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) requires the researcher to summarize the proposed research and provide supporting documentation ensuring that research is performed in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and institutional and federal policies regarding human subjects research, (2) ensures the proposed research has institutional support or will have such support through IRB approval and the endorsement of a qualified research advisor (i.e., faculty member) who assumes responsibility for the project, (3) provides the applicant with appropriate documentation that the MGCCC Executive Council has reviewed the proposed study. 			
Principal Investigator (PI) Contact Information – The PI for the purposes of this application is the individual who will personally conduct this research study. Under most circumstances, the PI will be the student researcher.			
Name:	Jason C. Ross	Phone:	601-310-8215
Email:	jason.ross@mgccc.edu	Fax:	601-528-8945
Address:	65 Sallie Rd.	City:	Wiggins
		State:	MS
		Zip:	39577
Research Advisor (RA) Contact Information – The RA for the purposes of this application is the individual who will personally supervise and oversee this research study. Under most circumstances, the RA will be the faculty member working with the student researcher.			
Name:	Dr. Richard Mohn	Phone:	601-266-6179
Email:	richard.mohn@usm.edu	Fax:	
Address:	P.O. Box 05027	City:	Hattiesburg
	University of Southern Mississippi	State:	MS
		Zip:	39406
Sponsoring Institution or Agency:	University of Southern Mississippi		
Sponsoring Academic Division/Department:	Department of Educational Studies and Research		
Has the study obtained IRB approval from sponsoring institution? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, Approve Date <u>07/31/15</u> If Yes, was Study <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt or Expedited (deemed minimal risk to human subjects) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Full Board (deemed greater than minimal risk or work with special populations of human subjects) <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable, Explain:			

<p>I. Title. Provide the title of the research study.</p> <p>Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chair</p>
<p>II. Research Summary. Provide a brief, non-technical description of the study. Typical summaries are less than 150 words. This summary should readily identify the following:</p> <p>(a) <i>Purpose and Rationale.</i> State research questions and/or hypotheses and tell why the study is needed.</p> <p>Developed in 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges describe six competencies deemed essential for community college leaders. This project seeks to understand these competencies as they relate to the success and needs of the community college department chair. In addition, this project will seek to determine the most common way that skills related to these competencies are acquired by the community college department chair. Specifically, this study will attempt to answer the following research questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a difference between the perceived importance of the AACC leadership competencies as ranked by the community college department chairs and upper level administrators? 2. Is there a difference between the perceived importance of the AACC leadership competencies as ranked by the veteran community college chair and the new community college chair? 3. What formal and informal training has been utilized in the leadership training of community college department chairs? 4. Is there a relationship between the identifiable formal and informal leadership training of community college chairs and the AACC leadership competencies?
<p>(b) <i>Justification.</i> Provide a brief justification for the study.</p> <p>The AACC leadership competencies have been well-researched with upper level administrators (deans, vice-presidents, presidents, board members). However, no research has been identified that seeks to understand the importance of these competencies as they relate to departmental chairpersons, a mid-level administrator. In addition, the literature identifies ways a department chairperson is prepared for administrative duties. This study will identify if these methods of skill-attainment indeed prepare department chairpersons to utilize and implement the AACC competencies.</p>
<p>(c) <i>Procedures and Methods.</i> Provide a brief summary of research methods and procedures.</p> <p>Department chairpersons and upper-level administrators will be utilized in this study and will be identified through community college websites and personal contacts. Specifically, district office administrators and administrators and chairpersons at the Jefferson Davis campus will be invited to participate in this study for the purposes of validating a researcher-created instrument. Once the instrument is validated, all other chairs and administrators at other campuses will be invited to participate. Participants will be invited via email, and the survey will be conducted using Qualtrics, a survey software package at the University of Southern Mississippi. The study will take approximately twenty minutes to complete. No personally identifiable information will be collected.</p> <p><small>Note: Section III is applicable primarily to interviews and other research not described in the context of the human subjects research and data in the table below. It is not applicable to research that is not described below.</small></p>
<p>III. Participants. Provide a brief, non-technical description of the human subjects of the study. This summary should readily identify the following:</p> <p>(a) <i>Participants.</i> Specify number of participants and their gender, ethnicity, race, and age. Clearly state any inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as identify any select populations such as minors, pregnant women, non-English speaking, remedial, elderly, specific major, etc.</p>

<p>All department chairpersons and upper-level administrators (deans, directors, vice-presidents) within MGCCC will be invited to participate. No select populations will be used.</p>
<p>(b) <i>Recruitment.</i> Describe how potential subjects will be made aware of the study and outline any recruitment procedures (email, letters, class announcements, newspaper ads, etc.), including any compensation or incentives.</p>
<p>Participants will be identified using personal contacts and information posted on the college website. Participants will be invited via email to participate in the study. Those individuals that have not responded will be invited again after one week to complete the study. No compensation or incentives will be offered.</p>
<p>(c) <i>Informed Consent.</i> Identify the process of gaining participant consent. Attach a copy of any consent forms used in the study. Provide any necessary explanation if informed consent is waived or not applicable.</p>
<p> human_research_re view_app_7-24-15 ¶</p> <p>Invited participants will be given a statement regarding the purpose and nature of the study, the time it will take to complete the survey, and the anticipated use of the data. Utilizing Qualtrics, participants must choose the "I give my consent to participate in this research. I am 18 years or age or older" link to access the survey instrument; those individuals that choose the "I do not give my consent to participate in this research" link will not be allowed to take the survey.</p>
<p>(d) <i>Risks and Deception.</i> Describe any immediate or long-term risks to participants that may arise from participation in this study (physical, emotional, social, occupational, financial, legal, etc.). Indicate if these risks are greater than those faced in normal life, and provide justification for any deception of participants.</p>
<p>There are no immediate or long-term risks to participants.</p>
<p>IV. Procedures and Methods. Provide a brief, non-technical description of the research methods and procedures of the study. This summary should readily identify the following:</p>
<p>(a) <i>Data Collection.</i> Describe the data collection procedures and provide any necessary supporting documentation (survey, interview questions, etc.). Explain when and where data will be collected, specifying if class time and/or institution facilities will be used to collect data. If databases will be used specify the exact data needed (file layouts, data elements, etc.), the timeframe, and identify the agency or agencies housing the data. (Note: Researchers using</p>

databases should ensure that the necessary data elements are available from the appropriate source.)												
 <p>Qualtrics Survey Software Jason Ross</p> <p>Participants will be invited via email to complete the attached survey in Qualtrics housed on the server at USM's College of Education and Psychology. Final responses will be analyzed using SPSS and will be saved on the researchers personal computer. Chairpersons and administrators will be able to complete the survey during their office time.</p>												
(b) <i>Personal Identifiers.</i> Identify any of the following personal identifiers that the study will collect or receive:												
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the study will not use identifiers</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Names</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Student ID Numbers (used by school)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Any Account Number</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Birthdates</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Academic (GPA, major, classification)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Numbers</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other Dates</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Photos (full face or other image)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Fax Numbers</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Social Security Numbers</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Internet Protocol (IP) Addresses</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain Below)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Other #1: Other #2: Other #3:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Names	<input type="checkbox"/> Student ID Numbers (used by school)	<input type="checkbox"/> Any Account Number	<input type="checkbox"/> Birthdates	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic (GPA, major, classification)	<input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Numbers	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Dates	<input type="checkbox"/> Photos (full face or other image)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fax Numbers	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Security Numbers	<input type="checkbox"/> Internet Protocol (IP) Addresses	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain Below)
<input type="checkbox"/> Names	<input type="checkbox"/> Student ID Numbers (used by school)	<input type="checkbox"/> Any Account Number										
<input type="checkbox"/> Birthdates	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic (GPA, major, classification)	<input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Numbers										
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Dates	<input type="checkbox"/> Photos (full face or other image)	<input type="checkbox"/> Fax Numbers										
<input type="checkbox"/> Social Security Numbers	<input type="checkbox"/> Internet Protocol (IP) Addresses	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain Below)										
(c) <i>Confidentiality and Anonymity.</i> Describe procedures for maintaining participant confidentiality and/or anonymity.												
<p>Although demographic information will be surveyed, no identifying information will be available. Participants will be invited via email to take the survey. Qualtrics has the capability to remind individuals that have completed the survey to do so, but the researcher will have no knowledge of who has completed the survey or not. The researcher will keep a spreadsheet of all responses and data for a period of one-year. The data will be permanently deleted after this time.</p>												
(d) <i>Data Security.</i> Describe procedures for protecting the data from unauthorized use. This should include any security or encryption measures used for the collection, transmission, and storage of any electronic or print data. Researchers using databases should state how the data will be securely transmitted.												
<p>Responses will be collected online and stored on the USM server using Qualtrics. The researcher and his major professor are the only individuals that will have access to this data. The data will be collected in a spreadsheet and analyzed using SPSS on the researcher's personal laptop, which is password protected.</p>												
(e) <i>Data Sharing.</i> Explain whether or not the collected data will be shared with other individuals. Specify if identifiable records (at the individual student level) will be shared with anyone other than the immediate researcher or research team. Include any confidentiality measures or data use agreements. External parties may include statisticians, consultants, sponsors, journals, etc.												

No one will have access to the data other than the researcher and major professor, and no personally identifiable records will specifically be used. Findings from the data and collected demographic information will be used in a doctoral dissertation and shared with the doctoral committee, possible journal articles, and in professional presentations.

Steps for Research Request Approval:

- (1) **COMPLETE REQUEST FORM** – Principal Investigator shall submit the completed research request form and all supporting documentation (surveys, file layouts, interview questions, etc.) electronically to jason.pugh@mgccc.edu at least 60 days prior to the desired date of approval.
- (2) **VERIFICATION OF REQUEST** – Once request is received, the Vice President of Instruction, Student Services, and Related Technologies and his/her designee will review for completeness.
- (3) **MGCCC ACTION** – The Vice President of Instruction, Student Services, and Related Technologies will forward all application materials electronically to the other members of Executive Council. The Executive Council will consider the request for approval and/or recommendation at their earliest convenience.
- (4) **NOTIFICATION OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR** – The Vice President of Instruction, Student Services, and Related Technologies will notify the principal investigator and provide signed documentation of the Executive Council action.

Signatures

Principal Investigator – I certify that the information in this request is complete and correct. As Principal Investigator, I have the ultimate responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.

Jason C. Ross

08/27/15

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Research Advisor – I certify that the information in this request is complete and correct, and that this proposed research has been approved by the IRB of the sponsoring institution or will be approved before the research is conducted. As Research Advisor, I confirm that the student researcher under my guidance is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human

subjects, and has sufficient training and experience to conduct the research outlined in this application.

I further agree to regularly meet with the student researcher to monitor his or her progress; and if problems arise, I will become personally available to help the student researcher resolve those problems. As an advisor of this project, I will assure the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants, secure conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. I will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of participants in human research.

Richard S Mohn

8/27/2015

Signature of Research Advisor

Date

Vice President of Instruction, Student Services, and Related Technologies. I acknowledge on behalf of the MGCCC Executive Council that this research has been reviewed and has been authoritatively approved through the following information in item with consensus of the Executive Council members:

Approved

Technical Review

Not Approved

Approved with stipulations

Signature of Vice President, Instruction and Security/Campus

Date

APPENDIX E – Consent Form



INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
LONG FORM CONSENT

LONG FORM CONSENT PROCEDURES	
<p>This completed document must be signed by each consenting research participant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Information and Research Description sections of this form should be completed by the Principal Investigator before submitting this form for IRB approval. • Signed copies of the long form consent should be provided to all participants. 	
<small>Last Edited August 28th, 2014</small>	

Today's date: July 22, 2015		
PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project Title: Leadership Competencies for the Community College Department Chair		
Principal Investigator: Jason Ross	Phone: 601-310-8215	Email: jasoncarross@yahoo.com
College: Education & Psychology	Department: Educational Studies and Research	
RESEARCH DESCRIPTION		
<p>1. Purpose:</p> <p>Developed in 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges describe six competencies deemed essential for community college leaders. This study seeks to understand these competencies as they relate to the success and needs of the community college department chairperson. In addition, the project will seek to determine the most common ways that skills related to these competencies are acquired by the community college department chairperson. Community colleges may choose to use the results to inform leadership opportunities and professional development.</p>		
<p>2. Description of Study:</p> <p>The researcher has invited community college department chairpersons as well as other administrators to participate in this study. If you choose to participate, you will complete a short survey electronically using a link supplied by the researcher. This survey should last approximately 20 minutes. In addition, demographic and descriptive information will be collected, but at no time will any personal identifying information be collected.</p>		
<p>3. Benefits:</p> <p>Faculty and college administrators may benefit from this study. Knowing that the six AACC competencies are deemed essential, college administrators can purposefully plan employee development offerings and enhanced leadership opportunities to impact their lower-level administrators.</p>		
<p>4. Risks:</p> <p>There are no inherent risks from participation in this study. Your choice of whether to participate in this study is voluntary, and you can choose to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequence.</p>		
<p>5. Confidentiality:</p> <p>No personally identifying information will be collected. Although descriptive statistics and demographic information will be utilized, at no time will participants own institution be connected to the data. Data submitted from the survey will be used for analysis, and all data will be password protected. At the end of the</p>		

two-year period, all data will be destroyed.

6. Alternative Procedures:

None.

7. Participant's Assurance:

This project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations.

Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the IRB at 601-266-5997. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits.

Any questions about the research should be directed to the Principal Investigator using the contact information provided in Project Information Section above.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Participant's Name: _____

Consent is hereby given to participate in this research project. All procedures and/or investigations to be followed and their purpose, including any experimental procedures, were explained to me. Information was given about all benefits, risks, inconveniences, or discomforts that might be expected.

The opportunity to ask questions regarding the research and procedures was given. Participation in the project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. All personal information is strictly confidential, and no names will be disclosed. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided if that information may affect the willingness to continue participation in the project.

Questions concerning the research, at any time during or after the project, should be directed to the Principal Investigator with the contact information provided above. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-5997.

Include the following information only if applicable. Otherwise delete this entire paragraph before submitting for IRB approval: The University of Southern Mississippi has no mechanism to provide compensation for participants who may incur injuries as a result of participation in research projects. However, efforts will be made to make available the facilities and professional skills at the University. Participants may incur charges as a result of treatment related to research injuries. Information regarding treatment or the absence of treatment has been given above.

Research Participant

Person Explaining the Study

Date

Date

<p>25. Indicate means of data collection (check all that apply).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Personal Interview <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Questionnaire <input type="checkbox"/> Audio or video recording <input type="checkbox"/> Behavioral Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group Inquiry <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain below):</p>	<p>26. Do any of the following apply to your study?</p> <p>Use of human biological samples <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Use of physical exercise <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Medical examinations or procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Use of drugs or biological products <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>27. Give a step by step explanation of data collection procedures.</p> <p>1. Using community college websites and personal contacts, a list of email address for participants will be created. 2. Participants will be invited via email to participate in the online survey. 3. Participants that have not responded will again be invited to participate after one week.</p>	
<p>28. Are your participants anonymous?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Note: 'Anonymous' means that even investigators cannot associate the data with individual participants and vice versa, not merely that identities will not be revealed. Electronic surveys must be conducted via websites that do not link responses to email addresses or other identifiers. Personal Interviews are not anonymous.</p>
<p>29. Does your research involve sensitive information?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Note: Sensitive Information may include (but is not limited to) information about sexual activity, drug usage, criminal behavior, financial or medical data, and religious views.</p>
<p>30. Does your research involve hidden video or audio recordings or deception?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Note: Deception includes any information or procedure that misleads a participant intentionally.</p>
<p>SECTION 3: RISKS AND BENEFITS</p>	
<p>31. Indicate all potentially vulnerable participants involved in the study.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Children <input type="checkbox"/> Mentally ill patients <input type="checkbox"/> Nursing home patients <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant females <input type="checkbox"/> Prisoners <input type="checkbox"/> HIV positive individuals <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p>	<p>32. Detail the methods that will be employed to protect vulnerable participants.</p>
<p>33. If your research involves prisoners, explain how it is directly relevant to prisoners or the prison system (check all that apply):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the causes and/or effects of incarceration <input type="checkbox"/> the process of incarceration <input type="checkbox"/> prisons as institutional structures <input type="checkbox"/> the conditions of prisons or prisoners <input type="checkbox"/> procedures for improving the well-being of prisoners <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain):</p>	<p>Note: All research involving prisoners requires compliance with federal regulations pertaining to biomedical and behavioral research involving prisoners as listed in FR 53655 Subpart C. Research must be directly relevant to prisons or prisoners (e.g. the effects of incarceration, criminal behavior, prison infrastructures, etc.). Completion of the CITI Research with Prisoners Module is also required.</p>
<p>34. How will you maintain confidentiality?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous data <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic data will be password protected <input type="checkbox"/> Physical data will be locked in a file drawer <input type="checkbox"/> Public/non-confidential data <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain):</p>	<p>35. Describe final disposition of data. The data will be permanently destroyed two years after the completion of the project.</p>
<p>36. Risks, inconveniences, or discomforts participants are likely to experience (check all that apply):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Physical <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Psychological <input type="checkbox"/> Social <input type="checkbox"/> Financial <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Occupational <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None</p>	<p>37. Detail potential risks, inconveniences and discomforts participants are likely to experience, if any.</p>
<p>38. Describe the methods that will be employed to mitigate any potential risks, inconveniences or discomforts.</p>	

39. Describe any potential benefits participants may gain as a result of participation. Participating institutions will have the opportunity to review the final results from the study, and they may choose to use the results to inform their professional development offerings.

40. List all incentives participants will receive for their participation.
None

Note: if class credit will be given for participation, describe what other options exist for nonparticipants to receive the same credit.

41. If individuals are unwilling or unable to complete their participation, how will their incentives be distributed?
 Not Applicable (no incentives will be offered)
 They will still receive all incentives.
 They will be informed that they will receive no incentives.
 They will receive partial incentives (explain):

SECTION 4: CHECKLIST AND AUTHORIZATION

42. The following documents must be attached to this form:






- CITI Common Course Certificate (mandatory for all USM investigators and student advisors)
- CITI Human Subjects Course Certificate (mandatory for all USM investigators and student advisors)
- Both CITI certificates or alternative documentation of research ethics training for all non-USM investigators
- Research proposal approval from Dissertation or Master's Thesis Committee (if applicable)
- Study recruitment documents (if applicable)
- Research Instrument (if applicable)
- Permission letter from external organization participating in the project (if applicable) on official letterhead
- Assent form for minors (if applicable)
- Consent forms (long or short) and any related documents
- Letter to parents (if applicable)

Instructions for Attaching Documents:

- 1) Place the cursor where you want the attachment to appear.
- 2) Select the "Insert" tab at the top of MS Word.
- 3) Select "Object," located on the far right of the tool bar (PC) or the bottom of the list (MAC)
- 4) Select the "Create from File" tab and **check the box that states "Display as icon."** Note: Do not check the box that says "link to file."
- 5) Browse to the location of your document, and double click on it.
- 6) Repeat these steps for each document to be attached.

Note for Mac Users: Word for Mac is unable to attach .pdf files, so Mac users will have to first save the Citi certificates or any other .pdf files as .doc or .rtf files before attaching them. There are several ways to accomplish this. You may use Adobe to open the file and then select "File" and "Save as" and change the file type to an .rtf or .doc format. Alternatively, you may also download or create your own .pdf to .doc application or simply save the application and then open the file on a PC to attach as instructed above.

Attach all relevant documents in this section:

 Common RCR Courses.docx	 Citi Courses IRB.docx	 Dissertation Approval.docx	 Qualtrics Survey Software Jason Ros:	 long_form_consent _template_8-28-14.d
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>43. Instructions for Authorization:</p> <p>1) Type your name and date in the appropriate box. 2) Students should email the form to their advisors, who should add their name and then send to Department Chairs for review. Department Chairs should add their name and send the completed form to rb@usm.edu.</p> <p>By typing my name below, I acknowledge that I have read, understood, and approve of the information herein.</p>		
<p>Jason C. Ross</p> <hr/> <p>Principal Investigator</p> <p>July 28, 2015</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>	<hr/> <p>Student Research Advisor (if applicable)</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>	<hr/> <p>Department Chair</p> <hr/> <p>Date</p>

REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies for community college leaders*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community Colleges.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2011). Fast Facts. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2012). Part A. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/competencies/Pages/parta.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2013). Who We Are. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/About/Who/Pages/default.aspx>
- Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *Career paths for community college leaders* (Research Brief Leadership Series, no. 2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Boggs, G. R. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 123, 15.
- Campbell, D. F., Syed, S., & Morris, P. A. (2010). Minding the leadership gap: filling a void in community college leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 149, 33-39. doi:10.1002./cc.393
- Cejda, B. D., & Jolley, M. R. (2013). Developing leadership competencies in the heartland. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37, 160-167. doi:10.1080/10668926.2013.739506

- Czech, K., & Forward, G. L. (2010). Leader communication: faculty perceptions of the department chair. *Communication Quarterly*, 58(4), 431-457. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2010.525158
- Duree, C. A. (2007). *The challenges of the community college president in the new millennium: pathways, preparation, competencies, and leadership programs needed to survive*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (UMI No. 3289420).
- Eddy, P. L. (2013). Developing leaders: The role of competencies in rural community colleges. *Community college review*, 41(1), 20-43. doi:10.1177/0091552112471557
- Eddy, P. L. (2010). *Community college leadership: A multidimensional model for leading change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- El-Ashmawy, A. K., & Weasenforth, D. L. (2010). Internal leadership academy: evaluation of one college's program. *Community college journal of research and practice*, 34, 541-460. doi:10.1080/10668920701831233
- Fenwick, T. J. (2003). *Learning through experience: troubling orthodoxies and intersecting questions*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Filan, G. L. (1999). The need for leadership training: the evolution of the chair academy. *New Direction for Community Colleges*, 105, 47-55.
- Foote, E. (1999). Sources and information on midlevel managers in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105, 75-82.

- 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, 233-250. doi:10.1080/10668920590901176
- Gillett-Karam, R. (1999a). Midlevel management in the community college: a rose garden? *New directions for Community Colleges*, 105, 5-11.
- Gillett-Karam, R. (1999b). College presidents examine midlevel management in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105, 37-46.
- Hardy, D. E., & Katsinas, S. G. (2007). Classifying community colleges: How rural community colleges fit. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 137, 5-18.
- Hassan, A. M., Dellow, D. A., & Jackson, R. J. (2010). The AACC leadership competencies: parallel views from the top. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34, 180-198. doi:10.1080/10668920903388172
- Haynes, J. (2009). Leadership development – an essential piece of leading change at community colleges. *Community college journal of research and practice*, 33, 962-964. doi:10.1080/10668920903153295
- Hull, J. R., & Keim, M. C. (2007). Nature and status of community college leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 689-702. doi:10.1080/10668920600851621
- Jackson, M. P. (1999). The role of the head of department in managing performance in UK universities. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 13(3), 142-155.

- Kools, J. (2010). *Leadership competencies for college leaders of public small, rural, single-campus, and large, urban, multiple-campus colleges*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest, (UMI No. 3424515)
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1993). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McArthur, R. C. (2002). Democratic leadership and faculty empowerment at the community college: a theoretical model for the department chair. *Community College Review*, 30(3), 1-10.
- 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, 199-217. Doi: 10.1080/10668920903388206
- McNair, D. E., Duree, C. A., & Ebbers, L. (2011). If I knew then what I know now: using the leadership competencies developed by the American Association of Community Colleges to prepare community college presidents. *Community College Review*, (39)1, 3-25.
- Mississippi Community College Board. (2013). Community and Junior Colleges. Retrieved from <http://www.sbcjc.cc.ms.us/>
- O'Banion, T. (2007). Crisis and calamity in the community college. *Community College Journals*, 77(3), 44-47.
- Pettitt, J. M. (1999). Situating midlevel managers' training: learning and doing in context. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105, 57-65.

- Price, M. R. (2012). *Academic affairs officers: An application of the American Association of Community College Competencies for community college leaders*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (UMI No. 3546132).
- 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. doi:10.1177/1069397110375597
- Rodkin, D. M. (2011). *Leadership competencies of community college senior student affairs officers in the United States*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest (UMI No. 3496925).
- Romero, M. (2004). Who will lead our community colleges? *Change*, 36(6), 30-34.
- Sessa, V. I., & Taylor, J. J. (2000). *Executive selection: Strategies for success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sinady, C., Floyd, D. L., & Mulder, A. E. (2010). The AACC competencies and the Ph.D. completion project: practical implications. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34, 218-226. doi:10.1080-10668920903451442
- Smith, A. B., & Stewart, G. A. (1999). A statewide survey of new department chairs: their experiences and needs in learning their roles. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105. 29-36.
- Smith, M. K. (2009) Communities of practice. Retrieved from http://www.infed.org/Biblio/communities_of_practice.htm
- Sullivan, M. (2010). *Statistics: informed decisions using data*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17-24. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17
- Wallin, D L. (2006). Short-term leadership development: meeting the need for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 513-528. doi:10.1080/10668920500210092
- Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Leadership development for the next generation. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 120, 59-66.
- Wenger, E. (2006, June). Communities of practice: a brief introduction. Retrieved from <http://www.ewenger.com/theory/index.ht>
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughan, G. B. (2007). *The Community College Presidency: 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: what academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), 227-238. doi:10.1080/13600800500120126