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ABSTRACT

Community colleges across the nation are facing a critical void in leadership during a time of unprecedented budget constraints due to the retirements of baby boomer presidents and vice presidents who started their careers in the 1960s and 1970s. Results from the Career and Lifestyles Survey indicated that 84% of the community college presidents across the nation planned to retire by 2016. The leadership development options that currently exist to train future community college leaders include university-based educational programs (Ed.D. and Ph.D.), short-term conferences and workshops, and internal succession planning “grow your own” (GYO) programs. Succession planning programs known as GYO programs emerged in the early 2000s as a strategy to recruit employees who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline and prepare them for leadership positions.

This study explores the results of a GYO succession planning program in recruiting and preparing employees for career advancement. A qualitative case study was conducted to gain an in-depth understanding of the GYO program participants’ experiences in the program, the impact of the program on their career advancement behaviors, and the effectiveness of the program in filling the leadership pipeline. The American Association of Community Colleges Competencies for Community College Leaders and two of Malcolm Knowles’ assumptions on andragogy were used as theoretical frameworks to guide investigation of the GYO program. This study is intended to inform community college leaders, those professionals who create leadership development programs, and aspiring leaders about the status of one GYO program.
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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

Who will lead the nation’s community colleges through the period of reconstruction that will follow this current era of economic exigency? Community colleges are facing numerous retirements of presidents, vice presidents, and faculty leaders. These colleges are facing a critical void in leadership during a time of unprecedented budget constraints and community college mission expansion (Anderson, 1997). Who are the future leaders, and how will they develop the requisite skills and gain the leadership experiences needed to lead the dynamic community colleges?

There are three current professional leadership development options to train future community college leaders: (a) traditional university-based educational and professional development programs (Ed.D., Ph.D.); (b) short-term conferences, workshops, academies, and institutes; and (c) internal succession planning “grow your own” (GYO) programs (Cloud, 2010; Ebbers, Conover, & Samuels, 2010; Hassan, Dellow, & Jackson, 2010; McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Shults, 2001). University-based options are traditional higher education Ph.D. programs that include limited coursework in community college history and philosophy, and a handful of doctoral programs, usually Ed.D. programs, that focus primarily on community college leadership. A few of these programs are available in online and distance education formats. Another leadership development option includes short-term professional development opportunities through attendance at conferences, institutes, fellowship programs, and academies. These short-term institutes are sponsored by national, regional, state, and local organizations and associations such as the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), League for Innovation in Community
Colleges, and Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA), to name a few.

Community colleges are beginning to address the growing need for campus leaders through campus-based succession planning GYO programs (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). A GYO program is a leadership development program offered by a college or district to current employees as a way of preparing them for leadership positions within the institution. Benefits of GYO programs include: producing internal leaders who understand the local institution, improving employee performance in current positions, increasing employee involvement in campus activities, enhancing organizational cultural competency, and improving communication and decision making skills (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Grow your own programs provide professional development for existing employees and create a career development pathway for those employees who aspire to lead within an organization.

The purpose of this study was to explore the effectiveness of a community college leadership development program in preparing college leaders for the 21st century. This case study focused on a GYO succession planning program at a multi-campus community college district in Southern California. The case study assessed the effectiveness of this program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behavior of program participants in this particular community college district. The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders and Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of andragogy were used as theoretical frameworks to organize this case study.
Background to the Problem

The first wave of community college leadership retirements became a reality in California in 2007 when 22 “of the state’s 109 two-year colleges [were] looking for presidents, and 28 started the academic year with new presidents at the helm” (Ashburn, 2007, p. A20; Piland & Kehoe, 2008). This critical level of retirements significantly impacts the effectiveness of leadership in the community colleges because of the loss of institutional experience, history, memory, systemic knowledge, and expertise among college leaders. The colleges’ “future leaders need to learn from senior administrators and prepare to replace them upon retirement” (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 60).

Changing Demands on the Community College President

These retirements are occurring in the state of California at a time when community colleges face the challenges of:

- diminishing economic support,
- expanding demands on accountability,
- a national goal of increasing college graduation rates while maintaining open access, increased use of technology, and
- managing campus construction projects funded by the successful bond campaigns in the first decade of the 21st century (McFarlin, Crittenden, & Ebbers, 1999; McNair et al., 2011).

Community college presidents face a multiplicity of demands due to expansion of the college mission from that of providing transfer education, vocational training, and community service to that of serving the changing needs of the community. The community also needs more effective developmental education and contract training
programs and services that address the changing workforce needs of private industry (McNair et al., 2011). Presidents are challenged with preserving the mission of student success in an era of unprecedented budget constraints which has created the need to develop new partnerships and collaborations with outside agencies to leverage diminishing resources. Anderson (1997) noted the expanded mission of community colleges requires a different set of skills, knowledge, and background in the art and science of leading and governing. Presidents need to become more involved in the affairs of the community and to become more skilled in political interaction and persuasion. Given the changing economic times, presidents need to understand national and state political agendas, predict political trends, and participate in public policy formation (Anderson, 1997).

**Increasing Retirements Among Community College Leaders**

In a survey of presidents conducted by Weisman and Vaughan (2007), 55% of the respondents indicated that they were in academic positions prior to assuming their first presidency. Academic administration is commonly the pathway to the presidency because of the background it provides in strategic planning, curriculum, instruction, faculty leadership, human and fiscal resource management, and community collaboration (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The traditional progression to executive level positions in community colleges begins with faculty in leadership roles such as department chair, faculty senate member, and faculty union representative. Typically, faculty leaders enter college administration in positions with progressively increasing levels of responsibility as program directors or associate deans, then academic deans, and ultimately chief academic officers. Results of the study conducted by Reille and Kezar (2010) indicated
that community colleges are also facing retirements of at least 25% of the chief academic officers during the period of 2007-2012. In a national survey of Chief Academic Officers (CAO) conducted by the American Council of Education in 2007, only 19% of the 1,715 CAOs who responded were age 50 and below, close to 47% were between the ages of 51 and 60, and 33% were 61 or older (Eckel, Cook, & King, 2009). Only 30% of the respondents indicated an interest in a presidency at some point in their career. The mean age of all CAOs in 2007 was 58.8 years.

Studies conducted in the early 2000s projected above-average retirements among baby boomer faculty leaders as well, and provided strong evidence indicating that those who were in the pipeline, who were groomed and mentored to succeed presidents, also were retiring (Ashburn, 2007; Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). As Piland and Wolf (2003) explained:

> The traditional means of preparing community college leaders are disjointed and in many cases ill-suited to meet the challenges leaders will face through the beginning decades of the twenty-first century. Community colleges must take a proactive role in development of their future leaders. (p. 93)

The anticipated shortage of presidents and vice presidents led Scott-Skillman (as cited in McNair et al., 2011) to encourage community college leaders to initiate succession planning within their organizations to assure continuance of quality education, student support, and institutional integrity.

**Current Professional Leadership Development Options**

Professional leadership development strategies that currently exist to train future community college leaders include traditional university-based educational
programs, short term conferences and workshops, and internal succession planning or GYO programs. There are a limited number of university-based doctoral programs with a focus on community college leadership. Short-term workshops and conferences are predominantly topics based and serve as a valuable supplement to university-based programs. Campus-based GYO programs have emerged as a succession planning strategy to prepare existing employees who are interested in career advancement for leadership positions within the institutions.

**University-based programs.** Currently, there are approximately 60 university-based doctoral programs in educational leadership in the nation, only 21 of these provide a focus on community college leadership (Council for the Study of Community Colleges, 2012; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Traditional community college leadership programs can be found at the University of Texas at Austin, one of the premier doctoral programs for community college leaders (McNair et al., 2011); University of Florida; Michigan State University; University of Illinois; and North Carolina State University at Raleigh. “No data are currently available but these established programs probably produce fewer than 50 graduates per year” (O’Banion, 2007, p. 46). Clearly, this low number of program graduates cannot meet the national demand for community college presidents and vice presidents.

Additionally, there is concern that the university-based programs focus primarily on theory and scholarly achievement, and do not include an experiential hands-on component vital to the development of core leadership competencies. They do not prepare students for the unique challenges leaders face in community colleges in the areas of union negotiating, fundraising, managing political relationships, shared governance,
and developing creative funding strategies (Anderson, 1997; Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002; Li, Friedel, & Rusche, 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003).

**Short-term leadership development institutes and academies.** These programs serve as valuable supplements to university-based programs. These organized leadership institutes provide training for current community college employees to study leadership theories, develop professional networks, and participate in guided practice through mentorship. The literature supports a growing need for supplementary leadership training that includes application of theory through problem-solving exercises and case studies for future community college leaders (Anderson, 1997). A leadership development system that links short-term leadership development academies with university-based programs may be an effective strategy for preparing current employees to enter the pipeline to leadership positions. However, the number of existing university-based programs and short-term leadership development programs are not sufficient to train the number of leaders needed in the 21st century.

**Campus-based grow your own (GYO) programs.** These newer succession planning programs recruit existing employees who are interested in career advancement and provide them with succession planning and training that incorporate the unique culture of the campus or district into the curriculum. These GYO programs customize leadership training content to address the needs of both the employees and the campus or district. Grow your own program participants tend to be middle managers with an interest in leadership development and career advancement. McFarlin et al. (1999) projected that 90% of all community college leaders would come from within the organization and recommended fully developing a leadership development pipeline for
aspiring middle managers (Ebbers et al., 2010). In addition to recruiting mid-level employees into management, GYO programs support in-house application of learning; and improve communication, networking, and collaboration across departments (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Organizational GYO programs serve as a point of entry into the institution’s leadership pipeline and an emerging strategy for building organizational capacity. However, they suffer from program developer bias, limited data on program effectiveness, and an absence of the application of adult learning theory within the program design and delivery methods.

Community college leaders need both theoretical and practical skills to govern community colleges in the 21st century. “Leaders do not learn such situational skills from a textbook alone but in combination with practice and experience in similar circumstances” (Anderson, 1997, p. 29). Formal graduate programs alone cannot develop the number of community college leaders needed with requisite skills to lead community colleges in the 21st century (Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010). As a complement to university-based programs, GYO programs support development of future college leaders by recruiting internal candidates into the pipeline for future leadership positions, facilitating real world experiences, and providing opportunities for application of learning (O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010). This GYO leadership development strategy can support continued professional development for employees by linking with formal university-based programs and professional institutes for those who are interested in embarking on the pathway to leadership in community colleges.
The changing demands on community college presidents, combined with the existing tidal wave of retirements of leaders and those who are in the traditional pipeline to leadership, have created a situation that calls for aggressive strategies and programs that recruit and train new community college leaders. Community college leaders must be proactive in identifying current employees who are prospective leaders and providing professional development training and experiences that will prepare them to assume leadership positions in the early 21st century.

**The Local Setting**

This case study was conducted using a GYO program initiated by a multi-campus community college district in southern California in 2009. The community college district (Sea Side Community College District) serves approximately 100,000 students each semester through three colleges and six noncredit program campuses. The three colleges offer associate degrees and certificates in occupational programs that prepare students for entry-level jobs, and arts and sciences programs that transfer to 4-year colleges and universities. The noncredit programs offer vocational, basic skills, life skills, and personal enrichment classes at sites throughout the city. The Sea Side Community College District (SSCCD) is governed by a five-member, locally-elected board of trustees and three student members serving on a rotating basis. Shared governance activities involve faculty, students, and staff in the development of solutions to key policy and budget issues. There were approximately 4,400 employees working within SSCCD in the 2009-2010 academic year. A total of 50% of the employees were faculty, 36% were classified and hourly employees, and the remaining 14% were managers, supervisors, and college police.
The District leadership includes a chancellor, five vice chancellors, the presidents of the three colleges and the noncredit program, and a director of public information. Each of the colleges has three vice presidents (instruction, student services, and administration), and the noncredit program has two vice presidents (instruction/student services, and administration). There are a total of 35 deans of instruction and student services District wide. As of the fall of 2011, there were vacancies in one vice chancellor position, three vice presidents’ positions, and six of the campus and district level deans’ positions.

In the fall of 2009, SSCCD implemented a succession planning GYO program with the primary objective of preparing the next generation of college leaders. The GYO program is designed to improve and expand the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the current staff and faculty by providing employment orientation, performance management training related to key subject areas, and leadership development academies in support of succession planning. Prior to implementation of this program, professional development training opportunities within the District were limited to mandated training for sexual harassment (Assembly Bill 1825, 2004); teleconference sessions provided through district membership in the Southern California Community Colleges Employment Relations Consortium; and professional development opportunities for faculty supported by the 1988 passage of Assembly Bill 1725 which changed the State of California Education Code in a number of areas and established funding for Instructional Improvement and Staff Development opportunities.

The SSCCD is located within a large county in Southern California that includes a total of eight colleges within five districts, including the three SSCCD colleges. As of
March 2011, one of the districts was searching for a vice chancellor, four out of the eight colleges were searching for new presidents, three of the colleges were searching for a total of four vice presidents, and 14 vacant deans’ positions were filled with 12 interim assignments. The current and projected demand for trained community college vice chancellors, presidents, vice presidents, deans, and managers within SSCCD and the region signals an urgent need for a region-wide approach to leadership development, which does not exist at this time.

The GYO Program

The SSCCD succession planning GYO program is designed to prepare existing employees for future career advancement within the District. The program was developed and implemented in response to the District’s commitment to goal four of the SSCCD 2009-2012 Strategic Plan: to enhance professional development for all staff. The professional development training program includes two tracks: the Management Leadership Development Academy for managers, and the Leadership Development Academy for Supervisors. Up to 30 participants are accepted in each academy. The Management Leadership Development Academy (MLDA) is designed for middle managers, program directors, and experienced supervisors. The program content focus is on SSCCD organization, leadership development, and communication training. Training is provided through a series of workshops that are conducted over the course of a semester and the program design includes an experiential component. The workshops are conducted at the District central offices and on the college campuses to acquaint program participants with the various campus locations and sites throughout the District. The curriculum includes basic leadership development contextualized within the culture of the
District. The workshops focus on leadership skills, assessment of participant leadership profiles, and dealing with difficult situations and employees. The District hires external consultants with backgrounds and expertise in leadership development training to conduct these workshops. The workshops are scheduled during two, half-day modules per month, for a total of 4 months (see Appendix A for curriculum and workshop schedule).

In addition to the half-day sessions, the program includes an Intensive Training component which consists of 3 full days of presentations by senior management personnel providing a high-level orientation to the five SSCCD organizational goals. The focus of the intensive training is on the internal divisions of the District, and includes the following modules: facilities, business services, student services, instructional services, and human resources. Each module is presented by the vice chancellor of the division.

The chancellor and presidents present a module on organizational mission and goal. The program design also includes experiential learning opportunities subsequent to the training that includes leadership coaching/mentoring, experiential assignments, as well as counseling and review of possible career paths and the specific skills and abilities necessary for successful promotion. This experiential learning component is under development and has not been implemented.

The Leadership Development Academy for Supervisors (LDAS) is designed for both experienced and new supervisors, and nonsupervisory classified staff who are interested in promotional opportunities. The program content focus is on specific training on primary departmental responsibilities. The focus of the LDAS is less on leadership and more on management responsibilities. The workshops are conducted at the District central offices. Similar to the MLDA, training is provided through two, half-day modules
per month, for a total of 4 months. In contrast to the MLDA, the facilitators are middle managers and supervisors from within the District. Subsequent to this training each LDAS participant will have opportunities for job shadowing, peer networking, and career advancement counseling. As is the case with the MLDA, this experiential learning component is currently under development and has not been implemented.

The GYO program was implemented in the 2009-2010 academic year with one cohort of MLDA in both the fall and spring semesters and one cohort of LDAS in the spring. In the 2010-2011 academic year, one LDAS was conducted in the fall and one MLDA in the spring. The first cohort of participants for the MLDA were selected by the campus presidents and included: new managers, new managers or supervisors to the district/campus, and employees identified by presidents as having an interest in and potential for career advancement. The second and third cohorts for MLDA and the two cohorts of LDAS were all self-selected. In the first 3 years of implementation, only the classroom instruction component was provided. The experiential learning opportunities of coaching/mentoring, experiential assignments, and career path counseling are still under development, with a plan for implementation in the fall of 2012. Program evaluation includes a participant survey at the completion of the program to measure customer satisfaction. There is no measurement of learning gains included in the program design. Only customer satisfaction is assessed.

Problem Statement

The problem under investigation in this study was the current crisis in community college leadership occurring as a result of the tidal wave of retirements of baby boomer presidents and vice presidents who started their careers in the 1960s and 1970s.
Furthermore, those faculty leaders and executive level managers who have historically been trained to fill the vacancies created by retiring community college executives also are retiring. Community colleges across the nation are facing the challenge of replacing approximately 1,500 community college leaders within a 5-year time period. Terry O’Banion (2007) predicted the retirement of 50% (600) of the community college presidents and 25% (900) of the chief instructional officers between 2007 and 2012.

This critical mass of retirements was predicted by higher education experts during the last decade (Hassan et al., 2010; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Results from the Career and Lifestyles Survey (CLS; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007) indicated that 84% of the community college presidents across the nation plan to retire by 2016. At the time of the study (2006), 24% of the respondents planned to retire in 1 to 3 years, 32% in 4 to 6 years, and 28% within 7 to 10 years. The average age of sitting presidents was 58. This high number of retirements among community college presidents and vice presidents, combined with the lack of a trained workforce to fill the projected demand, has created a leadership crisis in community colleges (Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

The projected demand for trained presidents, vice presidents, and other administrative leaders over the next 5 years signals an urgent need for a system-wide approach that provides a continuum of leadership development programs and services for community colleges. This professional development system must (a) link the current leadership development options and (b) include a mechanism that recruits current employees who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline.
Research Questions

This study focused on the assessment of a grow-your-own (GYO) succession planning program at a multi-campus community college district in Southern California. This study explored the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics and professional backgrounds of the GYO program graduates?
2. Why do community college employees participate in the GYO program?
3. What were the professional goals of the participants when they entered the program? Did these goals change after program participation?
4. What are the postprogram career advancement behaviors of GYO program participants, including: continued education, application for career advancement positions, and actual career advancement?
5. How are the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders addressed in the program curriculum?
6. How are Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of participant self-directedness and participant experiences reflected in the GYO participants’ learning experiences?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the effectiveness of Sea Side Community College District’s GYO program in (a) supporting career advancement behavior of current employees and (b) filling the pipeline to leadership positions with trained managers and supervisors. An additional purpose of this study was to determine the motivation of participants to join the program and their level of self-directedness in
pursuing career advancement opportunities after participation in the program. The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders and Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of andragogy were used as theoretical frameworks to organize this study. The researcher conducted a case study on the effectiveness of this program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behavior of program participants in this particular community college district. An in-depth assessment of the program was conducted to provide insight on why community college employees participated in the program and what their plans were for career advancement after participating in the program. The researcher assessed the program curriculum and method of delivery to determine the inclusion of the AACC Competencies and the application of adult learning theory in this GYO program.

**Significance of the Study**

This study is intended to inform community college leaders, those who develop leadership development programs, and current and aspiring leaders about the status of one GYO program. As a strategy to recruit and train future leaders, GYO programs may serve as a valuable professional development option for addressing organizational continuity of leadership for colleges and districts. Therefore, this study is significant for members of college and district boards of trustees, who are facing a shortage of trained leaders to assume executive level positions as college presidents and vice presidents retire, as well as executive level community college leaders who are seeking trained employees to fill vacant midlevel positions of deans and associate deans who also have retired.
This study is also significant for community college human resources personnel who are charged with creating professional development programs to address current and projected organizational leadership needs. Since 2000, many states have instituted GYO programs for middle managers and upper level leaders. Programs can be found in Iowa, Illinois, Massachusetts, Kentucky, and Louisiana. Colleges such as Central Piedmont College in North Carolina, The Community College of Philadelphia, Metropolitan Community College in Nebraska, and Johnson County Community College in Kansas also have initiated GYO programs (Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006). Information is available about GYO program trends in content areas and instructional strategies, program development strategies and the role of the college president in supporting GYO programs, and GYO program evaluations that focus on collecting information on participant satisfaction rather than learning gains or career advancement behaviors.

According to Ebbers et al. (2010), the focus of succession planning is on “filling the pipeline with high performing people who assure that every leadership level has an abundance of these performers to draw from, both now and in the future” (p. 63). However, there is limited data on the effectiveness of GYO programs in promoting career advancement. While a number of programs track graduate progress and career advancement, it is difficult to find data that measure improvement of job performance, increased leadership roles, or promotions resulting directly from participation in GYO programs. This study is intended to explore career advancement behaviors of program participants in a GYO program. The findings and recommendations of this study may be of significant benefit to college and district human resource personnel who are charged with initiating GYO programs.
This study also is significant for current employees and midlevel managers who are interested in professional development programs that support career advancement. Participation in a GYO program provides opportunities for leadership skills development and training within an organization, and notifies the college or district of employee interest in career advancement. Current community college employees can use the results of this study to determine if participation in a GYO program would serve as a valuable strategy in addressing their professional development needs.

**Conceptual Framework**

The researcher used the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders and Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions on adult learning and andragogy as frameworks for this case study of a GYO program. The researcher evaluated program effectiveness in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behaviors in program participants. The Leadership Competencies of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) were used as the primary conceptual framework to inform the study and review the program’s content. Knowles’ two key assumptions of adult learning and andragogy were used to structure the study of the participants’ learning experience and plans for career advancement.

**AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders**

In 2006, the AACC published the Competencies for Community College Leaders to provide a competency framework for leadership program development and to support decisions about executive hiring and evaluation. These competencies were developed over a 3-year process as part of the AACC Leading Forward Initiative (AACC, 2005). The AACC Competencies have been utilized for a variety of purposes in the past few
years, including identification of the top challenges facing community colleges and the
degree of community college leader preparation in these competency areas (Duree, 2007).
The six competencies identified by AACC are: organizational strategy, resource
management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and
professionalism.

1. Organizational strategy competencies include all aspects of strategic
management to achieve the organizational mission and goals.

2. Resource management includes effective and ethical management of all
resources including people, information, fiscal, and physical.

3. Communication competencies address open, honest, and clear communication
that foster open dialogue and include listening, speaking, and writing skills.

4. Collaboration calls for cooperative and beneficial internal and external
relationships and partnerships that support organizational sustainability and
student success.

5. Community college advocacy calls for advocating the community college
mission, vision, goals, and role in the community.

6. Professionalism means serving as a community role model by setting high
ethical standards for oneself and the college and seeking to continuously
improve oneself and the organization.

The utilization of the AACC Competencies as a conceptual framework is
supported by validation of the AACC Competencies in a number of recent studies (Cloud,
2010; Friedel, 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011; McNair et al., 2011; Reille &
Kezar, 2010). Use of the Competencies in leadership program development and
evaluation is also supported by the Institute for Community College Development and the AACC’s Future Leaders Institute (G. M. Taylor & Killacky, 2010).

The AACC Competencies have been used to support university based leadership development programs, short-term professional development workshops, and succession planning GYO programs. The Competencies were used as the framework for review of the GYO program curriculum content in SSCCD.

**Andragogy**

In addition to using the AACC Competencies to collect data on the participant experience relative to the GYO program design and components, the researcher utilized two of Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of adult learning, andragogy. In the 1960s, Malcolm Knowles popularized andragogy as an adult learning theory to separate adult learning from child learning (B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). The theory of andragogy is an adult learning theory that is learner-focused, rather than teacher-focused, and provides a set of assumptions for designing the instructional environment to support self-directed learning (B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Knowles described self-directed learning (SDL) as a process in which adults take the initiative to assess learning needs, develop personal goals and strategies for learning, and evaluate their own progress and outcomes (Smith, 2002). Candy (as cited in Garrison, 1992) noted the term self-direction refers to independent pursuit of learning. In SDL, the learner has some level of control over the planning and management of learning (Garrison, 1992). According to Knowles, self-directed learning involves learners taking responsibility for their own learning and pursuing their learning goals with a sense of purpose, assuring what they learn has meaning, serves a purpose, and is applied (Smith, 2002). Knowles identified five steps that take place in
self-directed learning and recommended using these steps in planning adult educational programs (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991). These steps include: diagnosing learning needs, formulating learning needs, identifying human material resources for learning, choosing and implementing selected learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes (Smith, 2002). The assumptions of andragogy were based on the premise that adults have more experiences than children and have an established set of beliefs. A mature person has accumulated experiences that provide a rich resource for learning.

Andragogy focuses more on the learning process than the content of instruction. A key assumption of andragogy is that learners are self-directed and active participants in the learning process. They interact with the environment and construct new knowledge by connecting it with their prior knowledge and experiences (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). In andragogy, Knowles views life experience as a resource and stimulus for acquiring knowledge. “Andragogy is an organized and sustained effort to assist adults to learn in a way that enhances their capacity to function as self-directed learners” (Mezirow, 1981, p. 21).

Knowles and Associates (1984) promoted six key assumptions about adult learners. These assumptions were based on adults having more experiences than children and a created set of beliefs, and include:

- the adult learner’s self-concept supporting self-direction in learning,
- the concept of the learner’s active involvement in planning learning,
- the role of the learner’s experience,
- the readiness to learn,
- the orientation to learning,
• the motivation to learn (Knowles & Associates, 1984; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009).

Historical records of andragogy trace the term back to Alexander Knapp in 1833, when he was describing Plato’s instruction of learners who were young adults (B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). The field of adult education grew from the 1920s to the 1940s, popularizing adult learning techniques that included group discussion, learning contracts, and applied problem solving. Although these were techniques of andragogy, the term andragogy did not fully emerge in the field of adult education until 1968 when used by Malcolm Knowles to describe an approach to learning.

Critics of andragogy argue that while it adds value to the field of adult education by providing a model for the development and delivery of adult educational programs, it lacks scientific evidence to support its use as a unifying theory of adult education. There is a lack of empirical evidence that supports Knowles’s key andragogical assumptions. It is still unclear whether andragogy is an adult learning theory, a set of assumptions, or principles of good practice in adult education (Smith, 2002; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009).

As part of the conceptual framework guiding this study, the researcher focused on two of the six assumptions in the andragogical model: the participant as a self-directed learner, and the use of participant’s prior experiences as a resource for learning. The researcher used the two key andragogical assumptions of self-directedness and participant experience as the conceptual framework in this study to assess the participants’ experiences in the program and the program delivery methods. The AACC Competencies identified in Table 1 also were utilized as part of the conceptual framework for review of program curriculum content.
Table 1

Application of Conceptual Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual framework</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACC Competency Categories</td>
<td>Study program content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational strategy</td>
<td>Study participant experience relevant to program design and components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andragogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of Terms

Career development pathway: A career development infrastructure supports employee career advancement. The pathway includes professional development programs and experiences that exist to support development of leadership skills and knowledge for employees who are interested in career advancement. These opportunities include conferences and workshops sponsored by professional associations and organizations, university based advanced degree programs, GYO programs, and interim or acting managerial assignments.

CEO: Chief Executive Officer of a college is the president or chancellor of the institution or district.

Grow Your Own Programs (GYO): A GYO program is a leadership development succession planning program offered by a college, district, region, or state to current college or district employees as a way of preparing them for leadership positions within the institution or system of institutions. Grow Your Own programs are designed to
identify and develop future college leaders from existing midlevel administrators, faculty, and classified staff. Grow Your Own programs focus on personal growth and acquisition of leadership skills.

*Grow your own program effectiveness:* Effectiveness is defined as participant career advancement behavior that includes application for new positions within the District or at another community college that reflect career advancement and continued participation in professional development activities subsequent to participation in this GYO program.

*Leadership pipeline:* The leadership pipeline is a pool of employees who have expressed an interest in career advancement opportunities and who have participated in professional leadership development programs and experiences. Professional development experiences include participation in formal internships and mentorship relationships, and serving in interim or acting assignments to gain experience in leadership positions that reflect career advancement.

*Short-term programs:* Leadership academies, institutes, and workshops are provided by professional associations and organizations throughout the United States and in the state of California. Workshops, institutes, and academies that provide training for current community college employees to study leadership theories, develop professional networks, and participate in guided practice through mentorship are examples of short-term programs. The primary focuses of short-term programs are on broad-based leadership development and discussions of hot topics in higher education.

*University-based programs:* Doctoral programs in higher educational leadership with community college leadership as an area of interest or with the primary focus in
community college leadership. Traditional programs are theoretically based with minimal practical application.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study was limited to one GYO program within a community college district. This was the only GYO program that existed among the five community college districts in the geographic region where this study took place. The study was limited in time and included follow-up data on program graduates only through the completion of the study, fall of 2012. Participants may advance in their careers after the conclusion of this study.

Outcomes of this study are unique to the program content, design, employee backgrounds and experiences, and hiring practices of the District participating in the study. Application of this model in districts or colleges with dissimilar hiring practices and employee backgrounds may generate different results. In addition, career advancement within the District or at other colleges may or may not be a direct result of participation in the program.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The leadership development program at the college district in this study offered both management (MLDA) and supervisorial (LDAS) tracks with separate foci in the program content. The focus of this study was on the management leadership development program (MLDA) only, as this program targeted those leaders who were closer to the executive end of the pipeline. Employees who participated in the MLDA were prepared to enter the pipeline to management level positions within the District. Since the inception of this GYO program, two MLDA academies were offered in the
2009-2010 academic year, and one in the spring of 2011. A total of 64 employees have participated in the three GYO Academies.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 provided an overview of the problem under investigation and explained the significance of this study. The purpose of the study was introduced, as well as the research questions and conceptual frameworks used to guide the study. The chapter provided a brief review of leadership development programs, including university based, short term, and GYO leadership development programs. Finally, the chapter concluded with the definitions of terms, the limitations, and delimitations of the study.

In Chapter 2, the researcher explored the literature on community college leadership development programs with a special emphasis on GYO programs, the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders, and Knowles’ theory of andragogy. Chapter 2 provides a summary of the literature emphasizing trends in GYO program development and delivery and gaps in the literature. Chapter 3 of this study provides a description of the methodology used to investigate the research questions of this study, and includes a description of the research design and the data collection and analysis strategies. Chapter 4 summarizes the findings and provides an analysis of the results of the study. The study concludes with a discussion of the findings, conclusions drawn by the researcher, and recommendations for practice and future study of GYO programs in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2—REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Community colleges are currently suffering from a void in leadership resulting from unprecedented levels of retirements of community college leaders ranging from presidents to department chairs. There are few trained individuals to replace them. Baby boomer presidents are retiring, as well as the vice presidents, deans, and faculty leaders who have historically filled vacated leadership positions. The traditional university-based doctoral programs and short-term professional development programs cannot meet the current demand for trained leaders (Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Kehoe, 2008; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Furthermore, these programs exist independent of each other and are not linked in a system-wide approach to addressing the current gap in leadership (Piland & Wolf, 2003).

Community colleges began to address the projected need for trained leaders in the early 2000s by developing internal succession plans or grow your own (GYO) leadership development programs (Ebbers et al., 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010). As of 2007, this trend had expanded to include external partnerships between community college districts and university-based programs to develop customized doctoral programs in community college leadership (Luna, 2010).

The purposes of this literature review were (a) to trace the history of university-based and short-term leadership development programs for community college leaders, (b) examine the current leadership development programs in the context of the challenges facing leaders in the 2000s, and (c) identify emerging strategies that link the leadership development efforts into a systems approach to developing community college leaders. Are succession planning or GYO programs filling the pipeline to community
college leadership positions with qualified employees? Do GYO program participants seek career advancement opportunities and continued professional development opportunities? As senior leaders leave community colleges, who will mentor the new leaders?

This review of the literature was focused on GYO programs published since 2005 to identify emerging and more recent trends in content development, methods of delivery, and outcomes for leadership development programs. The Competencies for Community College Leaders of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) were used as the primary conceptual framework to structure the review of the literature on program content development. The utilization of the AACC Competencies as a framework for this study is supported by validation of the AACC Competencies in a number of recent studies (Friedel, 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010). The competencies, which include organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism, also are supported by the Institute for Community College Development and the AACC’s Future Leaders Institute (G. M. Taylor & Killacky, 2010).

In addition to the AACC Competencies, this study used two of Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of andragogy to guide the review of the adult learning experience in the leadership development program design and delivery. Malcolm Knowles used andragogy as an adult learning theory to separate adult learning from child learning, and promoted six key assumptions about adult learners. Knowles defined andragogy as “the art and science of helping adults learn in contrast to pedagogy as the art and science of teaching children” (Smith, 2002, p. 8). The assumptions of andragogy,
sometimes referred to as descriptions of adult learners, were based on the premise that adults have more experiences than children and have an established set of beliefs. Knowles’ theory of andragogy is anchored in the characteristics of adult learners and focuses more on the learning process than the content of instruction (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Smith, 2002). “Andragogy is an organized and sustained effort to assist adults to learn in a way that enhances their capacity to function as self-directed learners” (Mezirow, 1981, p. 21). Andragogy is an instructional approach that focuses on adult life situations and experiences, and motivation and purpose for learning (Smith, 2002). Knowles’ six assumptions about adult learners include: the adult learner’s self-concept supporting self-direction in learning, the concept of the learner’s active involvement in planning learning, the role of the learner’s experience, the readiness to learn, the orientation to learning, and the motivation to learn (Knowles & Associates, 1984; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009).

Merriam and Caffarella (1991) defined constructive learning as “a process of constructing meaning; it is how people make sense of their experience” (p. 261). Learners are self-directed, active participants in the learning process interacting with the environment and constructing new knowledge by connecting it with their prior knowledge and experiences (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). In this case study, the researcher used Knowles’ assumptions of andragogy as the theoretical framework for examining the learning experience of participants in a GYO program. Specifically, the study focused on two of the six assumptions in the andragogical model: the participant as a self-directed learner and the use of participant’s prior experiences as a resource for learning.
This literature review begins with a brief review of the history of community colleges, leadership of the colleges, and the role of AACC in support of community colleges and leadership development. Then, it moves to a discussion of the background, history, and incorporation of adult learning theory in leadership development programs; and concludes with a focused review of the literature on GYO programs, their strengths, weaknesses, and implications for developing community college leaders.

**History of Community College Leadership**

In the past 100 years, community colleges have grown in number and changed in focus to meet emerging community needs over time. The organizational lifecycle theories of Gardner (1986) and Tillery and Deegan (1985) provide a historical structure for reviewing leadership development programs (Amey & Twombly, 1992). Gardner’s stages of organization lifecycle include: birth, growth, maturity, and renewal. Community colleges have grown and developed through the first three of these organizational stages, and are currently facing the challenges of the fourth stage as leaders renew mature colleges (Amey & Twombly, 1992). Tillery and Deegan described generations of community colleges based on the institutional characteristics. These generations include: high school extension (1900-1930); the period of the junior college (1930-1950); growth to more comprehensive community college (1950-1970); comprehensive community college (mid-1970 to mid-1980); and contemporary times since 1985 (Gardner, 1986; Tillery & Deegan, 1985).

Using an overlay of these two theories, this review organizes community college leadership history in the context of the American sociopolitical environment using the following categories:
Community College Birth (1900-1930)

In the early 1900s, during the high school extension or birth phase, the focus of community colleges was on a general liberal arts curriculum. During this phase, community colleges were known as junior colleges and were considered either an extension of the high school or a branch of the local university offering lower-division courses. In 1921, the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) was founded with the purpose of providing a national focus and leadership for the nation’s community and junior colleges. The Association began publishing its own journal named *The Junior College Journal* in 1930 (Vaughan, 2006). Cohen and Brawer (2008) noted, “much of the discussion about junior colleges in the 1920s and 1930s had to do with whether they were expanded secondary schools or truncated colleges” (p. 12). As junior colleges were formed, K-12 teachers became professors, and superintendents became college presidents. In some cases, instructors could teach at the high school and junior college under the same employment contract (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).


Between 1930 and the mid-1950s, development of 2-year colleges occurred in response to local community, economic, and political needs, as well as university interests, without any state-level planning for higher education including community colleges. New colleges were established as upward extensions of high schools or K-12 districts in California, Texas, and Mississippi (R. J. Young, 1996). In the early growth
years of the 1930s, community colleges expanded their curricula and began offering job training programs in response to the high number of unemployed adults impacted by the Depression. The passage of the GI Bill in 1944 provided federal funding for veterans returning from World War II to attend college by providing economic incentives and support for veterans to attend college. Continuing the hiring practices of the Birth Phase, community college leaders typically came from university and K-12 leadership positions to assume presidential positions at the community colleges.

In 1960, California initiated statewide planning of its postsecondary education system by adopting *The California Master Plan for Higher Education* which defined the roles of universities, colleges, and community colleges in meeting the educational needs of California residents. Junior colleges were renamed community colleges. The projected enrollment growth due to baby boomers reaching college age prompted Illinois, Michigan, and Florida to copy California and develop statewide master plans for higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; R. J. Young, 1996). These actions fostered the movement to develop statewide planning and coordination of higher education in other states across the nation. Regional accreditation became another driving force for higher education planning in the 1960s, as this became an essential condition for institutional certification and a requirement for allocation of funding by foundations and government agencies.

University professors were called on to assist in the formation of community colleges following the inaugural scholarship work of Leonard Koos and Walter Crosby Eells, who were the first prominent university professors to focus attention on the study of community colleges (R. J. Young, 1996). By the end of the 1950s, the first major text
about 2-year colleges was written to be used in graduate classes for community
college leaders (Medsker, as cited in R. J. Young, 1996). Key factors that led to the
establishment of university-based community college leadership development programs
since World War II included: university interest and involvement in early planning of 2-year colleges; the explosive growth, development, and complexity of community colleges in the growth period from 1960-1975; and the recognition that community college leadership skills differed from K-12 and university leadership. These factors prompted some universities to begin offering graduate leadership programs for community college leaders. The number of specialized graduate programs grew from 27 in 1945 to 87 in 1962-1963 (R. J. Young, 1996).

Philanthropic foundations supported the development and expansion of university educational programs with a focus on community college leadership. In the mid-1950s, the Carnegie Foundation provided grants to a few universities to develop higher education leadership programs. Kellogg, Ford, and other philanthropic organizations joined the effort to fund these programs. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation joined efforts with the University of Texas to develop a Higher Education Leadership Development Program, which would become a model for future leadership development programs funded by Kellogg. The intent of the philanthropic funding was not to fully address the demand for community college leaders, but to provide quality community college leadership development programs, in various formats and approaches, at universities with an interest in community colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; R. J. Young, 1996).

Kellogg provided grants to 10 universities in California, Florida, Michigan, New York, Texas, Colorado, and Washington to develop community college leadership
development programs. Some university-based programs offered community college components within their higher education programs. Others offered leadership development programs focused specifically on community colleges. University professors, specialized in higher education, helped educate the new generations of community college administrators, who would eventually replace the older generation of community college leaders who started their careers in K-12 or university settings (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Early philanthropic funding did not support evaluation of university programs, as this function remained the sole responsibility of each individual university (R. J. Young, 1996).

**Community College Maturity (1970-1980s)**

Between 1960 and 1975, community colleges saw explosive increases in enrollments, which resulted in the need to develop new community colleges at the rate of one per week (R. J. Young, 1996). By the mid-1960s, various states began developing agencies and offices to provide oversight of the 2-year colleges. The need for effective planning of statewide higher education became very clear by the late 1960s (R. J. Young, 1996). The 1980s were a period of stabilizing growth causing college leaders to plan for organizational renewal or revitalization. Colleges were more complex and more involved in their communities. Initiating change and revitalization in a more complex sociopolitical environment called for a new leadership style. The roles of community college presidents during this period were defined by George Vaughan (2006) as the interpreter of institutional mission, institutional manager, educational leader, and creator of the campus climate. Also, due to the growing size and complexity of the emerging 2-year colleges, the demand for administrative leadership began to surpass the ability of
universities to prepare new leaders. The initial recognition in the 1960s that 2-year college administrators needed a different set of skills than K-12 or university administrators became more prevalent in the 1970s.

In 1972, the name of the national association focused on 2-year colleges, AAJC, was expanded and changed to The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) “reflecting community orientation of most public two-year institutions” ( Vaughan, 2006, p. 28). The AACJC had provided advocacy for resources to carry out the evolving community college mission and a forum for national discussion of community college issues throughout the history of community colleges.

**AACC Role in Leadership Development**

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), initially named the AAJC and then AACJC until 1992, has focused on community college leadership trends and needs throughout the organization’s history. The role of the AACC in college leadership development intensified in the 2000s as major issues, such as the high levels of turnover of community college leaders, began to impact the future of community colleges ( Vaughan, 2006).

**AACC Focus**

In 2000, the AACC formed a Leadership Task Force to focus on the urgent need to train future leaders. The task force produced a statement of essential leadership characteristics and identified key components of leadership development programs (AACC, 2005). As a result of this initial effort, in the summer of 2003, the AACC began the *Leading Forward Initiative* with a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Through the *Leading Forward Initiative*, the AACC conducted a number of research and
planning efforts to address the impending leadership challenge (AACC, 2005; Jeandron, 2006; Vaughan, 2006).

National leadership summits were conducted with participation from AACC member presidents, university-based leadership-development program directors, and representatives from state, single, and multi-campus leadership development programs (Jeandron, 2006; Vaughan, 2006). One key outcome of this national effort was the development of a framework of leadership competencies deemed most important for successful leadership in community colleges, approved by the AACC Board of Directors in April 2005 (AACC, 2005; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). This framework included six competency categories identified by the AACC as essential for effective community college leaders. The AACC encouraged use of these competencies in university-based and other leadership development program curricula.

**The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders**

The six competencies identified by AACC were: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism.

1. Organizational strategy competencies include all aspects of strategic management to achieve the organizational mission and goals.

2. Resource management includes effective and ethical management of all resources including people, information, fiscal, and physical.

3. Communication competencies address open, honest, and clear communication that foster open dialogue and include listening, speaking, and writing skills.
4. Collaboration calls for cooperative and beneficial internal and external relationships and partnerships that support organizational sustainability and student success.

5. Community college advocacy calls for advocating the community college mission, vision, goals, and role in the community.

6. Professionalism means serving as a community role model by setting high ethical standards for oneself and the college and seeking to continuously improve oneself and the organization.

While these competencies did not take into account the specific culture of an organization, there is national consensus that these competencies are most important for community college leaders, and supports their inclusion in leadership development curricula (Friedel, 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010). These competencies were validated through a survey of community college leaders conducted by the AACC in December 2004, and again in 2010 as part of a follow-up study of how community college presidents and trustees in the states of New York and Florida viewed the importance of these competencies (Hassan et al., 2010). The results of this study indicated consensus between presidents in both states on the AACC Competencies, as well as agreement between the presidents and trustee board chairs on importance of the competencies.

In addition to validating the competencies, the second objective of the 2010 study was to identify the leadership development experiences that community college presidents found most helpful in developing their leadership competencies (Hassan et al., 2010). The researchers surveyed 59 community college presidents and trustees in
New York and Florida (116 invited to participate, response rate of 51%). The presidents surveyed on leadership development through experience indicated that on-the-job experience was perceived to be a major factor in their leadership development. The presidents identified specific types of experiences as helpful in developing specific AACC identified leadership competencies. The experiences most commonly noted as instrumental in developing leadership skills included networking with colleagues, feedback, mentoring, coaching, and action learning (progressive job responsibility, challenging job, hardships, personal reflection, and journaling; Hassan et al., 2010). The competencies also were rated in order of importance, with number one indicating the most important competency and number six the least important. The results are provided in Table 2.

Community college advocacy was rated as the most important competency by the presidents and trustees, and yet had the fewest number of leadership development experiences noted. The results of this study indicated that this competency needs to be targeted in professional development programs, as practices at lower-level positions do not provide sufficient experiences. The implications derived from the literature on the AACC Competencies validate the competencies as essential for effective leadership, and recommend their use in designing leadership development program curricula. Furthermore, while community college advocacy is rated as the most important competency, more work needs to be done to identify the content and experiences that may develop skills in this area.

In a more recent study conducted on preparation of community college presidents, McNair et al. (2011) noted that presidents also indicated the areas of fundraising,
Table 2

*Work Experiences That Address AACC Competencies With Level of Importance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community College Advocacy</td>
<td>Networking with colleagues, mentoring/coaching, sponsored workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Feedback, challenging job assignments, and hardships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organizational Strategy</td>
<td>Progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, and graduate degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Mentor/coaches, graduate programs, progressive job responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Progressive job responsibilities, challenging job assignments, and networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

construction project management, and bond management as important in addition to the six AACC Competencies. The authors noted that presidents in 2011 were facing the challenge of preserving the community college mission of open access in an era of unprecedented budget constraints. This situation requires presidents to develop partnerships and collaborate with other agencies to leverage resources in support of student success. Furthermore, the growth in bond funded capital construction projects requires skills that differ from those needed in the past. While fundraising could be addressed in development of the resource management domain, construction and bond management have emerged as new challenges.
The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders (AACC, 2005) also have been used recently in the development of a university-based doctoral program in community college leadership at California State University, Northridge (CSUN). In 2006, Senate Bill 724 amended the California Master Plan for Higher Education to authorize California State University to award the doctorate in educational administration and leadership for K-12, community college, and postsecondary education. “The goal of the CSUN’s Ed.D. was determined to be preparation of competent and reflective leaders committed to moral and ethical actions capable of serving as change agents and solving problems in complex organizations” (Friedel, 2010, p. 56). In 2007, CSUN used the AACC Competencies in combination with California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and the National Interstate Schools Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards to develop student learning outcomes (SLOs) for a university-based doctoral program for community college leaders.

The AACC Competencies have been identified by community college leaders as essential to success in leadership roles. They have been used to support development of doctoral programs, professional development workshops and academies, and succession planning programs. Recent studies indicate the need to expand these competency areas to include competencies needed by current leaders in the areas of fundraising, campus construction, bond management, and partnership development (Hassan et al., 2010; McNair et al., 2011). Furthermore, these competencies cannot be developed through participation in a single leadership development program or solely through experiential learning. Today’s leaders need a continuum of professional development opportunities to
effectively develop the requisite leadership competencies (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Hassan et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011; McNair et al., 2011).

**Community College Leadership Development**

The field of community college leadership development has grown and evolved to support the ever-changing need for specially trained community college leaders. Currently in the contemporary, or renewal period (Gardner, 1986), several types of leadership development strategies address the growing need for trained community college leaders. These types include traditional university-based graduate programs; short-term institutes, workshops, conference-based and nondegree leadership development programs; and succession planning grow your own (GYO) leadership development programs (Ebbers et al., 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; McNair et al., 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Shults, 2001). Currently, these strategies are disjointed: They are developed independently without any system-wide planning that links them together to create a professional development pathway to leadership (Piland & Wolf, 2003).

Short-term workshops and institutes provide professional development opportunities to enhance performance and inform community college leaders. They also provide social networking opportunists with other community college professionals who share common challenges. Grow your own (GYO) programs are emerging as a strategy to recruit employees into the leadership pipeline and provide organizational and leadership capacity building to start them on their pathway to leadership.

**University-Based Community College Leadership Programs**

University-based doctoral programs alone cannot meet the growing demand for trained leaders (Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar,
There are approximately 60 doctoral programs focused on educational leadership in the nation, 21 of these are focused on community college leadership (Council for the Study of Community Colleges, 2012; Reille & Kezar, 2010). These programs cannot recruit and develop the number of trained leaders needed, nor do they provide the experiential learning opportunity identified in research as vital to developing community college leadership skills (Anderson, 1997; Brown et al., 2002; Hassan et al., 2010; McNair et al., 2011).

Graduate programs in community college leadership emerged in response to the growing demand for specialized skills and credentialing of community college leaders in the 1950s. The primary focus was on the mechanics of administration, rather than the “whys” behind the “how to” of community college administration, and the institution’s nature and role in the broader context of education in a democratic society (R. J. Young, 1996). The absence of a nationally-recognized academic center for basic community college research resulted in early programs that trained administrators in the mechanics of administration, rather than as true leaders who fully understood and promoted the role of community colleges in society (R. J. Young, 1996). During the 1950s-1970s, credentialed leaders developed their community college leadership skills primarily through hands-on experiential learning and mentioning relationships with senior leaders while on the job (Hassan et al., 2010).

Since the inception of university-based leadership programs in the mid-1950s, the number of community colleges across the nation has grown from about 600 to approximately 1,200. Community colleges in the 2000s exist in a different social milieu from the colleges in the 1950s-1970s (McNair et al., 2011; Robinson, Sugar, & Miller,
The size and complexity of community colleges continue to grow, and the need for community college leaders has evolved and grown as well. Furthermore, the budget crises of the 2000s, coupled with the massive retirements of seasoned leaders, have changed the community college landscape. These changes in the demands on leaders have created the need to assess the attributes and skills needed by effective community college leaders who are charged with renewing mature institutions, as well as the methods for training new leaders. University-based programs initiated in the 1950s and 1960s must evaluate their leadership programs and make adjustments to program focus, context, and methods of delivery to remain responsive to the changing skills required of community college leaders (R. J. Young, 1996).

Over the last decade, criticism of university-based leadership development programs has grown (Friedel, 2010; Li et al., 2011; Luna, 2010; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; G. M. Taylor & Killacky, 2010). According to Brown, Martinez, and Daniel (2002), community college leaders need a multicultural perspective and must develop decision-making strategies that reflect a balance between theory and practice. The roles and responsibilities of community college leaders have changed since the growth years of 1950-1970 and yet, “there is no documentation of restructuring of higher education leadership programs to prepare students for these community college leadership positions” (Brown et al., 2002, p. 46). In a study of doctoral leadership programs, Li et al. (2011) criticized the coursework of doctoral programs for lacking relevance and connection to the actual practice of community college leaders. They questioned the possibility of learning all of the AACC Competencies solely through participation in a doctoral program. Results of this study indicated that doctoral programs may be better
suited to provide a basic foundation of learning for the competencies, and need to be combined with experiential or on-the-job learning to further develop the AACC Competencies (Li et al., 2011).

In 2001, the PEW Charitable Trusts funded a 2-year study in 2001 entitled *Revisioning the Ph.D.* (Brown et al., 2002). Through this study, hundreds of community college and university faculty and administrators, national educational leaders, doctor students, and accreditation agencies were surveyed to identify concerns about Ph.D. programs and collect suggestions for redesign of doctoral programs. Results of this study indicated the curriculum lacked specific community college content and that, “such degrees served a credentialing function only” (Palmer & Katsinas, as cited in Brown et al., 2002, p. 47). In 2001, a 5-year study was initiated by the Carnegie Foundation. This project—the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID)—was designed to critically examine doctoral education and develop creative approaches to increase effectiveness of these programs in preparing community college leaders (Friedel, 2010). The CID concluded that the quality of interaction between teacher and learner matters as much as the formal design and requirements of the programs. In 2007, the Carnegie Foundation and the Council of Academic Deans for Research Education Institutions launched the Carnegie Project of Education Doctorate to reclaim and transform the education doctorate (Ed.D.) into the degree of choice for the next generation of community college leaders (Friedel, 2010). In an examination of graduate programs in community college leadership, Friedel (2010) noted the key elements of the new Ed.D. program must provide relevance and rigor that serve the diverse needs, backgrounds, and goals of doctoral
students, develop program student learning outcomes (SLOs) that build on the AACC competencies, and customize curriculum specifically for community college cohorts.

**University Doctoral Programs**

If the doctoral degree serves as the gateway to community college leadership, then in addition to adjusting program content and delivery, retention of graduate students in doctoral programs becomes a key issue in university based programs. Luna (2010) reported that completion rates of doctoral students averages around 50%. Research on retention of students in doctoral education has focused on areas of socialization and integration, such as mentoring relationships, peer-coaching, and social support; organization and collaboration of cohorts; financial support; educational strategies; and quality of advising and faculty contact (Luna, 2010; G. M. Taylor & Killacky, 2010). Extensive research on the education leadership doctorate supports these factors as key in the attrition rates of doctoral students (Luna, 2010; Sorokosh, 2004; Stallone, 2009; I. Young, 2005). Lovitts (2001) identified doctoral program attrition as an invisible problem because doctoral students who withdraw from doctoral programs are silent about their reasons for leaving. This high rate of attrition from university-based leadership programs reduces the ability of these programs to ensure that they produce the number of prepared leaders needed to meet the growing demand.

During the community college growth years of 1950-1970, university-based doctoral programs focused on community college leadership led the national effort to develop community colleges. Those programs trained leaders, but lacked the experiential component noted in adult learning theory as vital to constructing new knowledge (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Presidents developed their community-college-specific
skills while on the job (Hassan et al., 2010; McNair et al., 2011; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Now, with community colleges facing a serious level of retirements among leaders at a time of historic changes, and with the expanding community college mission, universities are no longer able to lead the effort to train community college leaders. They are struggling to keep up with the demand, and to provide programs that include the rigor, program focus, and learning experiences vital to producing new community college leaders.

**University-Based Leadership Programs in California**

In 2006, Senate Bill 724 amended the *California Master Plan for Higher Education* to authorize California State University (CSU) to award the doctorate (Ed.D.) in educational administration and leadership for K-12, community college, and postsecondary education. This Ed.D. was designed for full-time working professionals to complete in 3 years, including the dissertation. The Ed.D. program’s Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) were built on the AACC Competencies, California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, and the National Interstate Schools Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards. As of December 2010, 13 CSU campuses were offering Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership, and seven of these programs prepared community college leaders (Li et al., 2011). San Diego State University began its Ed.D. program in 2007, with cohorts in both K-12 and community college leadership beginning in fall 2007. California State University Northridge began its first Ed.D. cohort in K-12 in fall 2008, and the first community college cohort began in fall 2009. “The goal of the CSUN’s Ed.D. was determined to be preparation of competent and reflective leaders
committed to moral and ethical actions capable of serving as change agents and solving problems in complex organizations” (Friedel, 2010, p. 56).

**Short-Term Leadership Development Programs**

The literature supports a growing need for supplementary leadership training for current and future community college leaders. Martorana (1986) argued that community college leaders need more training in the skills of understanding and predicting political trends. Anderson (1997) suggested a strategy for training administrators that included developing leadership training institutes as a supplement to theory-based university programs. These organized leadership training institutes provide training for current community college employees in leadership theories, developing professional networks, and guided practice through mentorship. These short-term programs focus on broad-based professional leadership development, and include discussions on hot topics and issues in higher education.

Professional associations and organizations throughout the United States provide leadership academies, institutes, conferences, and workshops. At the national level, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) provides leadership institutes and an annual conference designed for current and aspiring executives, with a focus on current trends and hot topics. These institutes range in length from 3 to 5 days and include the Future Leaders Institute, President’s Academy Summer Institute, Washington Institute, and the Workforce Development Institute. The League for Innovation in Community Colleges provides an annual Executive Leadership Institute for senior leaders who are experienced and qualified for a presidency, and an annual Innovations Conference. The National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA) provides a
leadership academy for instructional administrators, and the Chair Academy provides a 2-week residential leadership academy for department chairs and mid-level administrators.

In California, the Community College League of California (CCLC) provides institutes and seminars for CEOs; the Asilomar seminar for women; the Great Teacher Seminar for college faculty; and the Classified Leadership Institute. The Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) provides 5-day Administration 101, and 10-day Administration 201 seminars, an annual conference, and a mentorship program. Barnes et al. (1987) conducted a feasibility study on leadership development programs for California State University and California Community Colleges. This feasibility study resulted in the development of the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI) and ultimately the California State University doctoral programs (Friedel, 2010). The CCLDI was established by a group of community college leaders in 1999 at Claremont Graduate University for the purpose of preparing the next generation of community college leaders. The CCLDI provides leadership development activities for existing and future leaders, research and information dissemination, and access to professional development in community college education. The CCLDI provides professional development programs through a statewide center for community college leadership. The CCLDI program includes an intensive summer program in community college leadership, regional seminars on community college leadership, a certificate program for new community college leaders, and an information and research service for community colleges. The CCLDI initiative also formed a network of doctoral institutions within the state of California to foster interaction among students and faculty.
In 2005, CCLDI moved from Claremont Graduate University to the University of San Diego and formed the CCLDI Foundation. The work of the original CCLDI continues through the CCLDI Foundation and the University of San Diego (USD) School of Leadership and Education Sciences (USD, 2011).

The cost for participation in these short-term programs typically includes registration fees, travel and lodging expenses, and the expenses incurred for substitutes when attendance calls for absence from the college. If faculty members attend conferences during the academic year, the college ensures classroom instruction is not interrupted by providing substitutes to teach any missed classes. There is the limitation of space available in each seminar and academy, similar to the university-based programs.

Short-term leadership development workshops and seminars are valuable supplemental professional development strategies (Anderson, 1997; Ebbers et al., 2010; Li et al., 2011; Robinson et al., 2010; Shults, 2001). Information on current and emerging trends and issues is discussed to support the professional development of existing leaders at these nationally sponsored workshops, institutes, and conferences. Conferences and institutes also serve as starting points for community college employees who are interested in pursuing career advancement. Short-term professional development workshops and seminars provide opportunities to network and engage in dialogue with current leaders around a specific issue or area of interest. This approach provides opportunities to develop informal mentorship relationships that support professional growth and development.
Grow Your Own (GYO) Programs

Grow your own (GYO) programs represent a succession planning trend that has recently emerged in community colleges since the early 2000s. Campus or district-based GYO programs are designed to prepare current employees for future leadership positions within an organization. Succession planning is a systematic, long-term approach for creating a leadership pipeline that includes recruitment, capacity building, career planning, and retention strategies designed to meet the mission and goals specific to an organization (Ebbers et al., 2010; Luna, 2010; McNair et al., 2011). “Succession planning is perpetuating the enterprise by filling the pipeline with high performing people who assure that every leadership level has an abundance of these performers to draw from, both now and in the future” (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001, p. 167).

This contemporary trend of grooming current employees is not unique to academia. The private sector has been training and promoting executives from within for decades (Anderson, 1997). Succession planning involves understanding the organization’s long-term goals and objectives, identifying the workforce’s developmental needs within the organization, and determining workforce trends and predictions. In academia, this concept of promoting from within can be observed in the community college system as leaders leave their initial community college placement to seek promotional opportunities within the system rather than their college or district (Anderson, 1997). The corporate culture of identifying individuals to be groomed for future leadership within an organization has been uncomfortable for leadership development in higher education. The concept of promotion from within an organization needs to be developed further in the academic environment, where shared governance
rather than top-down decision making and successor selection drives decision making (Luna, 2010).

Grow your own leadership development programs may be more effective strategies for developing future leaders than traditional university-based programs because they can be customized to the unique needs of the college, the employee’s background and skills, and can serve a greater number of individuals than formal university programs. Grow your own programs identify and recruit mid-level employees into a pipeline that prepares them for career advancement through experiential learning, structured learning components, and organizational networking. Several states and community colleges have addressed the growing need for campus leaders through campus-based and regional succession planning or GYO programs (Anderson, 1997; Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Luna, 2010; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010; G. M. Taylor & Killacky, 2010).

Unlike the traditional executive leadership programs, GYO programs are designed to identify and develop future college leaders from existing midlevel administrators and faculty, with a focus on personal growth and acquisition of leadership skills (Jeandron, 2006; Piland & Kehoe, 2008; Reille & Kezar, 2010). McFarlin et al. (1999) projected that 90% of all community college leaders will come from within the organization; therefore, they recommend fully developing the pipeline by creating organizational stepping stones that provide professional development for aspiring middle managers. The primary goal of these GYO programs has been to prepare mid-level employees for leadership positions. Future leaders are prepared to better understand the culture of the college and to perform their job responsibilities effectively within the campus culture.
(Ebbers et al., 2010). These GYO programs for middle managers and upper level leaders can be found in California, Iowa, Illinois, Massachusetts, Kentucky, and Louisiana. Colleges such as Central Piedmont College and Pitt Community College in North Carolina, The Community College of Philadelphia, Metropolitan Community College in Nebraska, Collin County Community College District in Texas, Johnson County Community College in Kansas, and the San Diego Community College District in California also have initiated GYO programs (Ebbers et al., 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Robinson et al., 2010). Colleges with GYO programs tend to be larger colleges or districts with multiple campuses and dedicated staff development funding. Smaller, single campus colleges lack the dedicated staff development funding and rely primarily on state-level programs and local universities for leadership development support (Jeandron, 2006).

The number of GYO programs initiated at campuses and districts has grown since 2000 as community colleges that have been impacted by recent leadership retirements recognized and embraced their role in preparing their own leaders. Community college initiated GYO programs create a leadership pipeline and build the capacity of existing employees who are interested in career advancement. In a more recent study conducted by Luna (2010) on a GYO program in Arizona, the GYO program design had expanded from a campus or district-based program to a partnership between a group of community colleges in the Phoenix area and Northern Arizona University to develop a customized doctoral program. This example demonstrates the level of influence campus-based GYO programs is having on university-based doctoral programs. It exemplifies the possibility
of creating a leadership preparation pathway that links community college efforts with the university programs.

**Adult Learning in Leadership Development: Andragogy**

Leadership development programs for current and future community college employees need to incorporate adult learning theory into their program design and delivery (Reille & Kezar, 2010). The idea that adults learn differently from children is well supported by the literature on adult education (Chan, 2010; Knowles, 1970, 1990; Smith, 2002; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). The word pedagogy, defined as the art and science of teaching children, stems from the Greek word “paid” meaning child, and “agogos” meaning leader of (Knowles & Associates, 1984). Therefore, the definition of pedagogy is the transmission of knowledge. In pedagogy, education represents the process of instilling knowledge and culture in a learning environment where attendance is compulsory. The term andragogy stems from the Greek word “aner” (or andr) meaning man (Knowles, 1970, 1990). Malcolm Knowles described adult education as “unlike youth education, an open system in which participation is voluntary” (Knowles, 1970, p. 220). Therefore, Malcolm Knowles defined andragogy as “the art and science of helping adults learn in contrast to pedagogy as the art and science of teaching children” (Knowles, as cited in Chan, 2010, p. 27). A notable difference in the definitions of pedagogy and andragogy, other than the focus on child or man, is the change in the verb from “transmission of knowledge” to “helping adults learn” noting a difference in the status of the receiver of the knowledge from a dependent receiver of knowledge to an independent seeker of knowledge. Another differentiation between pedagogy and andragogy is the voluntary nature of attendance of the adult learner compared to the
compulsory nature of attendance in education for children. The voluntary nature of adult learning is the foundation for the assumptions Malcolm Knowles made about adult learners.

Malcolm Knowles promoted andragogy as an adult learning theory to separate adult learning from child education, and identified six key assumptions about adult learners. Knowles’ theory of andragogy is anchored in the characteristics of adult learners and focuses more on the learning process than the content of instruction (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Smith, 2002). Andragogy is learner-focused, rather than teacher focused, and provides a set of assumptions for designing the instructional environment to support self-directed learning. “Andragogy is an organized and sustained effort to assist adults to learn in a way that enhances their capacity to function as self-directed learners” (Mezirow, 1981, p. 21).

Knowles (1990) defined adults biologically, as reaching the age when they can reproduce; legally, as reaching the age when they can vote, drive, or marry without parental consent; socially, when they can perform in roles such as employee, parent, spouse, citizen; and psychologically, when they become self-directed and responsible for their own lives. The concept of adults as self-directed learners emerges from Knowles’ psychological definition of adults (Knowles, 1990). As people mature, their self-concept develops and moves from being dependent full-time learners to independent doers or producers in society. Through the process of maturity, the adult self-concept becomes self-directed, as adults begin to see themselves making their own decisions, facing consequences, and accepting responsibility for managing their own lives (Knowles, 1970, 1990). Knowles (1970) contended “one of the central quests of [adult] life is for
increasing self-direction . . . every experience we have in life tends to affect our movement from dependence to autonomy” (p. 26). Knowles (1990) concluded that “adults have a deep need to be self-directing; therefore, the role of the teacher is to engage in the process of mutual inquiry with them rather than transmit his or her knowledge to them and then evaluate their conformity to it” (p. 31).

Andragogy focuses on adult life situations and experiences, motivation, and purpose for learning (Smith, 2002). Historical records of andragogy trace the term back to Alexander Knapp in 1833, when he was describing Plato’s instruction of learners who were young adults. In the early 1920s, the study of adult education produced both psychological and sociological perspectives on the adult capacity to learn, as well as the need for an applied setting for formal adult education. The psychological perspective was based on the work of Edward Thorndike, who focused on the adult capacity and ability to learn. Thorndike emphasized the impact of human nature and variation on the way humans learn. Thorndike’s research on adult learning was conducted in a controlled environment. Eduard Lindeman explored the social methods by which adults learn and contended that adults need to learn through experience (B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). In 1925, Lindeman served as a mentor to Knowles while he was working at the National Youth Administration in Massachusetts (Smith, 2002). Knowles was inspired by Lindeman’s Meaning of Adult Education, published in 1926. In contrast to Thorndike’s work, Lindeman’s work was conducted in an applied rather than controlled setting.

The field of adult education grew from the 1920s to the 1940s, popularizing adult learning techniques that included group discussion, learning contracts, and applied problem solving. These were techniques of andragogy; however, the term andragogy did
not fully emerge in the field of adult education until 1968 when used by Malcolm Knowles to describe an approach to learning. Knowles became more concerned with adult learning as a professional area of its own, separate from the social change and progressive political activity that initiated the focus on adult learning in the 1920s (Smith, 2002).

Malcolm Knowles’ six assumptions of andragogy (Chan, 2010; Smith, 2002) include:

1. Self-concept. As a person matures his /her self-concept moves from being dependent and becomes more self-directed and resistive to others imposing their wills on the learner.

2. Role of experience. A mature person has accumulated experiences that provide a rich resource for learning. Adults learn by drawing from past experiences.

3. Readiness to learn. A mature person’s readiness to learn is oriented to his/her social role. Readiness to learn becomes dependent on appreciation for the relevance of a topic.

4. Orientation to learn. A mature person becomes more problem centered than subject centered and learns for the purpose of immediately applying new knowledge.

5. Motivation to learn. Adult learners are internally motivated to learn to achieve personal goals and develop self-esteem.

6. The need to know. Mature learners need to know the reason for learning something. Once they know the reason, as self-directed learners they invest full effort in learning.
These assumptions were based on the idea that human beings accumulate experiences as they move through life. Adults have a greater volume and range of life experiences than children because they have lived longer. These experiences provide a rich resource for adult learning (Knowles, 1970, 1990; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Smith, 2002; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). “Experience is the adult learner’s living textbook” (Linderman, as cited in Knowles, 1990, p. 29). Adults have a greater range of experiences from the various roles and levels of responsibility they have in the world of work, raising families, and as citizens interacting with the community. Adults identify themselves by who they are in the world (Knowles & Associates, 1984). As children mature and enter adulthood, they define themselves based on an accumulation of experiences from their work, education, travel, challenges, and accomplishments. Children’s experiences are primarily about what happens to them. Children’s identities are based on who they are in their family, where they go to school, and where they live. “Because an adult defines himself largely by his experience, he has a deep investment in its value” (Knowles, 1970, p. 44). Therefore, adults need to have the opportunity to use their experiences in the learning process; otherwise, they feel devalued and minimized (Knowles, 1970, 1990).

As a collective, a group of adult learners will have a more heterogeneous background than a group of youth (Knowles, 1990; Knowles & Associates, 1984). These experiences provide a rich resource for learning. Adults need to learn how to learn from their experiences (Knowles, 1970, 1990). In andragogy, the learning process uses the experiences of the learners to help adults make progress towards achieving their goals. “Experience is the richest source for adults’ learning; therefore, the core methodology of
adult education is the analysis of experience” (Knowles, 1990, p. 31). Adults learn by connecting new knowledge with existing knowledge and experience (Chan, 2010; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Real world experiences provide a basis to contextualize program content and apply learning (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Knowles (1970, 1990; Knowles & Associates, 1984) recommended using classroom strategies that tap into an adult learner’s experiences and give them the opportunity to share knowledge and experiences, including group discussions, case studies, simulation exercises, role playing, action projects, demonstrations, and community development projects. Instruction needs to be participatory and experiential in nature, and foster “ego involvement” (Knowles, 1970, p. 45). Adults need the opportunity to apply their learning into their daily lives, assuring that the learning leads to behavioral changes.

The negative side of accumulated experiences is the tendency to develop biases and predispositions that can close an adult’s mind to new ideas and approaches. In order for adults to be able to learn from experiences, they must first learn how to “unfreeze” their preconceptions, look at themselves and their experiences objectively, and analyze their own experiences with open minds to new ideas and concepts. This process of learning from one’s own experiences helps adults to assume responsibility for their own learning, and seek additional experiences to foster their continued growth and development (Knowles, 1990; Knowles & Associates, 1984).

Knowles described self-directed learning (SDL) as a process in which adults take the initiative to assess learning needs, develop personal goals and strategies for learning, and evaluate their own progress and outcomes (Knowles, 1970, 1990; Smith, 2002). Candy (as cited in Garrison, 1992) noted the term self-direction refers to independent
pursuit of learning. A key ingredient in SDL is the opportunity to self-assess and self-diagnose learning needs (Knowles, 1970, 1990). Once adult learners identify gaps or shortfalls in their existing competencies, they may develop a plan or a direction for growth and development to reach their professional development or career goals. According to Knowles (1970, 1990), the ability to self-assess and plan provides the motivation to learn.

In SDL, the learner has some level of control over the planning and management of learning (Garrison, 1992). Self-directed learning involves learners taking responsibility for their own learning and pursuing their learning goals with a sense of purpose, assuring what they learn has meaning, serves a purpose, and is applied (Knowles, 1970, 1990; Smith, 2002). Garrison (1992) noted SDL depends on opportunity and should be viewed as a “collaborative process between teacher and learner” (p. 141). According to Knowles (1970, 1990) in andragogy, the learning-teaching dynamic is based on mutual respect and responsibility for learning between the teacher and learner. The adult, as the self-directed learner, is responsible for self-assessment and learning. The teacher, as a catalyst of learning, is responsible for providing the learning environment and guiding the learner through the process of discovery.

Evaluation of learning in andragogy requires a mutual process that includes learner self-evaluation of progress towards meeting goals, and identification of strength and weaknesses of the program in facilitating learner growth (Knowles, 1970, 1990). The evaluation process is connected to the self-assessment and reflects growth and learning resulting from the learning experience, as well as the learner’s self-directedness and
motivation to learn. Both the teacher and adult learner must be open to constructive feedback in the evaluation process.

Knowles identified five steps that take place in his self-directed learning model (Smith, 2002). These steps include:

1. Diagnosing learning needs.
2. Formulating learning needs.
3. Identifying human material resources for learning.
5. Evaluating learning outcomes.

Adults may not follow all of these steps in a linear fashion. Learning may occur as a result of chance or circumstance rather than formal, structured learning. However, Knowles identified these five steps as a model to be used in planning adult educational programs (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991).

A critical component of fostering learning for adults is providing a climate or setting that is conducive to learning (Knowles, 1984). This includes both the physical and social environments. The furnishings, equipment, and configuration of the room must be adult-sized and decorated for adult tastes. The social climate should foster a sense of acceptance of differences, mutual respect, and support. Knowles (1970, 1990) noted that people feel they are treated like adults when the atmosphere is informal and the relationship between the instructor and learner is based on mutual respect and freedom of expression. As self-directed learners, adults accept responsibility for their own learning and are active participants in the learning process (Knowles, 1970, 1990).
Critics of andragogy argue that it is still unclear whether andragogy is an adult learning theory, a set of assumptions, or principles of good practice in adult education. They argue that although it adds value to the field of adult education, andragogy lacks scientific evidence to support its use as a unifying theory of adult education. In a comprehensive literature review on andragogy, B. Taylor and Kroth (2009) argued for the need to develop an instrument that provides measurable data to support the assumptions of the andragogical theory.

There are a few empirical studies that incorporate andragogical assumptions and a number of tools developed to measure learner attributes associated with self-directed learning (Hiemstra, 2003). The most frequently cited study and instrument developed to measure SDL is the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) developed by Lucy Guglielmino in her 1977 dissertation. The SDLRS is a questionnaire designed to measure attitudes, skills, and characteristics that reflect readiness to manage one’s own learning (Guglielmino, 1977). This instrument, also known as the Learning Preference Assessment (LPA), has been used by more than 500 organizations around the world, in research studies and in over 90 doctoral dissertations (Guglielmino, 1977).

In spite of the criticism of andragogy as an adult learning theory, andragogy has become popular in education and research, and is used in management education to prepare students for employment (Chan, 2010). In an article written about the application of andragogy in teaching and learning, Chan (2010) noted adoption of andragogy by European countries such as Germany, England, Poland, France, Finland, Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Russia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. As an instructional approach, andragogical applications can be found in the disciplines of education, medicine, criminal
justice, and management. Andragogical principles can be used to tailor instruction to the student area of interest and involve students in the planning process. The application of the andragogical principles in community college leadership development programs support program participants as self-directed learners (Knowles & Associates, 1984; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999) to self-assess and create professional development plans that build on their past experiences and identify areas of professional development growth.

The Grow Your Own (GYO) Program in the Community College

In-house leadership development GYO program emerged as a new leadership development strategy in the early 2000s. Prior to 2000, only one college and one state GYO program existed (Jeandron, 2006).

GYO Program Design

In 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) commissioned a formal national study of GYO programs as a follow-up to a study on community colleges within the state of Illinois conducted by the University of Illinois’ Office of Community College Leadership (Jeandron, 2006). The AACC conducted this initial landmark study of single college, multi-college districts, and state GYO programs at 16 community colleges (North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Nebraska, Massachusetts, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Illinois), two community college districts (Texas), and five state programs (California, Florida, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Kentucky). Researchers conducted interviews of program directors and college presidents, and reviewed instructional materials. Key themes surfaced in the
results of this study with recommendations on how to plan, develop, deliver, and strengthen GYO programs.

The GYO succession planning program trend grew in the early 2000s as indicated by the results from the Career and Lifestyles Survey (CLS) conducted of community college presidents (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). Of the 545 presidents responding to this survey, 43% of the responses noted that they sponsored a campus-based GYO program. Presidential involvement included broad oversight, participant selection, and input to content development.

A second more critical national study of GYO programs was conducted by Audrey Reille and Adriana Kezar in 2009, as a follow up to the AACC study. Like the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006), the researchers collected data on GYO programs nationally by conducting interviews of GYO program directors and conducting a national case study. The purpose of the second study was to identify program design flaws and make recommendations on planning program content, delivery formats, and incorporating campus culture into the curriculum (Reille & Kezar, 2010). The authors supported the benefits of GYO programs noted in the AACC study and identified key limitations as well. Among the limitations, Reille and Kezar (2010) cautioned program developers about the potential for developer bias in program content and making decisions on format based on convenience, rather than application of adult learning theories. A full discussion of program benefits and limitations is presented later in this chapter.

A summary of the results from these two major GYO studies indicated these succession planning programs provided a combination of structured and experiential learning components, and created a pipeline for those persons interested in career
advancement. Through workshops and experiential learning strategies such as mentorship relationships, job shadowing, internships, and networking, participants explored leadership skills and strategies, developed organizational and leadership competencies, and demonstrated their interest in career advancement. Program participants were prepared for internal organizational career advancement and encouraged to apply for job openings as they occurred. Colleges participating in both national studies noted increases in collaboration across disciplines, employee self-confidence, community involvement, participation on campus committees, and improved communication as a result of participation (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Specific findings from these two major studies and several additional studies on GYO programs are provided in the following sections, with key themes summarized in the conclusion section.

GYO Program Planning

Findings from the AACC (Jeandron, 2006) study indicated that the GYO program planning process must begin with a strong commitment from the president or CEO of the organization. In a dissertation study on community college presidents, Duree (as cited in Ebbers et al., 2010) noted “current community college presidents are demonstrating a growing commitment to leadership through identification of potential leaders, support of in-house leadership programs such as GYO(L), and mentor-protégé relationships” (p. 63). Presidents understand what is required to be successful in leadership positions and as such play a pivotal role in identifying future leaders and supporting program planning and implementation (McNair et al., 2011). “Nurturing and developing leadership skills is an essential responsibility of the college president” (Sharpes & Carroll, as cited in Campbell, 2002, p. 35). Respondents to the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) noted that active
involvement by the president was a key element contributing to the success of their program. In many GYO programs, the president was involved in program planning, curriculum approval, presentation of program content, and speaking at the GYO program graduation (Ebbers et al., 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). In-house leadership development was tied to the campus strategic plans, thereby engaging board of trustee support for the program (Jeandron, 2006). Grow your own programs have generally been housed in the office of the president or human resources (Jeandron, 2006). This tactic elevates the visibility of the program to a more prominent position and provides the level of credibility needed to recruit desired participants into the program.

Current presidents can apply their understanding of the presidency as they serve as mentors, facilitate development of locally-based leadership development programs, support those who want to continue their graduate studies, and provide the resources needed by aspiring presidents to attend external professional development programs. Current presidents can also integrate the AACC leadership competencies into hiring, selection, and evaluation of administrators with an eye to immediate and long-term needs of the college. (McNair et al., 2011, p. 21)

Models of GYO programs housed in the president’s office were found at Frederick Community College in Maryland, Midlands Technical College in South Carolina, Parkland College in Illinois, and Pitt Community College in North Carolina (Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Robinson et al., 2010). At County College of Morris in New Jersey, the GYO program was housed in the human resources office.
Typically, the responsibility for program coordination is assigned to one person. The recommended approach to program planning is to be inclusive in the planning process by involving representation from various campus divisions and employee groups across campus (Jeandron, 2006; Robinson et al., 2010).

**Participant Selection**

Grow your own program development activity involves identification of participants in addition to development of curriculum. Ideally, participants selected for participation are interested in personal growth and career advancement; demonstrate talent for the work they do; are enthusiastic about the college mission and goals; and represent diversity in gender, ethnicity, current position, and years of employment (Jeandron, 2006). In a more recent study of GYO programs, Ebbers et al. (2010) noted GYO program participants tend to be middle managers with an interest in leadership development and career advancement. “The focus of succession planning is on preparation, performance, and potential” (Ebbers et al., 2010, p. 63). “Succession planning is perpetuating the enterprise by filling the pipeline with high performing people who assure that every leadership level has an abundance of these performers to draw from, both now and in the future” (Charan et al., 2001, p. 167). Typically, colleges require program participants to be full-time faculty or professional staff, meet a minimum number of years of service, and in some cases hold positions of authority such as director, dean, or department chair. The Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) required applicants to be mid-level managers, or faculty with 60% release time for administrative assignments. Collin County Community College District requires
program participants to be full-time faculty or professional staff, hold a master’s degree, and have 3 years of work experience in higher education (Jeandron, 2006).

**Program Funding**

Jeandron (2006) noted the importance of identifying a continuous funding source and a realistic budget level to support the program. The majority of colleges participating in the AACC study included funding for GYO programs in the professional development budget line item. Other sources of program funding considered were foundations and state grant funding. The AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) noted GYO program costs ranged from $2,200 to $75,000 annually, with participant costs ranging from $25 to $3,000 per participant. Funds were used to cover costs of consultants, facilities rental, printing, supplies, and meals. Use of campus facilities and internal presenters were recommended as strategies to reduce the overall program costs. In California, community colleges do not report expenditures on professional development programs and activities. Therefore, there is no centralized data report of expenditures for professional development.

**GYO Program Curriculum Development**

Grow your own program curriculum can be developed using a range of strategies. In the findings of the two major GYO studies, program curriculum content reflected the AACC recommended six competencies for successful community college leaders (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Results of the Reille and Kezar (2010) study indicated that some colleges emphasized some competencies more than others. This practice varied across the campuses, with the average level of emphasis for each competency noted in Table 3.
Table 3

*AACC Competencies Degree of Emphasis in GYO Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AACC competency</th>
<th>Degree of emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational strategy</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college advocacy</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The competency of community college advocacy was emphasized least in the GYO programs, which is in direct contrast to the importance placed on this competency in the presidents’ survey on leadership development experiences conducted by Hassan et al. (2010). Community college advocacy focuses on external representation of the college mission and role; GYO programs are typically designed to address internal organizational culture and decision-making strategies.

Key findings from the Reille and Kezar (2010) study indicated that the program content in all college GYO programs incorporated campus culture into the curriculum, and decision making strategies were contextualized using the institutional mission and values. Throughout the curriculum there was a strong emphasis on the college’s way of doing things. In a study conducted by El-Ashmawy and Weasenforth (2010) on Collin County Community College District’s GYO program, named the Academy for Collegiate Excellence, the program curriculum included topics that ranged from strategic planning and history of community colleges to board relations and internal budgets. As noted earlier, GYO programs customize curriculum to address the unique needs of the
growth your own program curriculum topic areas range from leadership styles and ethics, to managing change, effective hiring practices, civility and diversity, project management, institutional effectiveness, managing conflict, grant management, budgeting, and fundraising (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010). In the AACC study, the researcher noted the importance of developing GYO program curriculum that “add[s] to the participant’s knowledge about leadership and community colleges” (Jeandron, 2006, p. 5). This finding is supported by Knowles’ andragogical assumption of building knowledge by adding new knowledge to the learner’s existing knowledge and past experiences (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

Researchers noted several colleges modified the curriculum regularly using feedback gleaned from participant needs assessments and program evaluation surveys (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010). Chemeketa Community College in Oregon conducted needs assessment and requested input from potential participants on topics prior to developing the curriculum. Ocean County College in New Jersey conducted continual needs assessment and updated the curriculum regularly. Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College researched other GYO programs and adapted the programs to fit the college needs (Jeandron, 2006).

**Program Delivery**

Grow your own programs use a range of methods to deliver program content. Common methods of delivery include face-to-face lectures, self-assessment, individual and team projects, assigned readings and case studies, portfolios, and experiential learning through job shadowing, mentoring, and attendance at board meetings.
(El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010). Grow your own programs are typically conducted once a year for a period of 5 to 8 months. Group meetings are scheduled once a month for up to 5 hours per session. Some programs include a 2- or 3-day intensive session. Most programs are offered on college campuses. Some district programs rotate the location to expose the participants to new environments.

In the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006), 50% of the colleges included an experiential component such as mentoring, job shadowing, and internships. Southeastern Community College in North Carolina included mentoring in its internship component. Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College incorporated mentoring and job shadowing in its third year of the GYO program. Frederick Community College in Maryland matched program participants with mentors providing exposure to different leadership styles (Jeandron, 2006). Collin County Community College District included meetings with college presidents, attendance at board meetings, and mentorship in its Academy for Collegiate Excellence (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010).

All of the programs responding to the survey by Reille and Kezar (2010) included assessment tools to improve self-awareness and to create professional development plans. The professional development plans included strategies to support Knowles’ assumption of self-directed learning through self-assessment, reflecting on individual skills and competencies, and developing individual career goals. The key to this strategy is the use of a self-assessment tool such as the Myers-Briggs or 360 surveys to become self-aware and reflect on individual strengths and weaknesses (Knowles & Associates, 1984;
Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Using this information, employees create a plan for growth and development to achieve career goals.

All statewide and district programs involved in the AACC study included mentoring in their GYO programs. However, contrary to the findings of this earlier AACC study, Reille and Kezar (2010) noted mentoring and job shadowing were used less frequently in GYO programs due to the challenges of scheduling and coordinating these components. Additionally, the mentorship program in Collin’s ACE program was criticized by program participants as needing further development in the areas of matching mentors with mentees and clarifying roles and responsibilities of mentors (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010).

**Mentorship Programs**

Mentoring plays a key role in preparing future leaders of community colleges for daily tasks and challenges (Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Markwood, 2007; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Learning through mentorship and networking with current leaders is a component of professional development. Mentor-protégé relationships are professionally-centered relationships where an experienced leader provides career advice and encouragement to aspiring leaders (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002). In an online survey of college presidents conducted by the AACC in 2001 to identify professional development activities that were most influential in preparing for the presidency, 57% indicated that a mentor had helped prepare them for the presidency; 76% of the CEOs who had been on the job for more than 3 years responded that they had served as a formal mentor in developing another community college professional (Shults, 2001).
In an unpublished dissertation, Duree (2007) noted that half of the presidents reported having a mentor. The role of mentors is also to help the protégé to develop networking skills. Current community college presidents are demonstrating a growing commitment to leadership development through identification of potential leaders, support of GYO programs, and through mentoring relationships (Duree, as cited in McNair et al., 2011). The AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) on GYO programs indicated 50% of the respondents incorporated experiential learning through mentoring in their programs.

Findings from a more recent study conducted by Reille and Kezar (2010) noted few programs included mentoring because of the difficulty coordinating this activity, and in obtaining commitments from mentors. The common concerns on the part of potential mentors in mentorship programs included the commitment of time, the matching of mentees to mentors, and dealing with issues of confidentiality (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

In spite of these concerns about formal mentorship program components, informal mentoring does occur in the absence of structured mentoring programs. Informal mentoring occurs when motivated managers seek guidance from more experienced and senior level managers, thereby developing relationships that support their professional development through work experiences (Piland & Wolf, 2003).

**Experiential Learning**

Malcolm Knowles popularized andragogy as an adult learning theory to separate adult learning from child learning, and promoted key six assumptions about adult learners (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). These assumptions were based
on the idea that adults have a vast amount of prior experience that can serve as a rich resource for learning (Knowles, 1970, 1990; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Smith, 2002; B. Taylor & Kroth, 2009). In andragogy, adults need to learn how to learn from their experiences. The learning process uses the experiences of the learners to help adults make progress towards achieving their goals. According to Knowles, adults learn by connecting new knowledge with existing knowledge and experience. Experiential learning through real work experiences, such as internships, job shadowing, and temporary interim assignments, provide a basis to contextualize program content and apply learning (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

Additionally, adult education specialists recommend the use of work experiences through special assignments and team projects to support application of learning as a key component in professional development programs. These experiences also provide organizational team building and networking opportunities outside of the structured classroom environment. Mentoring and job shadowing are recognized as effective experiential learning strategies for adult and professional learners. Even though the results of the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) indicted 50% of the programs incorporated mentoring into their GYO program planning, more recent research indicated that these components were rarely implemented in GYO programs because of challenges in coordination (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

**Program Evaluation**

Most GYO programs conduct program evaluation and solicit feedback from the participants at the conclusion of the program; some colleges solicit feedback after each session (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010;
Robinson et al., 2010). Feedback is collected on program content, quality of presentation and experience, topic interest level, and relevance to the employee’s current and desired position. Programs where participants provide feedback at the end of each session can be found at Cumberland County College, New Jersey; Community College of Philadelphia; Mount Wachusett Community College, Massachusetts; Central Piedmont Community College, North Carolina; and Metropolitan Community College, Nebraska (Jeandron, 2006). Program evaluations conducted on GYO programs at Collin County Community College District and Pitt Community College focused on program components and topics rather than outcomes (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010).

At the time of the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006), the author noted that several colleges tracked career progress of GYO program graduates using information gathered through informal word of mouth sources. Because of the relative newness of the programs, formal data collections systems to track progress were still in development. Community College of Philadelphia reported that over 30% of their program participants had progressed up the career ladder. The timeframe and specific career advancement information were not provided in the report (Jeandron, 2006). Additionally, Central Piedmont in North Carolina, Metropolitan Community College in Nebraska, Middlesex Community College in Massachusetts, Parkland College in Illinois, and Southeastern Community College in North Carolina claimed that they tracked promotions of program participants after program completion. However, specific data from these programs were not reported in the study (Jeandron, 2006).

While most GYO programs collect information on customer satisfaction either at the end of each workshop or at the conclusion of the program, there appears to be an
absence of program evaluation data on the effectiveness of program pedagogy in supporting learning gains, as well as GYO program participant career advancement behavior (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Several GYO program coordinators noted career advancement of program participants without providing specific data on career advancement timeframe, evidence of career advancement behavior and types of positions obtained after program participation, and whether the career advancement was attributed to program participation.

**Benefits and Weaknesses of GYO Programs**

The comprehensive studies of GYO programs conducted by Jeandron (2006) for AACC and Audrey Reille and Adriana Kezar (2010) focused on program planning, development, delivery, and evaluation. Robinson et al. (2010) conducted their study on the effectiveness of Pitt Community College’s leadership institute in improving participant skills and knowledge about leadership in the college. El-Ashmawy and Weasenforth (2010) evaluated Collin Community College District’s American Council on Education’s (ACE) Fellows Program with a focus on overall program effectiveness relative to program components and curriculum. Each study identified benefits of existing programs and suggestions for program improvement.

**GYO program benefits.** The benefits of GYO programs noted in the literature include:

- The flexibility and adaptability of program content, and the ability to customize the curriculum content to reflect institutional mission, values, and ways of doing things (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).
• The experiential components (mentorship, attendance at board meetings, and meetings with college president) were useful for making new contacts and understanding college administrative goals and decisions (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010).

• The programs were accessible to large numbers of participants, and could be scheduled at times and locations that are convenient to participants (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

• Program participants had the opportunity to directly apply learning in-house at their colleges (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

• Supervisors of program participants noticed communication, networking, and collaboration increased across departments (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

• The program participants increased their involvement in campus activities and participation on campus committees (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

• Participants appreciated the opportunity to learn about themselves, their leadership styles, and become more self confident in the performance of their job responsibilities (Robinson et al., 2010).

• Employee participants demonstrated improved problem solving skills (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

The strengths of GYO programs lie in the program coordinators’ ability to provide leadership development training to a large number of employees; the flexibility to custom-design the curriculum to incorporate the culture of the college and the employee background and skill levels; and the ability to schedule program activities when
convenient for employees. In addition, the program content can be designed to meet employees at their skill level and build new knowledge through experiences and preparation for career advancement opportunities within the organization. Grow your own programs can be scheduled on days, at times, and at locations that are convenient to a large number of participants. Program planners also can manage the cost of GYO programs by using campus facilities and in-house presenters.

Compared to university-based leadership programs that primarily focus on research and theory, GYO program content can be customized to address the capacity-building needs of employees within a specific institution. While university-based credentialing programs are designed to provide formal leadership development that can be applied within any institution of higher education, GYO programs address the unique capacity-building needs of a college, district, or region. The program developer can employ adult learning theory by structuring the learning environment, and by organizing activities to facilitate experiential learning through hands-on application of new knowledge in the workplace. In addition, program content can be contextualized to incorporate campus culture by integrating the institutional mission, values, and ways of doing things into the curriculum. Finally, GYO programs support in-house application of learning and improve communication, networking, and collaboration across departments (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). As a complement to university-based programs, GYO programs support development of future college leaders by recruiting internal candidates who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline, and building their capacity through real world experiences,
and opportunities for application of learning (O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

**GYO program weaknesses.** Results of the studies conducted by El-Ashmawy and Weasenforth (2010) and Robinson et al. (2010) noted weaknesses specific to each of the programs studied. Weaknesses included criticisms of the mentoring program and the superficial nature of the readings. Recommendations for program improvement included incorporating follow-up sessions to facilitate group discussions on application of learning.

As noted earlier, the effectiveness of GYO programs rests in the hands of the program developers. Reille and Kezar (2010) discovered a strong tendency among GYO program developers to create GYO programs that support the needs of the college without first assessing the training needs and interests of the employees. The authors noted the following limitations in GYO programs in general.

First, there is the risk of overlooking important training needs because of bias of program planners. “Every campus has a particular culture that will potentially bias the way its GYO program is developed” (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 76). Researchers noted the importance of assessment of professional attributes and training needs by surveying potential program participants prior to program creation (Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Programs created based on the perceptions of the program developer without assessment of participant need or interests may not meet the needs of all stakeholders.

Those programs developed without first assessing employee needs or interests are at risk of creating a program based on the program developer’s bias. Several of the
colleges responding to the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) conducted needs assessments or surveys of potential participants prior to finalizing the curriculum. For example, Chemeketa Community College conducted surveys of potential participants soliciting input on topic areas. Metropolitan Community College conducted retreats with potential participants to discuss leadership, conduct participant self-assessment, and identify areas of skill enhancement with the participants (Jeandron, 2006). This strategy assures that program content meets the prospective participants at their level of interest and need (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Another strategy to guard against developer bias in GYO program development is to hire outside consultants to conduct the employee and organizational needs assessments and develop the program curriculum based on the results.

Second, in addition to developer bias in curriculum development there is a tendency on the part of program planners to make decisions on program format based on convenience rather than what is supported by research and literature on adult learning theory. Reille and Kezar (2010) noted that 88% of the programs in their study provided instruction through classes, seminars, and workshops that included team building and collaborative projects. Other instructional practices such as mentoring/job shadowing are used, but less frequently. Even though mentoring, job shadowing, and team projects are recognized as effective strategies for adult and professional learners, these components are rarely implemented because of challenges in coordination (Reille & Kezar, 2010). The programs included a combination of day-long sessions that included outside speakers, team projects, case studies, and some additional shorter half-day workshops.
There are “no data demonstrating that certain formats are better at reaching particular community college leadership competencies or outcomes” (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 63).

According to Jeandron (2006), and Reille and Kezar (2010), program planners tend to make decisions on program format based on convenience rather than what is supported by research and literature on adult learning theory. Workshops are scheduled on days and at times to minimize travel time and interruptions from work during peak periods, rather than to provide an optimal learning experience. There is no consideration of adult learning theories. “Decisions about pedagogy, program structure, and scheduling were made on the basis of convenience rather than effectiveness” (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 77). While a daylong session may be easier to schedule, there is no evidence that this is effective. The design of the GYO program “should refer to adult learning and leadership development theories when designing programs that are conducive to learning” (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 77).

Finally, there is little evidence of Knowles’ assumptions of andragogy in the literature on GYO programs. Programs are designed with minimal input from participants, and classroom instruction rather than experiential learning are the most common instructional formats used in GYO programs. According to the andragogical assumption of adults as self-directed learners, program participants need to be involved in the selection and implementation of learning strategies. They must have the opportunity to self-assess, and reflect on learning to evaluate learning outcomes. Furthermore, involvement of participants in program planning assures the learning builds on their prior or existing knowledge and on their experiences. While community college faculty are encouraged to use adult learning theory and andragogy to support student success, it is
interesting to note the absence of adult learning theory as a focus in the literature on community college GYO programs.

**Summary of GYO Themes**

The number of GYO programs has grown considerably since 2000, as colleges and districts across the country have developed and implemented in-house leadership development programs. There were common themes identified in the review of literature in the areas of program planning, curriculum development, program components, and program evaluation. Table 4 summarizes the themes and findings.

**Conclusions**

Several key themes were noted in the review of literature on the history of university-based and short-term leadership development programs, and emerging strategies in community college leadership development. Succession planning programs known as GYO programs have emerged since 2000 as one strategy used to recruit current employees who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline and prepare them for career advancement. As the first step in a leadership development continuum, GYO programs provide an entrance to further career development opportunities.

Key themes noted in the review of literature include:

1. The number of university-based leadership development programs (approximately 60 in the nation) focused on community college leadership (approximately 21) are not sufficient to address the current need for trained executive leaders. Furthermore, the focus of university doctoral programs tends to be research rather than application of knowledge. Few programs
Table 4

**Themes and Summary of Findings of Community College GYO Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning</td>
<td>It is very important to have the college president’s commitment to the program. Linking the program with the college strategic plan assures board of trustee attention and provides credibility for the program. In addition to support from the campus executives, planning efforts need to be inclusive and solicit input from the various campus employee groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>The AACC Competencies for Effective Leaders were used in developing GYO program curriculum. While GYO programs provide the opportunity to contextualize the curriculum within the campus culture, efforts need to be made to reduce the possibility of designer bias, and design content that builds on employee knowledge by using results of employee needs assessments to develop program curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Components</td>
<td>All programs included regularly scheduled lecture sessions, combined with individual and team projects. Mentoring and job shadowing are noted as highly effective strategies in adult learning theories. While close to 50% of the GYO programs surveyed in the AACC study (Jeandron, 2006) included an experiential component of mentoring or job shadowing, Reille and Kezar (2010) found that few programs actively integrated experiential components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>GYO program evaluation consists primarily of gathering information on customer satisfaction and soliciting input on program improvement. Missing from the literature are data on the effectiveness of program components and curriculum content in achieving learning outcomes or directly impacting career advancement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provide an experiential learning component supported in the literature on andragogy as important for adult learners. In response to more recent criticism of university-based community college leadership programs and the urgent need for credentialed community college leaders, California amended the state’s Master Plan for Higher Education to authorize California State University to award the doctorate (Ed.D.) in educational administration and leadership for K-12, community college, and postsecondary education. As of December 2010, 13 CSU campuses were offering Ed.D. Programs in educational leadership, with seven of these programs focused on community college leaders.

2. Short-term leadership development workshops and seminars are a valuable supplemental professional development strategy. Professional associations and organizations throughout the United States, such as the AACC, The League for Innovation, and National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA) provide leadership academies, institutes, conferences, and workshops. In California, the Community College League of California, the Association of California Community College Administrators, and the Community College Leadership Development Initiative sponsor workshops, institutes, conferences, and disseminate information on current and emerging trends and issues. These short-term professional development workshops and seminars also provide networking opportunities for those participants who are interested in engaging in dialogue with current leaders.
3. Grow your own programs are a recent recruitment and professional development trend in community colleges. These programs provide opportunities to recruit current employees into the career advancement pipeline and prepare them for leadership positions within the campus and district. Grow your own programs provide the first step in the leadership development continuum by identifying potential leaders and providing capacity building and organizational networking that stimulate interest in career advancement. One of the benefits of GYO programs is that the curriculum can be customized to meet the specific capacity-building needs of the organization and the individual participants.

4. The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders are used in the development of programs and curriculum in both GYO and university-based doctoral programs focused on community college leadership.

5. Application of learning through experiential learning is a vital component in developing leadership skills. Mentoring and job shadowing are recognized as effective strategies for adult and professional learners. However, the literature noted that these components were rarely implemented in GYO programs because of challenges in coordination.

The literature does not address whether GYO programs are filling the leadership pipeline with qualified employees. It is still unclear whether employees pursue leadership positions or continue to participate in professional development activities after completion of GYO programs. There also is an absence of information on what motivates employees to participate in GYO programs. Minimal data have been collected
on GYO participants’ backgrounds and their motivation to participate. Due to the relative newness of GYO programs, there is an absence of published data on career advancement among GYO program participants, and it is difficult to attribute career advancement to program participation.

Grow your own program design includes minimal attention to Knowles’ key andragogical assumptions of self-directedness and use of experience as a resource for learning. Most GYO programs include participant self-assessment and career plan development, which supports participants as self-directed learners. However, the actual workshop instructional methodology and development of program topic areas do not appear to incorporate participant experiences and background into the curriculum.
CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology and procedures used to conduct the study of a grow-your-own (GYO) succession planning program at a multi-campus community college district in Southern California. This study employed a case study methodology to explore the effectiveness of the GYO program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behavior of program participants in this particular community college district. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Competencies for Community College Leaders and Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of andragogy were used as the theoretical frameworks to guide this study. This chapter contains the methodology used to address the research questions introduced in Chapter 1, and includes a description of research design and methods used for participant sampling and data collection, the systematic data analysis process and procedures, the steps followed to assure trustworthiness of the findings and confidentiality, the role of the researcher, and the limitations of the methodology.

The review of the literature on community college leadership programs in Chapter 2 concluded by identifying key themes in the areas of university-based doctoral programs focused on community college leadership; short-term professional association sponsored conferences, institutes, and workshops; and the emerging strategy of college- and district-initiated succession planning GYO programs. Several articles in the literature noted that the number of university-based leadership development programs focused on community college leadership is not sufficient to address the current need for trained executive leaders (Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Kehoe, 2008; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Short-term workshops, institutes, and seminars are valuable professional
development strategies and provide networking opportunities for current leaders as a supplement to formal university-based doctoral programs. Succession planning or GYO programs are emerging strategies to recruit current employees into the career advancement pipeline and prepare them for leadership positions. The GYO programs provide the first step in the leadership development continuum by identifying potential leaders and providing capacity building and organizational networking that stimulate interest in career advancement.

The purpose of this study was to explore the effectiveness of a GYO succession planning program in preparing community college leaders for the second decade of the 21st century. Specifically, this study focuses on the Sea Side Community College District’s (SSCCD) GYO program. This study used qualitative data analysis through a case study of program participants to gain an in-depth understanding of the GYO program participants. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics and professional backgrounds of the GYO program graduates?

2. Why do community college employees participate in the GYO program?

3. What were the professional goals of the participants when they entered the program? Did these goals change after program participation?

4. What are the postprogram career advancement behaviors of GYO program participants, including: continued education, application for career advancement positions, and actual career advancement?

5. How are the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders addressed in the program curriculum?
6. How are Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of participant self-directedness and participant experiences reflected in the GYO participants’ learning experiences?

In this chapter, the researcher describes the methodology used to conduct a case study of a GYO program implemented by a Southern California multi-campus community college district. This program, called the Management Leadership Development Academy (MLDA), is a succession planning academy offered to employees interested in career advancement positions. The MLDA is designed to provide training for current and new managers in the District, experienced supervisors, and faculty in coordinator positions who have a professional goal of advancement to higher level management positions. Two Academies were offered in the 2009-2010 academic year, and a third Academy was offered in the spring of 2011. A total of 30 individuals participated in the first GYO Academy, 17 participated in the second Academy, and 17 participated in the third Academy.

**Research Design**

The researcher conducted a qualitative case study to investigate the participant experience in a GYO program, with a focus on understanding why employees participated in the program, how they constructed knowledge from their participation in the program, and how participation in the program impacted their career advancement behavior. The study took place at a multi-campus community college district in Southern California. This study involves one case, the GYO program, and three subunits or cohorts. This case study included a combination of qualitative strategies. These strategies included interviews and document analysis.
Social Constructivist Theoretical Perspective

The researcher’s theoretical perspective was grounded in social constructivism, which overlaps with the assumptions of Malcolm Knowles’ adult learning theory of andragogy. Constructivism is a theory describing how learning happens, and suggests that learners construct knowledge out of their experiences (Powell & Kalina, 2009; Wertsch, 1997). Merriam and Caffarella (1991) defined constructive learning as “a process of constructing meaning; it is how people make sense of their experience” (p. 261). Similar to the andragogical assumptions used as a theoretical framework for this study, in social constructivism learners are self-directed, active participants in the learning process interacting with the environment and constructing new knowledge by connecting it with their prior knowledge and experiences (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Constructivist learning theory and andragogy view life experience as a resource and stimulus for acquiring knowledge.

The social constructivist paradigm views the context in which the learning occurs as central to the learning itself (McMahon, 1997). In this study, the researcher used a social constructivist lens to describe the GYO program design, including the curriculum, methods of delivery, and social activities to support construction of knowledge. The researcher explored the GYO participants’ reasons for participating in the GYO program and how they constructed knowledge from the program content and experience. The researcher also explored the employees’ career advancement behaviors after program participation, including participation in further career development activity.
Qualitative Case Study

Merriam (1998) noted that a qualitative case study provides a “holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bounded system” (p. 12) to “gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” (p. 19). A case study is conducted when the researcher is interested in discovery of the process of a unit of study (program, treatment, phenomenon), rather than hypothesis-testing or outcomes (Merriam, 1998). According to Yin (2009), “The strength of a case study is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence, documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations” (p. 11). Case studies are used as research methods when the focus of the investigation is on a contemporary phenomenon or event, and the researcher does not seek control over behavior or events (Yin, 2009). According to Yin, if the research questions focus on “how,” “why,” and “what” questions that are exploratory in nature, then a case study is the preferred research method. Case studies are conducted to produce a description of the phenomenon under investigation, with a focus on the process of events and programs rather than on the outcomes (Merriam, 1998).

The researcher selected a case study research design to investigate the participant experience in a GYO program, with a focus on understanding why employees participated in the program, how they constructed knowledge from their social interactions and participation in the program, and how participation in the program impacted their career advancement behavior. The GYO program in this study is a bounded system that includes three cohorts of participants. The researcher used a single-case (embedded) design, or what Yin (2009) referred to as a “type two” design, to focus the study on the participants’ experiences within the context of the program. The rationale for using a
single case design is that the subject of the study was a single organizational leadership development program within a community college district. The case study included analysis of the contextual conditions provided by the MLDA program design and delivery relative to the participants’ experiences and subsequent career advancement behaviors. A total of three Academies have been offered to employees of the SSCCD. Each of the three Academies formed a cohort of program participants. These cohorts represent three subunits of study embedded within this single case study. Participants were selected from each cohort, or unit of study, using sampling techniques discussed later in this chapter.

The GYO program was initiated in fall 2009 and has served 64 employees as of the date of this study. This case study design was used to explore the GYO program from the participant perspective, to develop a rich description of the participants’ experiences, and to describe how participation in the program impacted employee career advancement behaviors. The research questions in this study did not focus on measuring “how many” participants were served or completed the program. Therefore, the case study is the actual product of this investigation and provides an intensive description of the study’s unit of analysis or bounded system (Merriam, 1998).

**Research Setting and Context**

The study took place at the Sea Side Community College District (SSCCD), a multi-campus community college district in Southern California. The SSCCD serves approximately 100,000 students each semester through three colleges and six noncredit program campuses. The three colleges offer associate degrees and certificates in career technical programs that prepare students for entry-level jobs, and arts and sciences programs that transfer to 4-year colleges and universities. The noncredit programs offer
vocational, basic skills, life skills, and personal enrichment classes at sites throughout the city. There were approximately 4,400 employees working within SSCCD in the 2009-2010 academic year. A total of 50% of the employees were faculty, 36% were classified and hourly employees, and the remaining 14% were managers, supervisors, and college police. In the fall of 2009, SSCCD implemented a succession planning GYO program in response to goal four of the District’s 2009-2012 Strategic Plan: to enhance professional development for all staff. The Professional Development Program includes a range of components targeted to support leadership development with the primary objective of preparing the next generation of college leaders for career advancement within the District.

The SSCCD is located in a county that includes eight colleges within five districts, including the three colleges in the SSCCD. As of March 2011, one of the districts was searching for a vice chancellor, four out of the eight colleges were searching for new presidents, three of the colleges were searching for a total of four vice presidents, and 14 vacant deans’ positions were filled with 12 interim assignments. At SSCCD, in the fall of 2011, there were vacancies in one vice chancellor position, three vice presidents positions, and six of the campus and district level deans positions.

This site was selected for the case study because it has an established GYO program that has completed three cycles of the program since the fall of 2009. As noted in the literature, most GYO programs are initiated by large colleges or districts that have human resources departments to develop and implement the programs (Jeandron, 2006). The SSCCD is the largest community college district in the region, and the only organization in the region that has initiated a GYO program to address the shortfall in
trained community college leaders. This site provided the researcher with the opportunity to explore the participants’ experiences in the program, as well as their career advancement behavior, including professional development activity after they completed the program. Furthermore, the District Human Resources Department has compiled participant and program information and presented this information to the District Board of Trustees in the spring of 2011. The program is considered successful by the District based on positive feedback received from participants in the program evaluations, and the District is in the process of expanding the program to include classified staff and a mentoring component in the 2012-2013 academic year.

This study took place during a time period when California was struggling with unprecedented budget shortfalls, and the community colleges were dealing with a critical void in leadership due to the retirement of baby boomer presidents, vice presidents, and faculty leaders. In most cases, when the positions of dean, vice president, president, and chancellor are vacated, they are filled on an interim or temporary basis for up to 1 year, while the college or district conducts the search to fill the position permanently. This practice creates opportunities for experiential learning through interim or acting assignments. Program graduates may apply for these temporary assignments, and if selected, gain professional development experiences that improve their qualifications for future permanent opportunities.

Selection of Participants

This case study consists of a single bounded system, or unit of investigation which is the GYO program (Merriam, 1998). This case study involves one case, the GYO program, and three subunits or Academy cohorts identified by Yin (2009) as a type two,
single case (embedded) study. The researcher conducted an analysis of each cohort within this case study to “focus the case study inquiry” (Yin, 2009, p. 52) on the participants’ experiences within the context of the case, or the GYO program. Participants from the embedded units within this case were selected through sampling (Yin, 2009). A total of 64 employees participated in the three cohorts of the GYO program. At the time of this study, summer of 2012, five of the program participants had left their employment at the District. Therefore, the researcher invited all of the remaining 59 program participants from the three cohorts to participate in interviews using Merriam’s (1998) nonprobability sampling, or what Chein (1981) referred to as purposive, and Patton (1990) called purposeful sampling, to select a sample of participants to interview. Purposeful sampling assumes, “the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). The researcher selected interviewees from those who volunteered to assure maximum variation and diversity of participants in this study (Merriam, 1998). Maximum variation of sampling, “involves identifying and seeking out those who represent the widest possible range of the characteristics of interest for the study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 63). The criteria used to sample participants from each cohort included the following attributes:

- job classification (manager, classified supervisor, or faculty supervisor),
- ethnicity,
- age category,
- educational degree,
• gender, and

• years of employment within the District (Merriam, 1998).

The criteria used to sample within the case were important to the study, as they assured the information generated and themes that emerged reflect the diversity of participant sentiments unique to each category (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). According to Patton (1990), “Findings from a small sample of great diversity yields important shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity” (p. 172).

As noted earlier, all of the 59 remaining employees who participated in the three GYO program Academies were invited to participate in this study via an email from the GYO program coordinator, with a link to the questionnaire for this study (using Survey Monkey). The GYO program coordinator is an employee of the SSCCD Human Resources Department. The email invitation briefly introduced the study and invited the MLDA completer to participate in the study by responding to the attached questionnaire (see Appendix B). The invitation email specified the purpose of the study, assured participation in the case study was voluntary and confidential, and requested responses from those participants who were interested in participating in the study (see Appendix C for the questionnaire). The questionnaire was used to gather participant information used by the researcher to select the sample for the study from those who volunteered.

Participant privacy and confidentiality of information were strictly maintained. The researcher did not have access to contact information for the 59 GYO program participants. The researcher only had access to the identities of those who responded to the questionnaire and volunteered to participate in the study. The participants who
volunteered to participate were notified that their responses would be confidential and that no individually identifiable information would be used or released. The participants who were selected to serve in the study received the Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study form electronically when the researcher made the appointments for the interviews (see Appendix D for the form). Participants were assured that any articles or reports written as a result of the study would not contain the names of or identifying information about the individuals or the organization (S. J. Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Each participant in the study selected a pseudo name, which was used as the participant identifier in the interviews. Any information that was obtained from this study that can be identified with the participants has been kept confidential. The code book for this study, including the participant identifiers, is stored separately from the transcripts of the interviews in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s home. If the results of the research are published or discussed at conferences, no information that can potentially reveal participant identity will be included.

Characteristics of the Interview Sample

The researcher used purposeful sampling to select interviewees from those program participants who responded to the invitation to participate in the study. A total of 64 employees participated in the three GYO program academies since inception of the program in fall 2009. At the time of this study, summer of 2012, five of the program participants had left their employment at the District. The District does not maintain contact information on those employees who exit from the District. Therefore, a total of 59 program GYO program graduates were invited to participate in the study via an email invitation from the MLDA Program Coordinator, who is an employee in the Human
Resources Department at the District. A total of 22 individuals responded to the invitation to participate. They volunteered to participate in the study, provided their contact information, and completed the initial questionnaire. Table 5 provides demographic information on the 22 employees who volunteered to participate in the program and the number of individuals selected from each category for the sample.

The researcher selected the sample using the demographic information collected by the questionnaire. A total of 13 employees accepted the invitation and participated in the interviews. The researcher selected a higher number of subjects for the sample from the first cohort, as these individuals would have had more time to demonstrate career advancement behaviors after program participation, which is one of the research questions in this study. Table 6 provides descriptive data on those employees who volunteered to participate in the study based on the sample selection criteria.

Data Collection

This case study included a combination of qualitative strategies. These strategies included interviews, and document, textual, and content analysis. In addition, a questionnaire was used to screen participants for this study based on the criteria of job classification, ethnicity, age category, gender, educational degree, and years of employment within the District. Table 7 identifies which strategy was used to address each of the research questions.

The researcher conducted a review of program documents and extant data to collect descriptive data on the program, its participants, and analyze the contextual conditions of this case study. Data gleaned from the review of the extant program data contributed to the description of the program, including the demographics, education
Table 5

*Invitation Respondents and Sample Counts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
<th>Response count</th>
<th>Sample count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Supervisor</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in supervisory role</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in district</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level (degree)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* In some cases, the response rates do not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Table 6

*Sample of Participants and Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Years in district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Classified Supervisor</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Faculty Supervisor</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Classified Supervisor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Faculty Supervisor</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>Classified Supervisor</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Classified Supervisor</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Data Collection Strategy by Research Question*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Who/what</th>
<th>Data to be collected</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the characteristics and professional backgrounds of the GYO program graduates?</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Background (descriptive)</td>
<td>Review of extant program data, questionnaire</td>
<td>Knowles—experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Years of experience in the district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Job classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the professional goals of GYO program participants when they entered the program? Did the goals change after participation? What are the postprogram behaviors of participants?</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Professional goals and career advancement behavior</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Knowles—self-directedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do community college employees participate in the GYO program?</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Reason for participation</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Knowles—self-directedness (intrinsic/extrinsic motivation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommended by supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of participant self-directedness and participant experiences appear in the GYO participants learning experiences?</td>
<td>Participants, GYO program delivery methods</td>
<td>Classroom learning</td>
<td>Interviews and program document review</td>
<td>Knowles—experience + self-directedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Application of prior experiences in the learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Content vs. the classroom learning experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders addressed in the program curriculum?</td>
<td>GYO program curriculum</td>
<td>Program content</td>
<td>Program document review</td>
<td>AACC competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level, and professional background of the participants. Data collected from the program
document review also were used to respond to the research question on the use of AACC
Competencies in the program curriculum, and to provide a contextual background for the
description of the participants’ experiences (see Appendix E for Document Analyzer
Form).

The participants who volunteered to take part in the study provided their contact
information in response to the questionnaire. The researcher used this information to
contact those participants who were selected to participate in the study, and sent an
electronic copy of the consent form when scheduling the interviews for a time and day
that was convenient for interviewees. A total of 22 employees volunteered to participate
in the study, and 13 were selected. The researcher sent an electronic message to the nine
employees who were not selected thanking them for their interest and noting that the
number of volunteers to participate was greater than the number needed for this study.

The Interviews

The researcher used a semi-structured interview process that included a
combination of structured and open-ended questions (see Appendix F for interview
questions). A semi-structured interview process was selected to allow access to the
participants’ perceptions, language, and views of the world (Merriam, 1998). Knowles’
andragogical assumptions of self-directedness and experiential learning were used as a
guide to construct the interview questions. The interview included specific questions
worded flexibly to explore how the participants constructed meaning from the program
content and learning experience, as well as their reasons for participation in the program
and career advancement behaviors after completion of the program. For example,
questions were asked on how the program content built upon or added to existing knowledge and experience. The interviews included a number of questions on participant motivation for participating in the MLDA Program. For example: Whose idea was it to participate in the program? There were two questions on career advancement behavior and goals. Such as: What has been your career advancement behavior since participating in the program? Have you applied for any new positions? The interview included questions on self-directedness of the participants, as well as how the program built on their existing knowledge or experience. For example: Why did you participate in the program? What did you expect to get out of the program? How did the program content build on your existing knowledge and experience? The order in which the questions were asked varied to “allow the researcher to respond to the situation at hand or emerging worldview of the respondent and to new ideas on the topic” (Merriam, 1998, p. 74). Yin (2009) described interviews as “guided conversations rather than structured queries” (p. 106). The interview questions were grouped by research question as noted in Table 7 and were used to guide the interviews as conversations that were exploratory in nature. The interviews took place at the convenience of the employee, either in his/her office or in the researcher’s office. Each participant was interviewed once for a period of time that ranged from 30 minutes to 1 hour. The length of time for the interviews varied because of the difference in how extensively each participant responded to the questions.

The researcher conducted interviews over a 9-day time period from June 4 through June 13, 2012. The interview questions were pilot tested on the first three interviewees in this study. The only change made after the first three interviews was a switch in the order of questions 17 and 18 because question 17 seemed more like a final
question than 18. The researcher began each interview by thanking the employee for agreeing to participate in the study and providing a brief description of the study. Then the researcher asked the participants for the pseudo names they selected, as these would be the names used in the introduction on the recording of the interviews along with cohort and demographic information. Each recorded interview began with the introduction of the employee by his or her pseudo name and selection criteria (cohort number, job classification, age category, educational degree, ethnicity, and years of employment in the District), date of interview, and interview number.

The length of time for interviews varied. Several employees gave brief responses and were less conversational than others. The researcher took notes during the interviews and used a recording device to capture every spoken word. All participants agreed to be recorded. The researcher thanked each employee at the conclusion of each interview. A transcript of the interview was provided to each interviewee for review and correction of any errors before finalizing analysis of the findings.

**Data Management and Analysis**

Each interview was recorded and transcribed. The individual interviews were coded using an identifier that included the program cohort (fall 2009, spring 2010, and spring 2011), the participant pseudo name, the interview number, and the sampling criteria: job classification, age category, gender, years of employment in the District, educational degree, and ethnicity. The data were reviewed and analyzed manually first and then electronically using the computer software program Atlas Ti. Field notes were recorded at the conclusion of each interview. The researcher noted observations, thoughts, and speculations during the data analysis process.
The data were coded using Charmaz’s (2006) methods of open and focused coding, and Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) axial type of coding. “Coding is the link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to explain the data” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 46). The first phase of coding was conducted line-by-line, stuck closely to the data, and remained open to analysis. Line-by-line coding was used to support analysis of the data critically and analytically. Open coding then was used to allow themes and subthemes to emerge from the data. The codes were constructed by the researcher using action verbs rather than topic words that reflect the language and perspectives of the participants during the interviews (Charmaz, 2006). The researcher looked for actions and attempted to code using action words rather than conceptual words to protect from making conceptual judgments of themes. The initial codes were grounded in the data and were revised to fit the data throughout the coding process as themes and subthemes emerged.

The transcripts of the interviews were coded manually first and then electronically using AtlasTI software. The initial codes and their meanings emerged from the words used by the interviewees. The researcher developed the codes and initiated a code book during the manual coding of the first five interview transcripts. The code book was used to ensure consistency in coding of all transcripts. The codes were in vivo codes that reflected the language used by the employees (Charmaz, 2006). All of the transcripts were then coded electronically using the code book created by the researcher during the manual coding of the first five transcripts. The researcher developed codes to note direct responses to the research questions in the transcripts. Only these codes remain constant.
during the coding process. The other codes were modified and the code book was revised as new codes emerged during the coding of the transcripts.

The second phase of coding was focused. During this phase of coding, the data were analyzed with a focus on identifying “salient categories in larger batches of data” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 46). Subthemes emerged from these codes as groups of codes had similar meanings. For example, the subtheme of connection to others emerged from the codes of networking, interaction, connection, trust, and observation of others. The words used to describe the subthemes and themes were originated by the researcher to begin organizing the codes. The researcher used constant comparative methods (Glasser & Strauss, 1967) to compare data within each interview and between interviews to identify similarities, differences, themes that were unique to each person or cohort, and to discover themes that emerged and spanned across all participants. Subthemes were compared between interviews to identify similarities and differences, and identify the subthemes that were unique to each person, job classification, or cohort, and to discover themes that emerged across all participants (based on category of cohort, gender, job classification, educational degree, age category, ethnicity, and years of experience in the District).

Axial coding was used to connect subthemes to themes and bring the data back into a “coherent whole” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), axial coding reassembles the data that have been broken down into pieces and converts the data into concepts that are linked to subcategories. Through the coding process, the data were coded to identify salient themes from the subthemes that emerged from the data. The researcher assembled the subthemes into themes, and identified which
themes had strong evidence (i.e., large number of quotes, confirmation across cases, little or no disconfirming data). The researcher noted some overlap of subthemes among the themes.

The data generated from the review of the program documents provided background information on the MLDA program and were used to contextualize the participants’ responses to the interview questions about their expectations of the program content, the effectiveness of program format, and how the program content added to their existing knowledge and experience. Data generated from the review of the program curricula, schedule, and methods of delivery added to the description of the program and were used to identify the extent to which the AACC Competencies were found in the curricula.

The demographic data collected from the questionnaire and the review of program extant data were used to provide a holistic description of the program participants. The researcher reported demographic information on program participants collected from the review of the extant data, the employees who volunteered to participate in the study, and those employees who were selected to participate in the study in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 13 (see p. 180) of this study. Table 13 (p. 180) provides demographic and background information on MLDA program participants using descriptive statistics of the population. Tables 5 and 6 provide demographic and background information on the employees who volunteered to participate in the study and the study sample, respectively.

**Trustworthiness and Quality Assurances**

The researcher took systematic steps to ensure the trustworthiness of the research findings and quality assurance throughout the methodological process. The researcher
employed strategies to ensure qualitative validity and accuracy of findings (Creswell, 2009). These strategies included triangulation of data, member checking, and use of thick descriptions which are described below. According to Merriam (1998), internal validity “deals with how research findings match reality” (p. 201). Gibbs (as cited in Creswell, 2009) described validity as “the researcher checks for the accuracy of findings by employing certain procedures, while qualitative reliability indicates the researcher’s approach is consistent across different researchers and different projects” (p. 190). The researcher ensured reliability of the methodological process by applying Yin’s (2009) recommendation of developing case study procedures, case study protocol, and a chain of evidence. The recorded participant interviews were transcribed by a professional transcriptionist. The researcher checked the transcriptions carefully to assure the absence of errors made during the transcription process, by listening to the interview tapes and reading the transcriptions. The codes were defined in the researcher’s code book and the researcher used the code book and constant comparison of coding between transcripts during the coding process to ensure accuracy of data coding.

The researcher implemented several of Creswell’s (2009) and Merriam’s (1998) validity strategies to assess and ensure the accuracy and credibility of findings. First, the researcher triangulated the data by collecting data from multiple participants in each of the three subgroups in the case study. This allowed themes to emerge from multiple sources and ensured the themes reflected the perspectives of a number of program participants from within and across the three subunits. The researcher also used member checking to validate the accuracy of the findings by sharing each employee’s interview transcript with the employee to determine if the transcripts accurately reflected the spoken
perspectives. Finally, the researcher provided thick and rich descriptions of participants’ perspectives to convey the study findings using the participant’s spoken language, and quotes to exemplify and support the themes and subthemes. This strategy was employed to support authenticity and trustworthiness of the themes and subthemes that emerged from the data.

Yin (2009) recommended several research procedures to ensure reliability and consistency of the methodological process. These procedures involve consistent documentation of the investigative procedures to ensure reliability of the results and support replication of the study in a different setting where similar conditions exist (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). The researcher practiced consistency in the documentation and coding process throughout the study by applying several strategies. First, the researcher developed case study procedures and protocol, and maintained a chain of evidence (Yin, 2009). The case study procedures and protocol documented the steps taken during the case study investigation. The researcher followed the protocol closely and maintained a journal to document actual steps followed throughout the process. Each step of the methodological process was documented in the journal to ensure consistency in both the data collection and coding processes, as well as implementation of the study protocol. The case study protocol included the interview questions and the procedures and rules followed when conducting the interviews (Yin, 2009). The researcher also maintained a code book that provided definitions of the codes used in the data coding process. This code book provided clarity in the meaning of the codes and assured consistent application of the codes throughout the coding process. The researcher used the code book during the interview transcript coding process to ensure consistency in
coding and support consistency during the constant comparison of data across all of the interviews. This strategy protected the researcher from drifting away from the definition of the codes and provided a process for reliable application of the codes during the coding process (Creswell, 2009).

The researcher used a database as the chain of evidence to follow “the derivation of any evidence from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions” (Yin, 2009, p. 122). This process ensured both validity of the findings by providing a pathway that led from the research questions to the findings and reliability of the process through detailed documentation. Finally, the researcher checked the transcripts of each interview closely to assure accuracy in the transcription of the interviews. S. J. Taylor and Bogdan (1998) recommended that researchers maintain a detailed journal during interviews to document the case study investigative process, record observer comments, record observed participant behavior and mannerisms, and make note of researcher hunches during the interview. Recording observations during the interview, as well as hunches or researcher observations after each interview, assisted in the process of checking the accuracy of transcribed interviews. A database was maintained of all data collected in the investigation to support authentication of findings. In addition, the database provided an audit trail to the Atlas Ti output files, interview transcripts, the case study code book, and the researcher journal (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009).

Confidentiality was maintained using a number of strategies. First, the researcher uses a fictitious name for the site and organization, and contrived identifiers, or pseudo names for the participants (Creswell, 2009). The researcher has the record of pseudo
names in a confidential journal stored in a locked storage cabinet at the researcher’s home. Only the researcher has access to this confidential information.

**Role of the Researcher**

The researcher was a senior level manager in a community college within the District where the study was conducted. This District is currently struggling with the loss of experienced managers as a result of the recent retirements of senior and mid-level managers at the colleges and within the region. The researcher was a vice president at this District for 3.5 years, and during this time she had to train a number of new and interim deans and faculty leaders each year, due to the continued retirements of experienced community college managers. Discussions with the other vice presidents of instruction and student services in the region identified a combined interest in a regional capacity-building program for mid-level managers of community colleges.

In the fall of 2011, the researcher initiated a regional Deans Academy to address the capacity building needs of the mid-level community college managers in the region. Prior to initiating the Deans Academy, the researcher conducted a needs assessment of the region to explore the interest in a regional capacity-building initiative for mid-level managers and to identify the most important topic areas to be included in the Academy. The needs assessment indicated that 75% of the respondents (presidents, vice presidents, deans, and associate deans) had been in their current positions for less than 5 years. Merriam (1998) noted, “The researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis” (p. 42). In this study, the researcher was admittedly biased in favor of leadership development GYO programs as a leadership development strategy at the college, district, and regional levels. However, this was an exploratory study and the
researcher was open to evidence that was contrary to this perspective (Yin, 2009). The researcher was interested in exploring the benefits and limitations of GYO programs and employed active listening to get first-hand experiences from the participants. To maintain objectivity throughout the process, the researcher asked peers in the doctoral program and her dissertation chair to check the researcher’s work by reviewing the emerging themes to ensure objectivity in the interpretation of the data. This peer examination of themes ensured that the findings accurately emerged from the data and were not influenced by the researcher bias.

Due to the position the researcher held at a community college within the region, the participants knew the researcher and the researcher knew the participants. The researcher only used data collected during the recorded interviews and the document review and did not add information to the data collection and analysis process based on prior knowledge or familiarity with participants. The researcher made efforts to protect against researcher bias relative to the value of GYO programs by strictly following the interview protocol during the data collection and coding process, using the participants’ words and expressions in any descriptions, and acknowledging and noting researcher biases and perceptions in the comments sections of the journal and during the coding and data analyses process. The researcher did not embellish on participants’ comments or fill any gaps in information with statements that were not made by the participants.

**Limitations**

The biggest limitation of this study was that only one GYO program within one community college district in the region was investigated. This limited the generalizability of findings to other community colleges and districts in other regions.
This study may be replicated in other districts that have GYO programs, but the findings may differ. The outcomes of this study are unique to the program content, design, employee backgrounds and experiences, and hiring practices of the SSCCD. Application of this GYO program model in districts or colleges with dissimilar hiring practices and employee backgrounds may generate different results. In addition, career advancement within the District or at other colleges may or may not be a direct result of participation in the program.

Out of the 57 employees who participated in the MLDA program, 22 volunteered to participate in this case study. The researcher selected a sample from these volunteers. It is unclear why these individuals volunteered to participate in the study, as the researcher did not ask this question. It is possible that those employees who volunteered to participate in the study were more self-directed or may have had stronger career advancement goals than those who did not volunteer to participate in the study.

The findings from this qualitative case study reflect the professional goals, motivation, and experiences of 13 individuals who participated in the interviews. Findings cannot be generalized to other settings, programs, or categories of participants. Comments were unique to the interviewees’ personal backgrounds and needs, as well as the opportunities for advancement that existed within this District, region, or community college industry at the time of the study.

The study was limited in time, and included follow-up data on program graduates only through the completion of the study, fall of 2012. Participants may advance in their careers after the conclusion of this study.
Another limitation of this study resulted from the state budget shortfall in California. Historically, vacancies resulting from manager retirements create career advancement opportunities for existing employees. However, due to the current budget crisis, some management vacancies have been held open and not filled. This situation could have impacted career advancement of GYO program participants at SSCCD, as the District may not fill all vacant management level positions until the budget climate improves.

The methodology also may have been limited by the existing relationships or level of familiarity between the researcher and the participants. This may have impacted participant comfort level with sharing personal information on career advancement behaviors with the researcher, who may have been perceived to be in a position of making recommendations on future hiring decisions at the researcher’s college. As noted earlier, the researcher attempted to mitigate this limitation by informing the participants that findings of this study were strictly limited to the stated purpose of the study.

Finally, the researcher attempted to mitigate limitations with the methodological process by providing the participants with the transcripts of the interviews to review for accuracy of their statements. None of the interviewees made any corrections to the transcripts.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a detailed account of the systematic process and the methodology used to conduct this case study. The research design of this qualitative case study was described and included a discussion of social constructivism as the theoretical framework guiding the investigation. The research design explained the research setting
and context of SSCCD, the sampling techniques for the three subgroups or cohorts within this case study, and the data collection strategies that were employed in this single case (embedded) study. The data coding techniques were described, as well as the steps taken by the researcher to assure trustworthiness and quality assurance of the process and findings. The chapter concluded with a description of the role of the researcher. It highlighted several unavoidable limitations of this research study and efforts to mitigate these limitations.
CHAPTER 4—RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the effectiveness of a community college leadership development program in preparing community college leaders for the 21st century. Focused on a grow your own (GYO) succession planning program at a multi-campus community college district in Southern California, this case study assessed the effectiveness of this program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behaviors among program participants in this particular community college district. The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders and two of Malcolm Knowles’ key assumptions of andragogy were used as theoretical frameworks to organize this case study.

Succession planning programs known as GYO programs have emerged since 2000 as one strategy used to recruit current employees interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline and to prepare them for advancement in their careers. As the first step in a leadership development continuum, GYO programs identify potential leaders and provide capacity building and organizational networking to stimulate interest in career advancement. One of the benefits of GYO programs is that the curriculum can be customized to meet the specific capacity-building needs of the organization and the individual participants. However, the literature does not address whether GYO programs are filling the leadership pipeline with qualified employees (Reille & Kezar, 2010). It is still unclear whether employees pursue leadership positions, continue to participate in professional development activities after completion of GYO programs, or alter their professional goals. There also is an absence of information on what motivates employees to participate in GYO programs. Minimal data have been collected on GYO participants’
backgrounds and their motivation to participate. Due to the relative newness of GYO programs, there is an absence of published data on career advancement among GYO program participants, and it is difficult to directly attribute career advancement to program participation.

**Document Analysis**

The researcher reviewed several Sea Side Community College District (SSCCD) program documents:

- Sea Side Community College District’s Professional Development Program Overview,
- a PowerPoint presentation made to the Board of Trustees in May 2010 on Leadership Development and Succession Planning in the District,
- the SSCCD Strategic Plan 2009-2012,
- reports about the Management Leadership Development Academy (MLDA) program evaluation results and cohort demographics, and
- the MLDA curriculum and workshop materials, and the printed graduation celebration program for the spring 2011 cohort.

A summary of the program documents in relation to the AACC Competencies and the two principles of andragogy observed in the review of these documents is provided in Table 8.

**The Professional Development Program Overview**

The Professional Development Program Overview is the business plan for the professional development program created by the District’s Human Resources Department. The Professional Development Program Overview is an informal document
### Table 8

**Summary of GYO Program Documents and Connections to AACC Competencies and Assumptions of Andragogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Organizational strategy</th>
<th>Resource management</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>C. C. advocacy</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Self-directedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Program Overview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint Presentation to the Board of Trustees in May 2010</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Side Community College District Strategic Plan 2009-2010</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation and Cohort Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLDA Program Curriculum and Workshop Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Celebration Program Spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that is eight pages in length. It is used by the Human Resources Department to communicate the District’s professional development program to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor’s Cabinet. The program overview describes the objectives of the program, provides background information on the program, identifies targeted participant groups and program stakeholders, and outlines the program components. The objective of the program was to prepare the next generation of leaders for the organization by providing employment orientation, performance management training, and leadership development Academies in support of succession planning. The MLDA Program is a component of the District’s Professional Development Program and its parts are described in the plan. The purpose of the MLDA Program is to train and prepare staff to seek promotional opportunities and fill future vacancies. This strategy of addressing leadership needs within the organization reflects the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Professionalism because the MLDA program was developed to ensure long term organizational health of the District by providing a professional development program to build the capacity of college and District personnel and fill future leadership vacancies (AACC, 2005).

**PowerPoint Presentation Made to the Board of Trustees in May 2010**

The PowerPoint presentation highlights the components of the District’s Employee Performance Development Plan, including the Program Overview and Plan for Professional Development. The presentation focuses on the need for succession planning, demonstrates how the program addressed this need, and communicates how this program addressed Goal Four of the District’s Strategic Plan 2009-2012, which is described below. In-house leadership development programs are typically tied to
organizational strategic plans, thereby engaging boards of trustees in support of the program (Jeandron, 2006). The presentation updates the SSCCD Board on the program implementation progress and components by highlighting the MLDA program and other internal professional development programs, shares demographic information on each cohort, and provides a sample of comments received from the program evaluations. The presentation also includes a plan to expand the program and include an Academy for classified staff in 2010-2011. This presentation reflects the District’s efforts to address AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy, Professionalism, Communication, and Collaboration by fostering organization-wide participation in the program and communicating program information and opportunity to participate in the Academy to internal and external audiences (AACC, 2005).

**Sea Side Community College District Strategic Plan 2009-2012**

The Sea Side Community College District Strategic Plan for 2009-2012 includes seven goals. The MLDA Program addresses Goal Four: “Enhance Professional Development for all staff.” The MLDA Program addresses the District goal of enhancing professional development for all staff by establishing a leadership development program in support of succession planning. Inclusion of professional development as one of the goals of the District’s Strategic Plan demonstrates an organizational commitment to preparing District personnel for leadership positions and communicates this message to internal and external constituents and stakeholders. This practice reflects the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Communication (AACC, 2005).
Reports on the MLDA Program Evaluation Results and Cohort Demographics

These reports are compiled for each of the three cohorts and provide information on participant demographics and program evaluation. The evaluation report provides customer satisfaction ratings for each workshop and an overall average of all workshops for each cohort. The evaluation focuses on participant satisfaction with the workshop content and the presenters. Participants rate the workshop and presenters separately using a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). No evidence of participant self-reflection of learning or evaluation of learning gains as a result of participation in the program is reported. This type of program evaluation is common to GYO programs (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010; Robinson et al., 2010). Most GYO programs collect information on customer satisfaction either at the end of each workshop or at the conclusion of the program, including feedback on program content, quality of presentation and experience, and topic interest level. Program evaluation data on the effectiveness of program pedagogy in supporting learning gains, and/or GYO program participant career advancement behavior is not collected (Reille & Kezar, 2010). At this time, the SSCCD’s GYO program coordinators are not tracking career advancement of program participants after completion of the program.

The MLDA reports on program evaluation and cohort demographics reflect the AACC Competency of Communication. The District uses these reports to communicate employee satisfaction with program components and delivery, as well as the characteristics of the program participants to internal and external audiences (AACC, 2005).
MLDA Program Curriculum and Workshop Materials

The workshop materials for the eight program modules and the 3-day intensive component, which provides an orientation to District departments and personnel, are accumulated in a single binder. Each workshop participant receives a binder. The program content and facilitators remained the same for all three cohorts. The first module begins with an orientation to the MLDA program and focuses on being an effective leader. The workshop includes a discussion of challenges faced by district managers, their changing roles and expectations, the skills needed to succeed, and the Clifton Strengths Finder assessment. Participants take the Clifton Strengths Finder assessment to identify their top five strengths from 34 possible talent themes. These dominant themes impact behavior and performance (Rath, 2007). The Strength Finder assessment was frequently mentioned during the interviews of program participants as being valuable and useful. Program participants were able to apply Knowles’ assumption of self-directed learning in this module by conducting a self-assessment of their own talents and then considering and discussing their own potential for strength development with program facilitators and colleagues in the cohort.

The second module focuses on an overview of the colleges within the District, application of the District’s core values, and team building within the District culture. The second module also provides tools to enhance engagement of employees in teams. This module fosters the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Collaboration by assuring alignment of the district’s mission, vision, and values, and developing employee capacity to enhance teamwork within the district (AACC, 2005).
The third module includes a presentation of shared governance by one of the college presidents, followed by a discussion of the Dominant Interact Steady Compliant (DISC) Communication Styles. As with the Strength Finder activity, this module fosters self-directedness in learning among the participants as they discover their personal communication styles and learn how to interact with others who have similar or different styles.

Module four provides an overview of the District’s Strategic Plan and tools for managers to use to: (a) conduct analysis of departmental strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats (SWOT); (b) create measurable goals; and (c) develop a balanced scorecard approach to goal setting. This module reflects the AACC Competency of Communication to internal and external audiences regarding departmental goals and performance measures (AACC, 2005).

Modules five, six, and seven focus on diversity in the workplace and employee performance management reflecting the AACC Competency of Resource Management (AACC, 2005). Participants receive tools for assessing employee performance, strategies for managing conflict, instructions on how to give constructive feedback and information on what motivates different generations of employees. These modules are interactive and include role playing, small group work, and coaching from the facilitators.

The eighth module concludes the program with a participant self-assessment of leadership competencies and an opportunity to create a professional development plan. This module includes coaching from the facilitators and other cohort members on how to create plans for career and professional development. Like the first and third modules, this final module provides opportunities for participants’ self-direction by planning future
career paths and identifying plans for continued professional development. Program participants were able to apply Knowles’ assumption of self-directed learning in this module by conducting a self-assessment of their leadership competencies and creating their own plans for career advancement.

In addition to the eight modules, the program includes a 3-day intensive component that provides an overview of the District departments and operations. Each section of this component includes a description of the department structure, roles and responsibilities of departmental leaders, and functions of the department within the District. The 3-day intensive component of the program assures participants develop an understanding of the organizational structure, relationships, and culture. This component provides an orientation to the District community and organizational culture reflecting the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Professionalism (AACC, 2005).

**The Graduation Celebration Program Spring 2011**

The printed graduation program celebrates the accomplishments of the cohort members by listing the names of the participants and identifying their positions within the District. The program also lists all of the modules that the cohort completed and highlights key topics within each module. The graduation program is a public acknowledgment of the employees’ completion of a leadership development program and provides organizational visibility for those employees who are interested in their own performance improvement and career advancement. The graduation program also acknowledges the contributions made by District departments other than Human Resources to the MLDA program. This practice reflects AACC Competency of
Collaboration by involving diverse District resources and personnel to work towards a common goal (AACC, 2005).

**Participant Interviews: Major Themes and Subthemes**

The GYO program serves multiple purposes. These purposes, as noted in the review of the program planning documents, include enhancing the District community of employees through a professional development program that builds capacity of the individual, while encouraging consideration of career advancement within the organization. Through the process of initial, focused, and axial coding of the interview transcripts, four major themes evolved. These themes include: building community, building capacity, the individual, and the program. Each one of these themes and its family of codes or subthemes, are described in this section. Table 9 demonstrates the themes and subthemes gleaned from analysis of the data.

There is overlap across several of the subthemes:

- The subtheme of succession planning (1.3 and 3.2) appears in the themes of building community (1) and the individual (3) as marked with a single asterisk in Table 9.
- The subtheme of connection to others (1.1) emerged in the theme of building community (1) and overlaps with the subtheme of growth of knowledge (2.1) in the theme of building capacity (2), the subtheme of self-discovery (3.1) in the individual theme (1), and value for participants (4.2) in the program theme (4). These overlapping subthemes are indicated with double asterisks in Table 9.
### Table 9

**Interview Themes and Subthemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Community</td>
<td>1.1 Connection to Others**&lt;br&gt;1.2 Organizational Loyalty&lt;br&gt;1.3 Succession Planning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Capacity</td>
<td>2.1 Growth of Knowledge**&lt;br&gt;2.2 Hands on Experience&lt;br&gt;2.3 Management Tools&lt;br&gt;2.4 Application of Learning&lt;br&gt;2.5 Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Individual</td>
<td>3.1 Self-Discovery**&lt;br&gt;3.2 Succession Planning*&lt;br&gt;3.3 Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Program</td>
<td>4.1 Content, Format, Facilitator, Coordination&lt;br&gt;4.2 Value for Participants**&lt;br&gt;4.3 Unmet Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* See explanation of asterisks in the previous two paragraphs.

Table 10 ranks the subthemes in order from the most number of comments received from interviewees to the least number of comments. A comparison of subtheme appearances by the categories of program cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, and years of employment in the District indicated the highest number of appearances in the subthemes of self-discovery, connection to others, growth, and program.

Tables 11 and 12 provide information on the average number of comments made by employees for each of the subthemes organized by the participant sample variables. The themes and their subthemes, as well as overlaps in subthemes and comparisons of appearances across subject variables, are described in detail following Tables 11 and 12.
### Table 10

**Subthemes Ranking by Number of Participant Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Major theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.1 Self-discovery</td>
<td>The Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1.1 Connection to others</td>
<td>Building Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.1 Growth of knowledge</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.1 Content, format, facilitators, coordinators</td>
<td>The Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.2 Organizational loyalty</td>
<td>Building Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.3 &amp; 3.2 Succession planning</td>
<td>Building Community and The Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.2 Hands on experience</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.3 Management tools</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.2 Value</td>
<td>The Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.4 Application of learning</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.5 Change</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3 Challenges</td>
<td>The Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3 Unmet expectations</td>
<td>The Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Average Number of Participant Comments for Subthemes by Sample Variables (Cohorts, Job Classification, and Years in District)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes and subthemes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cohorts (#)</th>
<th>Classification (#)</th>
<th>Years in district (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One (6)</td>
<td>Two (4)</td>
<td>Three (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Connection to others</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Organizational loyalty</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Succession planning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Growth</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Hands on experience</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Management tools</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Application of learning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Succession planning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Challenges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Content, format</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Value</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Unmet expectation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Average Number of Participant Comments for Subthemes by Sample Variables (Gender, Age, Education, and Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes and subthemes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender(#)</th>
<th>Age(#)</th>
<th>Education(%)</th>
<th>Ethnicity(#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males (4)</td>
<td>Females (9)</td>
<td>Under 50 (7)</td>
<td>Over 50 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Connection to others</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Organizational loyalty</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Succession planning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Growth</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Hands on experience</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Management tools</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Application of learning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Self-discovery</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Succession planning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Challenges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Content, format</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Value</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Unmet expectation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Theme 1: Building Community

Participation in the program created a sense of belonging to and contributing to the larger organization or community. Each of the three cohorts was comprised of participants from diverse areas and job classifications within the District. For example, each cohort had participants from all three of the campuses and various noncredit sites as well as the District offices. There were managers, classified supervisors, and supervisors with faculty standing who were program directors (faculty supervisors) in each cohort. This diversity in each group provided valuable networking opportunities that fostered learning about the roles and challenges of others. However, this same diversity created limitations in the specificity of the program content. For example, the managers wanted to learn about employee disciplinary strategies specific to shared governance and union environments, but the focus of the program content was on general strategies for managing conflict and having difficult conversations with employees. Subthemes that emerged within this theme include connecting to others (1.1), organizational loyalty (1.2), and succession planning (1.3). Figure 1 illustrates the theme and subthemes, along with the frequency in which codes appeared within each subtheme.

Subtheme 1.1: Connecting to others. This subtheme includes connections made by the participants to other participants within the cohort and District. These connections were made through networking with other members of the cohort, District employees who presented course material, interactions with the program facilitators, and the actual learning from other cohort members and district representatives. Participants noted that strong networking and experiences interacting with colleagues supported working together collaboratively within the organization to improve performance of their jobs.
This subtheme appeared across all subject variables (program cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, educational level, and years of employment in the District) and ranked as the second out of 13 most frequently noted subthemes by all participants during the interviews, as depicted in Table 10. Participants who had the most years of experience in the District, over 20, commented on this subtheme on average 25 times, which was more than they commented on any other subtheme. A comparison of comments made about connection to others across participant variables indicate a higher average number of the comments made by:

- females in comparison to males, 16.78 compared to 14.75;
- employees who were over the age of 50 compared to those who were under 50 years of age, 17.5 compared to 15;
participants in the first and second cohorts compared to the third cohort, 17 and 16.25 compared to 14.33, respectively;

- employees who had doctorate and master’s degrees compared to employees with other degrees (bachelor and associate), 19 and 16.5 compared to 10.5, respectively;

- Black and Caucasian employees compared to Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 20.5 and 16.89 compared to 7 and 10, respectively; and

- employees with more than 20 years of experience in the District compared to employees with less than 10 years of experience, and employees with 10 to 20 years of experience, 25 compared to 12.8 and 14.2, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about connection to others within the variable of participant job classification.

Grant said, “When we worked on problem solving together, it was interesting to see areas where we overlapped and yet, we’re all very different. The approaches that they took or we took, and also, it was a very—I want to say kind of a bonding experience.”

Trish shared her perspective on connections she made with others in the program: “I think that was the jewel of the program, is that you met other people similarly situated in their own professional development. They are kind of hungry to learn something different.”

Collaboration is the AACC Competency that calls for cooperative and beneficial internal and external relationships and partnerships that support organizational sustainability and student success (AACC, 2005). Through these internal connections with other District personnel, employees noted that they learned how the District and other sites and departments operate, established trusting relationships with others in the
cohort, and increased their own visibility within the organization. Karen learned more about the organizational culture and found opportunity to introduce change in the culture through her interaction with one of the District presenters. She had the opportunity to ask about the genesis of a business practice and discovered that it was internally developed and not required by the California Education Code or Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. Karen commented:

> I mean I never really got to know [executive administrator] very well, but his breakout on budget was very transparent and I felt very comfortable asking questions that I had never had answered before in the 20 plus years I had been here, about why things are a certain way, what are these rules for? And at one point he said, well, I set that up because that is what I think it should be. And I said, oh. So it is not Ed Code, it is not a policy. He goes, no, I just don’t think people should spend more than $200 of their own money to go get blah, blah, blah. And I was like, yeah, well it was like that 20 years ago. You know, I was able to have this conversation with, you know, somebody who I don’t have access to, so that’s what made it good.

Sabine explained the value that connecting to others had in helping her to perform in her job. She explained:

> As much as the information in general was important, getting to know deans and supervisors and folks from other areas on campus, not just on campus, that in all my years . . . I hadn’t seen because they were tucked away somewhere . . . that connection became important . . . for example, I have had to ask deans in another
site for permission to use their facilities, and I knew exactly who to e-mail, and having known that person made that a lot easier.

A couple of the interviewees commented on how participation in the program increased employee visibility through connections made with District personnel during the workshop sessions. Connecting to others, while learning about the organization, gave several of the participants the sense of getting to know employees in higher positions and the opportunity to increase their own professional visibility within the organization. Scarlet provided insight on how she viewed participation in the program and connecting to others as an avenue for increasing her visibility within the organization:

The program is presented as you participate in this program, and then there’s wonderful advancement opportunities for you. And I’m actually not certain that that’s the case within the . . . District. I’m hoping it is. . . . I’m hoping that participation in this program and, of course, my own work, that folks can see, touch, and feel will be enough for me to advance in the future.

Rachel added a comment about visibility of the program participants within the District “having the chancellor come in was helpful. It was good—and I thought it was good to see that she was interested in the group that was going through there.”

By networking with senior administrators, one of the classified supervisors, Yasmine, shared that she was encouraged about her own ability to advance in her career within the organization. She asserted:

You have a three-day intensive training where you have people come from all over the district and give you an overview of what the district—the roles that they play within the district. And you listen to people who have moved up the ranks.
And . . . you listen to people who were promoted through the district. It gives—it gave me a great sense of encouragement, a great sense of, you know, we can, I can do this. I have the potential to do this, this is a great encouragement. For me, it was encouraging to see people that went through the ranks.

As noted previously, the subtheme of connection to others overlaps with other subthemes in each of the major themes. This overlap is described further in the subthemes of growth of knowledge (2.1), self-discovery (3.1), and value for participants (4.2) in the other three major themes.

**Subtheme 1.2: Organizational loyalty.** This subtheme includes employee contributions to the mission of the organization, college or department; understanding organizational structural relationships; and servicing other units (department, colleges, and District offices) within the District. Organizational loyalty encompasses comments made by the interviewees about how participation in the GYO program fostered their ability to serve the organization and support achievement of the organizational mission and goals. Carl noted his reasons for participation in the MLDA program were to “support the needs of the wider institution . . . to gain some more tools to manage and supervise and lead my employees in meeting my office’s mission.” David said he decided to participate to “support excellence, and innovation, and arts and other, you know, language education, and to support institutional influence, and therefore, to do that, I want to be as excellent as I can be.” Yasmine explained that she participated in the MLDA program to “contribute to the district’s mission, vision, and goals and objectives.”
Participation in the program, especially the 3-day intensive component, provided employees with a better understanding of the organization’s structural relationships. Trish noted:

It was just kind of interesting to see the interplay between the District and college people. It was like in corporations, the nerve center versus the places where you do business, the daily front line people. That was interesting, even the personalities within it.

Organizational loyalty ranked fifth out of 13 when compared to the other subthemes in the number of comments made by participants and was consistently mentioned by participants across all the variables regardless of cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, or years of employment in the District. A comparison of code occurrences for this subtheme provided in Tables 12 and 13 (see p. 180) indicate a higher average number of the comments made by:

- males in comparison to females, 11.25 compared to 5.33;
- employees who were under the age of 50 compared to those who were over 50 years of age, 9.43 compared to 4.50;
- participants in the second cohort compared to the first and third cohorts, 10.5 compared to 6 and 5, respectively;
- managers compared to classified supervisors and faculty supervisors, 8.14 compared to 6.25 and 5.5 respectively;
- employees who had bachelor and associate degrees compared to employees with doctorate and master’s degrees, 14.00 compared to 6.00 and 5.88, respectively; and
• participants who had less than 10 years of experience in the District compared to employees with 10 to 20 years of experience and employees with more than 20 years of experience in the District, 10.0 compared to 5 and 6, respectively.

There was no variation noted in the average number of comments made about organizational loyalty in comparison of participant ethnicity.

Organizational loyalty reflects the AACC Competency of Organizational Strategy, which includes all aspects of strategic management to achieve the organizational mission and goals (AACC, 2005). Comments made by participants in this subtheme reflect their interest in contributing to achievement of the departmental, college, and district mission and goals.

**Subtheme 1.3: Succession planning.** The succession planning subtheme encompasses comments made by employees on the observed value of the program in bringing leaders up through the ranks, and providing organizational visibility. This subtheme ranked sixth out of 13 when compared to the other subthemes in the number of comments made by participants. It was consistently mentioned by participants across all the variables regardless of cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, or years of employment in the District. The comparison of average comments made by participants about succession planning indicate that there were a higher number of appearances of succession planning related comments made by:

• participants from the first cohort compared to the second and third cohorts, 7.67 compared to 5.5 and 5, respectively;

• employees with doctorate degrees compared to employees with master’s and other degrees, 9 compared to 6 and 4, respectively; and
• Black employees compared to Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 9 compared to 6.44, 5.0, and 2, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about succession planning in comparison of participant gender, job classification, years of employment in the District, and age category.

David shared his observation on the value of the program: “I appreciate being in an institution that wants to—is looking to, you know, bring leaders up through the ranks, and so that was valuable and that says a lot of good things about an institution.” Grant and Trish both spoke about how the MLDA program demonstrated the organization’s commitment to succession planning. Grant commented:

We can learn all kinds of new techniques and things like that; but if those aren’t going to be supported outside of the training itself, then they are going to wither. The very fact that the District has made a commitment to succession planning and a commitment to leadership, implies kind of a higher standard of functioning and more of a creative approach to problem solving.

Trish affirmed Grant’s observations by saying “that is what the program does. It kind of reminds the institution that we are supposed to make this commitment to succession planning or to the managers. Anything like that I think is important.”

Susan commented on how being selected by her president to participate in the program indicated confidence in her ability to advance in her career within the District. She noted the value of learning about the career advancement pathway within the District and explained:
There was discussion about what would be the hierarchy . . . I think the thought was that I would be a potential candidate for future or higher positions so to teach me what that was, and I didn’t understand what that was, so that has helped immensely.

Succession planning reflects the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Resource Management because it is a professional development strategy that the District is using to prepare personnel within the organization (AACC, 2005). The Professional Development Program Overview clearly states the objective of the program is to prepare the next generation of leaders in support of succession planning. Program participants noted their appreciation of the opportunity to benefit from a program that fosters capacity building and career advancement, while learning about the organization’s mission, vision, and structural relationships.

**Major Theme 2: Building Capacity**

This theme reflects comments made about building the capacity of the program participants, as well as the organization. Participants noted growth and development in their understanding of District operations, as well as learning or enhancing existing management skills and techniques. Some participants noted that they gained a better understanding of the diverse departments within the District and the issues that confront them. Jason explained:

I learned that the issues that we faced within my department are not all that different from other departments within the District. . . . I learned that I needed to be a little more sympathetic to the needs of different departments within the District.
Several of the classified supervisors noted that they learned about management tools for dealing with employee issues and conflict and appreciated having the opportunity to practice techniques through hands-on-role-playing exercises during the workshops. A few of the managers mentioned that they found it difficult to apply the techniques discussed in the workshops within the shared governance and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) union environment of the District. They suggested customizing the program to more accurately reflect strategies that could be used in a shared governance and collective bargaining work environment. These suggestions are addressed further in the description of the program theme. A number of subthemes are included in this major theme: growth of knowledge (2.1), hands on experiences (2.2), management tools (2.3), application of learning (2.4), and change (2.4). Figure 2 illustrates the theme and subthemes, along with the frequency in which codes appeared within each subtheme.

**Subtheme 2.1: Growth of knowledge.** This subtheme includes growth of knowledge by learning about organizational functions and structures, learning from others, and understanding the District and how people work together. A comparison of subtheme appearances by the variables of program cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, and years of employment in the District indicate the highest number of appearances in the subtheme of growth of knowledge (2.1), the third highest ranked subtheme, after self-discovery (3.1) and connection to others (1.1). The growth of knowledge subtheme was consistently mentioned by participants across all categories. The comparison of the average number of comments made about growth of
knowledge by participant categories indicate that a higher number of appearances of growth-related comments were made by:

- participants from the second cohort in comparison to the first and third cohorts, 18.25 compared to 15.7 and 13.33, respectively;
- classified supervisors and managers compared to faculty supervisors, 16.25 and 16.14 compared to 13.00, respectively;
- participants with less than 10 years of experience in the District, and those employees with over 20 years of experience compared to employees with 10 to 20 years of experience, 17.8 and 17.33 compared to 12.6, respectively;
- females compared to males, 16.44 compared to 14; and
There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about growth of knowledge in comparison of participant age and educational level.

Interviewees noted learning about themselves and others, the District structure and operations, and how to manage conflict and deal with employee issues. Several participants noted quite a bit of learning about themselves and how they have changed in comparison to their previous career personas. Rachel came to the district from a career in the military. She noted:

I have reflected on a couple of things. I have looked back and seen that I don’t give people enough of an opportunity to answer things before I start to try to throw my opinion in there, so I’m trying to learn to sit back and instead of giving somebody an answer saying, well, what do you think we should do? If you were me, how would you handle this? And I think that is one of the biggest changes in the way that I manage now from the program.

Suzie had a career in the private sector prior to her employment in the District, and like Rachel she found value in learning about herself in the DISC communication styles workshop. Suzie explained:

The DISC model was also very helpful because again it reinforced, I’m one of those split personalities both in left brain, right brain concepts, but also in dealing with people and processes, and I’m strong in both those areas. . . . but one of them is the major driver and for me it is just my natural inclination just to get the task
done, get the work done and I have had to learn over the years . . . to remember to let people talk.

Other program participants discussed how they learned from interactions with others in the cohort and from the District leaders. Learning from others overlaps with subtheme 1.1 connection to others described earlier in theme 1, building community. Karen explained that she learned through interactions with facilitators, peers, and district presenters. She shared:

I got it because other people were there. It was the peer interaction type stuff.

And I think if you talk to a lot of people, at least that were in my cohort, because we all kind of had this same agreement, that it really opened up an opportunity for us to get to know other people, like-minded manager types that we could call if we needed to, that weren’t even on our campus, that, you know, had an insight or something that was valuable that, you know, you could pick their brains on.

Susan, who was new to community colleges, also explained the value of learning about the District through interactions with others:

That was helpful to me because, again, I was lucky to have learned some of that being in those groups, but I was brand new to community college, so this helped fill in some of the voids that I hadn’t fully understood.

Carl shared his thoughts on learning from others in the cohort: “I also learned from my coworkers about some management skills when they discussed about their experiences and how they handle different situations. Their insights really benefitted me.”

Other participants interviewed appreciated learning about the District structure and relationships from the District executives and managers who presented information.
about their departments, personnel, and functions during the 3-day intensive component of the program. David commented:

There was the stuff specific to the District, we got training on district policies and procedures and things like that, and so it was those little things also. I picked up a variety of things to do whether student services . . . I was able to query them which I wasn’t before, you know, I was able to, where I didn’t understand the rationale of something, or whatever, that I was able to ask the person in charge of that area, drill down into it more so that was useful.

Anne also spoke about learning from the 3-day intensive component. She shared:

I gained some understanding, and some of the nuances of the District that I had no clue about. . . . And if you recall, there were different folks who came in and talked about their departments and what have you and what they do and all that great stuff. So I did learn something in that respect.

Yasmine reflected on her growth as a result of participation in the MLDA noting, “I grew in the sense of having the ability to interpret the policies, procedures, to know more about all the policies and procedures, to be able to do that.” Jason added insight on how learning about the issues that other departments face has changed the way he interacts with others in the District. He said:

I learned that the issues that we faced within my department are not all that different from other departments within the District, but about myself what I learned is that I need to go into every interaction with other leaders understanding that their department and the concerns that they have . . . are similar to mine. . . .
learned that I needed to be a little more sympathetic to the needs of different departments within the district.

Comments made by participants in this subtheme reflect their growth in learning about themselves, the organization, and changes in how they interact with others as a result of participation in the program. Growth of organizational knowledge, management skills, and knowledge of self reflect the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Communication (AACC, 2005). This GYO program develops an organizational environment that supports teamwork and successful organizational outcomes. Through interactions with other employees in the District, program participants develop an understanding of the organizational culture, structure, and relationships, as well as their own role within the organization.

**Subtheme 2.2: Hands-on experiences.** This subtheme includes coaching, job shadowing, and mentoring. The subtheme of hands-on experiences ranked seventh out of 13 when compared to other subthemes in the number of comments made by interviewees. The comparison of the average number of comments made about hands on experiences by participant categories indicate that there were a higher number of appearances of related comments made by:

- females compared to males, 7.11 compared to 4;
- participants from the second cohort in comparison to the first and third cohorts, 13 compared to 3.50 and 2.33;
- faculty supervisors and classified supervisors compared to managers, 12.5 and 7.5 compared to 3.57;
• participants with more than 20 years of experience in the District, and those employees with between 10 and 20 years of experience compared to employees with less than 10 years of experience, 9.33 and 7.8 compared to 2.6;

• participants who were under 50 years of age compared to employees who were over 50 years of age, 9.29 compared to 2.5;

• employees with doctorate degrees compared to those employees with master’s and other degrees, 11 compared to 5.25 and 2.5, respectively; and

• Black employees compared to Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 16.5 compared to 5, 1, and 1, respectively.

At the time of the interviews, only the coaching component existed in the MLDA program. Several of the employees commented on the value of receiving coaching from the facilitators during the workshops and outside of the workshops. However, the majority of the comments made were about the need to add mentoring and job shadowing to the program. The program developers were in the process of implementing a mentoring component scheduled for launch in the fall of 2012. The literature on GYO programs indicates that while program coordinators plan to include a mentoring component in the program, this is usually the last part of the program to be implemented due to the difficulty of identifying mentors and coordinating the activity (Jeandron, 2006).

The coaching component is provided by the program facilitators. David discussed his appreciation of the opportunity for coaching. He said:

I found the coaching, it was helpful because when you find yourself in those situations and they can be very emotional, very acrimonious and you need to be cool as a cucumber. You need to keep your cool and that’s hard to do if you
haven’t had practice. Usually I think you kind of learn that stuff the hard way if you haven’t been trained in the field that specifically gives you training on that. So I think that the coaching was helpful.

Anne also benefitted from coaching. She explained:

One of the things at the time that I was dealing with was a new transition to an acting position . . . and was meeting resistance from one individual at that time. And interestingly enough, once the training was over, I actually got to continue to have dialogue with one of the trainers regarding how to negotiate some of that. That was really helpful.

Yasmine, Anne, Jason, and Grant spoke about the need to add mentoring and job shadowing to the program. Yasmine said,

I would have liked to have had the opportunity to be mentored by one of our managers, mentored by a dean to get a hands-on experience that I was seeking, actually, in an effort to serve the District in a high level or capacity.

Anne noted, “So in my mind, if you’re creating a leadership program, for succession, then you would have some opportunities, in my opinion, to mentor, to be mentored, by those people who were, perhaps deans, vice presidents, vice chancellors, etc.” Jason promoted the idea of job shadowing of leaders in other departments. He shared:

I think it would be effective for people participating in the program to maybe shadow a leader with another program or with another department within the District. So, for example, maybe have somebody shadow the vice president for a day or shadow the chief and just kind of gain an understanding of what they do.
Jason invited members of his cohort to shadow him. One person took advantage of the offer. Grant also spoke of the need to add job shadowing to the program. He explained:

I have also been coming to the conclusion that we should spend a lot more time doing job shadowing. We do it informally in the sense that some people are encouraged to take on interim positions, and there has been more opportunity for that with turnover. . . . But I think that we should really—if I was asked to where we should take our training next, that would be one of the directions that I would recommend because I don’t think you can appreciate what it is really like for the people in the other roles until you have had to do it.

Hands-on experiences provide opportunities to grow through structured and supportive relationships with individuals in senior positions. Hands-on experiences reflect implementation of a strategy to address the AACC Competency of Professionalism by providing the opportunity for continued self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection through relationships that provide regular feedback and professional guidance (AACC, 2005). But this approach is not evident in the MLDA program based on participant feedback.

**Subtheme 2.3: Management tools.** This subtheme includes tools and strategies for managing conflict and dealing with employee issues. The workshop curriculum had three modules dedicated to managing human resources and dealing with employee issues. This subtheme was consistently mentioned by participants across all variables, but ranked eighth out of 13 when compared to all other subthemes in the number of comments made by interviewees. The comparison of the average number of comments made about
management tools by participant variables indicates that there were a higher number of appearances of related comments made by:

- females compared to males, 4.44 compared to 2.25;
- participants from the second cohort in comparison to the first and third cohorts, 5 compared to 4 and 1.67, respectively;
- employees with doctorate degrees compared to those employees with master’s and other degrees, 5.67 compared to 3.63 and 1.5, respectively; and
- Black employees compared to Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 5 compared to 4.11, 1, and 1, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the comparison of average number of responses among those participants across the age categories, years of experience in the District, and job classification.

The overall comments made were that the management tools were generic in nature and could not be applied in a shared governance and union environment. Susan shared:

I guess I was a little disappointed that . . . Again we were the first ones, I understood what they were saying because I had seen that in the past, but I also knew what wasn’t applicable in the community college. So that was the part of that that was disappointing, that in a couple cases they used some examples that didn’t tie to what could occur at the community college.

David’s comments about the program content confirmed Susan’s concerns. He noted that the content
didn’t deal very much with the shared governance issue. And some of the generic management training, that was very good, and they were good facilitators, and they knew their stuff, but some of those general rules really don’t apply in the shared governance environment, and that is a real special beast of its own and it requires its own special training.

In contrast, Rachel commented on how she was able to use tools she learned in the program. She asserted: “I was able to actually take the things that I was learning and apply it in my job, which was huge.” Yasmine also found value in the management tools she learned and practiced in the program. She commented:

I feel that the best experience in the MLDA for this particular matter came in the form of the mini module role playing that we had. In particular, conflict resolution, where I learned the benefit of candid conversations, where my employees would gain a greater perspective of their role and how they can contribute to the success, overall success, of the department. So, that was critical for me.

Sabine added that she has applied lessons learned in the workshops. She shared, “I did use a lot of the conflict resolution things that I learned, and I do so on a daily basis.”

Because of the diversity of the cohort, some of the participants interviewed found the management tools useful, while others wanted tools that were less management generic and could be applied in a shared governance and union environment. The tools that employees noted as most valuable were learning how to deal with conflict and having difficult conversations with others.
This program builds the capacity of employees to implement performance management strategies and tools. By providing conflict resolution and performance management tools to participants in the program the District is addressing the AACC Competency of Resource Management in the implementation of a human resources management system that includes performance management and professional development (AACC, 2005).

**Subtheme 2.4: Application of learning.** This subtheme includes opportunities for practicing learning in the MLDA Program workshops through role playing and small group work, and application of techniques and lessons learned to the workplace. Application of learning was consistently mentioned by participants across all categories, but ranked tenth out of 13 when compared to all other subthemes in the number of comments made by interviewees. Application of learning appeared more frequently in the average number of comments made by:

- participants from the first cohort in comparison to the second and third cohorts, 4.5 compared to 2 and 1.33, respectively;
- managers compared to classified supervisors and faculty supervisors, 3.86 compared to 1.5 and 3, respectively;
- participants with 10 to 20 years of experience compared to employees with less than 10 years of experience in the District, and those employees with over 20 years of experience, 5 compared to 2.2 and 1, respectively;
- employees with doctorate degrees compared to employees with master’s and other degrees, 7 compared to 2 and 1, respectively; and
• Black employees compared to Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 6.5 compared to 2.56, 2, and 1, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about application of learning in comparison of employee age categories and gender.

Not all interviewees were comfortable with the role playing experience, but those who were appreciated having the opportunity to practice in a safe environment. Rachel noted:

They would have one of us be the employee and one of us be the manager and practice that way . . . there was no right or wrong answer, but how could you have handled it differently? How could you have done better?

Grant appreciated the opportunity to practice techniques in a safe environment. He explained:

There was an overall agreement that what was presented during the training was not to be shared outside. So, we were free to speak our minds and our experiences without concern about reprisal from management for example. And so we were able to take problems that different—I mean, we took turns offering problems and then getting other people’s input into how to resolve the problem. What they would do similarly, what they would do differently. And, that was productive.

In contrast to comments from Rachel and Grant, Jason reflected on his preference for learning in the workshop environment:

The group activity was not effective for me simply because I had already been through a similar format. The workshops, you know, I think the open discussion was the best part for me was just being able to have open mind of communication
with the other students in the class, and with the moderator and the instructors I think is the most helpful for me because I can hear it from somebody else.

Rachel appreciated the opportunity to bring real work situations into the workshop and get input and feedback. She shared:

It allowed you to bring in actual situations and then get input from the other people that you worked with. I thought that was very helpful too because with so many different styles of leadership, it gave you some other perspectives on how something could be handled more effectively.

Sabine, on the other hand, had difficulty applying the strategies that were practiced in the workshop in the work environment. Sabine noted:

I think it is really easy to go and sit in a workshop and say, okay, this is the mistake managers make, you should do it this way, and then actually practicing this way when it doesn’t feel right to practice what they tell you to practice. I think some of the things that we learned was you’re not your subordinate’s friend, you’re their boss, you have to set certain expectations and stick to those expectations. And essentially, if they don’t do what you expect them to do, then you follow a certain path. . . . I have found it very difficult to go down the prescribed human resources or management, employment/management tracks that were outlined in those things.

Some of the participants benefitted from and appreciated the opportunity to practice and apply learning through role play exercises in the safe environment provided within the workshops. Other interviewees commented that workshop exercises were not conducive to their learning; they preferred group discussion. This finding may reflect the
diversity of learning styles. Some participants prefer learning through discussion rather than small group work, and others benefit from hands-on practice in a safe environment. A few of the interviewees discussed difficulty they experienced, applying the workshop strategies in the workplace. Comments about the workshop format and content are highlighted further in the discussion of theme 4, the program.

The SSCCD GYO program attempts to build the capacity of employees to deal with difficult situations and conversations by providing a role-playing component within the workshops and practice in the workplace. This approach reflects the AACC Competency of Resource Management by facilitating development of skills in managing conflict in a manner that contributes to the long-term viability of the organization (AACC, 2005).

**Subtheme 2.5: Change.** This subtheme includes change in how one interacts with others in the performance of his or her work, career goals, or career plans as a result of participation in the program. Change was consistently mentioned by participants across all variables, but was ranked eleventh out of 13 when compared to all other subthemes in the number of comments received from interviewees. Comments about change appeared more frequently in the average number of comments made by:

- participants from the first cohort in comparison to the second and third cohorts, 4 compared to 2.25 and .67, respectively;
- managers compared to classified supervisors and faculty supervisors, 4.29 compared to .75 and 1, respectively; and
- Caucasian and Black employees compared to Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 3.22 and 3 compared to 0 and 0, respectively.
There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about change in comparison of employee gender, age category, years of experience in the District, and education level.

Several participants noted changes in the way they interact with others as a result of the program. Some interviewees benefitted and changed from learning through the role play exercises, others changed as a result of interactions and feedback received from peers in the cohort. Karen noted, “My people skills kind of changed because, like I said, I have more of an authoritative-type background based on where I come from, so I think I listened. Once I finished it, I found my listening skills were better.” Suzie, who had a career in the private sector prior to employment in the District, commented on how she has changed in the way she interacts with others and involves them in projects rather than just completing the task at hand. Like Karen, Suzie commented, “In dealing with people and processes. . . . I take that extra step to get involved with them as a person, not just getting the work done.”

Susan, who also had a career in the private sector prior to employment at the District, shared how she has changed in the way she reacts to situations:

There is another dean here who is very sweet and knew that I got excited about things, so she would sit next to me and she would pat my hand. And when she would pat my hand I knew that was to, calm down, take a deep breath. And it helped immensely, so she doesn’t have to do that now. I calm myself. But it was really, it is just the right approach.

Participants commented on how learning about other departments helped them to understand the differences and commonalities across the District. This resulted in
changes in the way they interact with others. As noted previously, Jason shared, “I changed in my interaction with the faculty and staff.” Grant commented on how participation in the MLDA program changed his attitude and perspective of the District, and how he treats others. He noted, “I felt renewed after that training. I was more excited again. I felt more positive about the District. I was humbled in some ways; really learned to respect some of my peers even more than I did before.”

Most of the comments on change were related to how the employees changed in their understating of others and how they interacted with others. This finding reflects personal growth and self-discovery (3.1), which are discussed further in theme 3, the individual. Changes that occur as a result of participation in the MLDA program exemplify professional growth for employees who develop an understanding of others and an appreciation of how interactions impact others. This reflects the AACC Competencies of Professionalism, Communication, and Organizational Strategy (AACC, 2005).

**Major Theme 3: The Individual**

Participation in the GYO program was a very personal experience for the interviewees. They shared quite a bit of information about personal and professional backgrounds and careers, as well as assessments of their own strengths and career goals. The MLDA program provided a valuable orientation to the organizational culture, policies and procedures, and structural relationships for those who were new to community colleges. Participants noted that they learned about themselves and their roles within the organization relative to others.
The subthemes that emerged within this theme include self-discovery (3.1), succession planning (3.2), and challenges (3.3). The subtheme of self-discovery (3.1) includes participant personal goals and interests, affirmation and reinforcement of knowledge, confidence in self, encouragement of ability and goals, opportunity for career advancement, and success in performance of the current job. The subtheme of succession planning (3.2) reflects comments made from the individual employee’s perspective about career advancement behaviors, rather than the organizational perspective, as was described in the succession planning subtheme (1.3) earlier in theme 1, building community. Succession planning (3.2) includes the participants’ awareness of opportunities for advancement, the value of participation in the GYO program, and career advancement behaviors. The challenges (3.3) that these employees faced include unmet expectations of the program, difficulty accepting or applying the tools and content learned in the program, and MLDA program scheduling. Figure 3 illustrates the major theme and subthemes, along with the frequency in which codes appeared within each subtheme.

**Subtheme 3.1: Self-discovery.** Participants commented on learning about themselves, their strengths, communication styles, roles within the District, and shared their professional goals, interests, and choices. As noted previously, self-discovery had the greatest number of comments in the interviews across all participant variables, with the exception of employees who were in the District for more than 20 years. There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about self-discovery in the comparison of cohorts, gender, age category, job classification, and years of employment in the District. Comments related to self-discovery appeared more frequently from:
participants with doctorate and master’s degrees compared to other degrees, 24.33 and 20.5 compared to 18.5, respectively; and

• Black and Caucasian employees compared to Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 29 and 20.89 compared to 14 and 14, respectively.

Participants commented on learning about themselves and their roles within the District through their interactions and connections with others in the cohort and the District. Several of these interactions were described earlier and reflect the overlap in subthemes of connecting to others (1.1) and growth of knowledge (2.1) described in theme 1, building community, and theme 2, building capacity.

Trish shared what she learned and gained from participation in the MLDA program:
You gained a better understanding of where you are as far as your competence levels, relative to others in the District. . . . I would say the growth is to understand that you do not make people happy all the time. In management you do not do that. You do not have a person to call when things get rough. You are the person who gets called. I learned tools on how to not personalize decisions that I make.

Others noted gaining affirmation of their knowledge and reinforcement of what they knew and their ability to advance in their careers. Scarlet said:

   It was number one, a great refresher of a lot of the topics that I had already studied. . . . But I think generally overall it was just the program was an affirmation that on a professional level I do want to advance, and I believe that I have the skills and techniques that would allow me to function in an administrative position within the district.

Yasmine was encouraged by the District executives who presented at the 3-day intensive session about her own ability to advance in her career within the organization. She commented:

   You listen to people who were promoted through the District. It gives—it gave me a great sense of encouragement, a great sense of, you know, we can, I can do this. I have the potential to do this, this is a great encouragement.

Rachel also was encouraged to pursue her career goals after participation in the program. She explained:
I felt like I got a better feel for that . . . . I had such a better understanding, so I think—it focused it a little bit more and it made me a little more confident that I could accomplish those goals over time.

Sabine shared her sentiments about what she learned about herself and her strengths, “gaining a lot of confidence in knowing what my strengths are and actually affirming those strengths was important.” Carl discussed learning about his personality type and turning his strengths into assets when performing his job. When asked the question about what he learned through participation in the MLDA program, he responded:

My personality type! I knew that I was relatively introverted and umm . . . . But it doesn’t mean that one cannot be a leader. It takes training and experience to become a leader, so turning my strengths into assets. After all, I learned that there were different types of effective leaders, so they all don’t come from a single mold. I was happy about the diversity in the program, so I get the chance to work with different folks and learn about myself in the process in terms of relationship [work] dynamics.

Both Rachel and Suzie discussed learning about their communication styles and tempering their strong styles to more effectively communicate with others. Rachel reflected on her communication style and background and how she has grown:

I tend to be pretty quick to respond to things. I tend to make pretty fast decisions because of the environment that I was in, and sometimes you make a decision without stopping to find all the facts and I think that has helped me as well with this, to take that second to step back and ask more questions to see, do I actually know what the situation is?
Suzie discussed learning about her communication style through the DISC workshop and explained how she was using what she learned in her interactions with others. She explained:

I’m strong . . . and I know that . . . and it is mistakes made but also constant reminders, even like little sticky notes to remember to let people talk or make sure I take that extra step to get involved with them as a person. . . . So yeah, it was a great reminder for that but also knowing that, hey, we are all different, we all have things to bring to the table, but the more you know about yourself, the more you know how those can be leveraged rather than be a negative.

Karen commented on her career and what her plans are for the future. She shared:

I know that a lot of people go through this with the idea that they are moving, you know, in that direction, whereas for me, I’m like a 10-year person and I have really loved this opportunity. I mean I couldn’t have been luckier to land the job that I landed. I’m a 10-year type of person, so I will start getting that itch in another 6 years and who knows what is gonna be going on in 6 years.

Participation in the MLDA program was a very personal experience for every person interviewed. During the interviews, employees had the opportunity to reflect and share insights on their learning and growth during and after participation the MLDA. This subtheme reflects the AACC Competency of Professionalism because it affords employees the opportunity to self-assess on their own performance and their career options and identify areas of strength and growth (AACC, 2005).
**Subtheme 3.2: Succession planning.** As noted previously, succession planning as a subtheme of theme 3, the individual, overlaps with theme 1, building community, because it is presented from two perspectives, the organization and the individual. The discussion in subtheme 3.2 emphasizes comments made about the perception of opportunities for advancement, the value of participation in the GYO program in preparation for career advancement, and the actual career advancement behaviors of applying for jobs, participating in additional training and professional development, and being hired in new positions that represent career advancement. Succession planning in themes 1 and 3 ranked sixth out of 13 when compared to the other subthemes in the number of comments made by participants, and was consistently mentioned by participants across all participant variables regardless of cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, or years of employment in the District. The comparison of average comments made by participants about succession planning indicates that there were a higher number of appearances of career advancement and succession planning related comments made by:

- participants from the first cohort compared to the second and third cohorts, 7.67 compared to 5.5 and 5, respectively;
- employees with doctorate degrees compared to employees with master’s and other degrees, 9 compared to 6 and 4, respectively; and
- Black employees compared to Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 9 compared to 6.44, 5.0, and 2, respectively.
There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about succession planning by participant gender, job classification, years of employment at the District, and age category.

Trish, a dean who was recently hired in an interim vice president’s position within the District, reflected on her own career advancement behaviors: “It is my mother’s adage. Closed mouths do not get fed. If you do not go for it, you are never going to get it.” This is how she described her job seeking behaviors, noting that if she does not apply for new opportunities then there is no chance that she will advance. Scarlet, a faculty supervisor who is interested in career advancement to a dean’s position, explained her perspective on the opportunities created by the District’s openness to promote candidates from within the organization. She stated, “I’m thankful that the District recognizes that we do have folks within that could become leaders or could be future leaders, and that it just makes sense to grow, you know, to grow our own.”

Other program participants have demonstrated career advancement behaviors by participating in additional professional development programs. Both Rachel and Carl have enrolled in doctoral programs after completion of the MLDA. Carl shared:

I enjoyed learning in the program immensely. So much that I decided to apply for the Ed.D. program while in the program. I did have an inkling that the Ed.D. program is something I would be very interested in. The MLDA gave me the impetus to move forward and apply for the Ed.D. program.

Sabine applied for two management positions and was hired in a permanent management position after participating in the MLDA. Sabine has moved in positions from a faculty member to a manager and expressed a willingness to advance further in her
career. She shared that she has moved from “faculty to dean. And I’m willing to jump into a higher position than a dean.” Trish applied for two vice president positions, was offered both of them and accepted one. Suzie was promoted to a director’s position after completion of the MLDA Program. A few of the managers, one of the classified supervisors, and both faculty supervisors have applied for jobs that would reflect career advancement after they completed the MLDA program.

Most of the participants have continued their professional development by attending workshops, professional training, and assuming a greater leadership role within their departments. Only Carl directly credits his participation in the MLDA as contributing to his career advancement behavior.

Succession planning reflects the AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy and Resource Management because it is a professional development strategy that the District is using to grow personnel within the organization (AACC, 2005). Program participants noted appreciation of the opportunity to benefit from a program that fosters capacity building and career advancement within the District.

Subtheme 3.3: Challenges. Participants discussed challenges they experienced with program format and content delivery strategies. This subtheme was consistently mentioned by participants across all categories except for the classified supervisors, who did not mention any challenges with the program content, delivery, or implementation of strategies discussed in workshops. This subtheme ranked 12 out of 13 subthemes in the number of comments made by participants. The comparison of average comments made by participants about challenges indicates that there were a higher number of appearances of challenge-related comments made by:
• participants from the first cohort compared to the second and third cohorts, 3.17 compared to .25 and .67, respectively;

• managers compared to classified supervisors and faculty supervisors, 2.86 compared to 0 and 1, respectively;

• employees with doctorate degrees compared to employees with masters and other degrees, 3.33 compared to 1.38 and .5, respectively;

• employees who had been in the District less than 10 years and between 10 to 20 years compared to those employees who had been in the District more than 20 years, 2.2 and 2 compared to .33, respectively; and

• Caucasian employees compared to Black, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 2.33, .5, 0, and 0, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about challenges with the program for the variables of participant gender and age category.

Several of the managers, including Susan, Sabine, and David reported challenges with applying the content of the workshops in a community college environment. Susan discussed the applicability of the content in a community college environment. She explained:

Hopefully, they went back and saw what we are teaching is not applicable here, just a way that they said you could handle the discipline and we can’t—that is not how we deal. We are not allowed to do that. We can’t reprimand, we can’t do this.
This concern was noted previously with regards to the generic nature of the program content in the subtheme of management tools. Sabine shared her struggles with attempting to apply program strategies:

I find some of the employee/management types of stuff difficult to use. It doesn’t fit my personality. You know, absences by subordinates and just talking to them about excessive absences, how to do things differently, et cetera. Again, I think it is really easy to go and sit in a workshop and say, okay, this is the mistake managers make, you should do it this way, and then actually practicing this way when it doesn’t feel right to practice what they tell you to practice.

Carl, Trish, Karen, and Sabine mentioned difficulty with the program format and scheduling and found that the 3-day intensive session required too much time away from work. Trish shared:

I felt like the 3 or 4 days away from the office were like, I do not have 3 or 4 days away from the office. It just does not work like that. The program was not in line with the population that it was working with; managers cannot be away from desks for 3 or 4 days in my experience.

Sabine recommended breaking the 3-day intensive session up a bit. Comments about challenges with program format are described in a later section under the subtheme of program content and format. Challenges were anecdotal comments made about difficulties with the program and therefore do not reflect any of the AACC Competencies. They do, however, reflect the absence of participant involvement in program planning, which is discussed later in the program format subtheme.
Major Theme 4: The Program

This major theme emerged from the feedback that employees gave in response to questions about how the program content contributed to their knowledge about community college leadership, as well as the effectiveness of the program format in facilitating their learning. While this study is not a program evaluation, the researcher has included this theme to describe the role of the program in facilitating the experience of the employees who participated in the program. The subthemes that emerged within this theme include feedback on program content, format, facilitators and coordinators (4.1); value for the participants (4.2); and unmet expectations of the participants (4.3). Figure 4 illustrates the major theme and subthemes, along with the frequency in which codes appeared within each subtheme.

Figure 4. Theme: the program with code frequency within subthemes.
Subtheme 4.1: Content, format, facilitators, and coordinators. A comparison of subtheme appearances by the variables of program cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, and years of employment in the District indicated that this subtheme (4.1) appears fourth most frequently within each participant variable after self-discovery (3.1), connection to others (1.1), and growth of knowledge (2.1). The comparison of average comments made by participants about subtheme 4.1 indicates that there were a higher number of appearances of comments made by:

- employees with master’s degrees compared to employees with doctorate degrees and other degrees, 15.75 compared to 14.67 and 11, respectively; and
- employees who had been in the District more than 20 years compared to those employees who had been in the District less than 10 years, and between 10 to 20 years, 20.67 compared to 13.8 and 12.2, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about the program for the participant variables of cohort, gender, age category, job classification, and ethnicity.

Comments were made about the program workshop format including balance between lecture and small group work, as well as the scheduling patterns of the workshop and 3-day intensive session. The program format of including group exercises and role-playing exercises were valuable for Carl, Grant, and Yasmine. Carl shared his perspective on the program format and expertise of the facilitators: “The workshop presenters are experts in their own areas, and I like that they utilize small group formats instead of a long presentation type workshop.” Grant admitted to being uncomfortable in role play situations but found the experience to be valuable. He shared:
I really believe that you have to have experience exercises . . . it was one thing to hear about different departments and what they are doing and what they are responsible for and that sort of thing. It is another thing altogether to find yourself thrust in a role play trying to do a labor relations problem. I don’t find those kinds of exercises to be very comfortable. . . . I think they are powerful learning tools. . . . You need as many dimensions as possible in the learning experience, so being able to see people take action, talk, listen—very powerful.

Yasmine commented that the role-playing modules were the best experiences she had in the MLDA program. She explained:

I feel that the best experience in the MLDA for this particular matter came in the form of the mini module role playing that we had. In particular, conflict resolution, where I learned the benefit of candid conversations, where my employees would gain a greater perspective of their role and how they can contribute to the success, overall success, of the department. So that was critical for me.

Managers joined the classified supervisors in preferring the group discussion and small group activity to the PowerPoint lectures. David, like Grant, did not enjoy role-play exercises but found the experience valuable when combined with coaching. He commented:

I kind of hate role plays, but sometimes they were useful and especially because sometimes we just find ourselves as managers in this environment, in some of the oddest and most difficult situations and you need to be transparent, but you also can’t necessarily—you have to be very thoughtful and diplomatic, and I think that
was already a strength of mine, but I think that it allowed me to further refine, you
know, through some of those role plays and some of that coaching.

Several participants noted that they did not enjoy being “talked at” in the lectures
and the 3-day intensive session. Participants preferred more interaction and deeper
discussion of topics and content. Sabine reflected, “The ones that were hard were the
ones that we got talked at a great deal where it was just a PowerPoint or someone
talking.” She added comments about the 3-day intensive session:

I distinctly remember one day where we had a parade of people from the District,
one after another, and it was an all-day thing. And everybody was from the
District office. And I remember half way through that I had a big headache
because it was just one thing after another. . . . It was just one presentation after
another from a parade of people from the District, and I remember that being the
hardest day.

Anne made a digging motion during her interview to indicate her interest in having
deeper content discussions that were less about delivery of surface information and more
about issues and implications. She shared the following comment about the level of
discussion during the workshops: “So it’s almost as if it’s got strong bones. Now put
some meat on it.”

As noted previously, David, Susan, and Sabine expressed concern that some of
the content on disciplinary procedures was not relevant to community colleges; however,
learning about the SSCCD was valuable for all participants. Susan explained:

I think for me in particular having not been at the District before, it was just an
eye opener. It just helped solidify, formulate for me, finalize, community college,
structure, whatever, versus what I have been used to before, getting a whole
picture in one combined spot. I think a lot of it was better grasping the rules about
how budgets are determined at community college overall and the different
campuses. . . . They lost my attention some, unfortunately, when I saw that they
said you can’t do that, and they kept going on. Should I be listening to something
I can’t use?

The program structure did not foster a great amount of independent learning.
Resources were identified by the program facilitators and coordinators for participants
who wished to do additional reading. Only a couple of the classified supervisors and one
of the faculty supervisors saw this as advantageous. Both Suzie and Scarlet mentioned
the resources that were provided or identified prior to the topics being presented. Suzie
shared:

I think one of the things I found helpful was the resources that were provided, so
whatever topic it was, there was additional resources or ideas to explore, and I am
one of those people that will go and explore. One of the things I found especially
helpful were some of the library book references, and I took it upon myself to
purchase a few of the books.

Scarlet also appreciated having access to additional resources and receiving the materials
ahead of time. She noted:

Just receiving the materials ahead of time or one of the facilitators just kind of, I
think it must be part of her style, she would have further references for us that she
would mention or, you know, if this is a topic that would interest you, you could
look at this book or that book. And, in fact, even the office that supports the
Academy, they would bring several books, they have like a lending library and then they had a much larger list of books that you could check out from them. Grant commented that he has used the references since participation in the program. He said, “Yeah, we were provided with materials that are good references. Now that I am not in it anymore, I can refer back to it.” He was one of many who complimented the coordinators on the work they did coordinating the program: “I really like the coordinators’ attitudes about the training. I think the Human Resources Department has done a nice job with the resources that they have. I think the District is starting to reap the benefits.”

Interviewees made program-related comments in response to questions about the program meeting their expectations and the effectiveness of the program format in facilitating learning. These comments do not reflect any of the AACC Competencies but do indicate the absence of adult learning theory in the design of the program learning experiences. This is explained further in the response to the research question on the Knowles’ assumptions of andragogy.

**Subtheme 4.2: Value for the participants.** The interviewees indicated the value of participation in the program included networking with other colleagues from other District locations and learning about the big picture of the District operations and budget. Value for participants ranked ninth out of 13 in comparison with other subthemes in the number of comments made by participants, and was consistently mentioned by participants across all participant variables regardless of cohort, gender, ethnicity, age category, job classification, education level, or years of employment in the District. The comparison of average comments made by participants about the value of the program for
participants indicates that there were a higher number of appearances of value comments made by:

- participants from the first cohort compared to the second and third cohorts, 4.83 compared to 3 and 1.33, respectively;
- managers compared to classified supervisors and faculty supervisors, 4.86 compared to 2 and 1.5, respectively;
- employees who had been in the District less than 10 years, and between 10 to 20 years compared to those employees who had been in the District more than 20 years, 4.2 and 4.2 compared to 1, respectively; and
- Hispanic employees compared to Caucasian, Black, and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 6 compared to 3.78, 2.5, and 0, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about the value of the program based on participant gender, age category, and education level.

The value of networking with other participants reflects the overlap with connection to others (1.1), growth of knowledge (2.1), and self-discovery (3.1). While most of the managers who had master’s and doctorate degrees said that the material was not new to them, David said he “appreciated the opportunity to buff up skills and refine knowledge of the District.” Karen and Sabine had been faculty members prior to assuming management level responsibilities. They appreciated learning about their own strengths and how to “temper” or “soften” their forceful nature of handling situations. Karen shared, “I have more of an authoritative-type background based on where I come from, so I think I listened. Once I finished it I found my listening skills were better. I listen more. I don’t interrupt as much.”
Susan and Rachel, who came from the private sector and the military prior to being hired as managers in the District, appreciated learning about shared decision-making in contrast to the “top-down” decision making they were used to. Most of the subjects stated that the peer interaction during the group activity helped them to learn about themselves and identify areas where they needed to improve in their interactions with others. Rachel described how she benefitted from the group activity and peer interaction and feedback during the role playing exercises: “That was huge for me to actually be able to do it in a safe environment where you could get responses back.”

Classified supervisors and faculty supervisors who participated in the program appreciated the orientation to the District, as well as the program content on how to serve as a leader within the District. They indicated that the format was conducive to learning the material and were thankful to have the opportunity to participate with managers in the District. Yasmine said that participation in the Academy gave her the confidence to pursue her goal of becoming a dean in the District. She saw how other participants who were deans had reached this level and reported that she had similar qualifications.

Carl, Grant, and Jason stated that they have developed a better understanding of what is going on at other District locations and have added details to their knowledge about the District. Both Grant and Jason mentioned relationships they developed and how these new relationships have helped them initiate projects or do their jobs better. Jason shared this information about a connection he made with another member of his cohort:

He and I work parallel to each other quite frequently. Having spent time with him in MLDA, I now understand what he does, he understands what I do, and we also
gained a friendship out of it. Well, because of that we have been able to bounce things off of each other to prevent problems from happening before they do, and it has been an invaluable resource for me because I have been able to call him and say, I have got this issue.

Jason also said that he is better-rounded in his current position. He grew in the area of developing a better understanding of what other employees and other departments struggle with. He reflected, “So from the Academy, from the leadership academy what I got, again, a better understanding of the District, which will make me a more well-rounded leader.” Jason has changed in his interaction with faculty and staff because he has a better understanding of their challenges. This change came about through the contacts and relationships he built with other participants in the Academy. Both Carl and Grant stated that they used tools learned in the Academy to help them handle difficult employees and situations.

Participant comments on the value of networking and learning about the big picture of the District demonstrate the AACC Competencies of Collaboration and Organizational Strategy (AACC, 2005). The MLDA program helps the organization build networks and partnerships among employees across the various campuses and departments to advance the organizational mission. This program supports development of teams and teamwork, while building capacity of the employees within the District.

**Subtheme 4.3: Unmet expectations of the participants.** Participants shared comments about unmet expectations and made recommendations for program improvement in response to the question on whether the program met their expectations. This subtheme had the fewest comments of the 13 subthemes. Employee comments
related to unmet expectations were consistently mentioned by participants across all variables, except for the employees who had bachelors or associate degrees, who did not mention any unmet expectations. The comparison of average number of comments made by participants about unmet expectations indicates that there were a higher number of comments made by:

- participants from the first cohort compared to the second and third cohorts, 2.17 compared to 1.25 and .33, respectively;
- faculty supervisors and managers compared to classified supervisors, 2 and 1.86 compared to .5, respectively;
- employees with doctorate degrees and master’s degrees compared to employees with other degrees, 2.33 and 1.5 compared to 0, respectively;
- employees who had been in the District less than 10 years, and between 10 to 20 years compared to those employees who had been in the District more than 20 years, 2 and 1.4 compared to .67, respectively; and
- Black and Caucasian employees compared to Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islander employees, 3 and 1.44 compared to 0 and 0, respectively.

There was minimal variation noted in the average number of comments made about the value of the program for participants by age category and gender.

The level of expectation varied among the participants. Anne noted, “In terms of what my expectations were, they were just that some table would be spread in front of us and we would have something to learn and to, you know, gain from this experience.” Others who were new to the District or to community colleges had expectations of
learning about how community colleges operate. Susan shared what that she expected to learn about:

The structure, expectations, culture, how they handle situations. Coming from more a private sector, I knew it was different and needed to know for my own perspective more guidance on how it was different and how to, you know, handle myself in certain situations that would be handled differently than you would handle in a business setting.

As described previously in the comments made about the program content and format (subtheme 4.1), Susan, David, and Sabine noted concerns and unmet expectations in the management curriculum because it was generic in nature and at times did not apply to the community college environment of shared governance and collective bargaining agreements. Susan acknowledged that the program met her need to learn about the community college environment but fell short with specific management tools that could be applied in a shared governance and collective bargaining environment. The absence of useable content for the managers was described earlier in the program content subtheme (4.1). Specifically, managers commented that the faculty and staff evaluation and discipline strategies could not be applied in the District setting. Several of the managers noted that they raised this as a concern during the workshops but that it was not modified or addressed by the facilitators. Recommendations were made to find internal personnel who are expert in the Education Code, Title 5, and the collective bargaining agreements to cover employee related topics and workshops.

There was strong disappointment expressed by Anne and Yasmine at the absence of a mentoring component to help guide them through the application of the program
material, as well as provide guidance on career advancement opportunities. Anne explained, “If you’re creating a leadership program, for succession, then you would have some opportunities, in my opinion, to be mentored by those people who were, perhaps deans, vice presidents, vice chancellors, etc., what have you.” Yasmine added, “I would have liked to have had the opportunity to be mentored by one of our managers, mentored by a dean to get a hands-on experience that I was seeking, actually, in an effort to serve the District in a high level or capacity.”

Trish and Grant discussed the need to provide training on interviewing techniques and job search preparation, in addition to the creation of a professional development plan to support career advancement efforts after program completion. Trish said:

We need to teach people how to interview. I know that 5 years ago, I had someone who came into my life who was really good at interviewing. They really helped me re-tool how I interview. I completely would have done it a different way.

Grant said that he has seen people who have the skills and background who need help developing interviewing skills to get the next level job. He commented:

I have been on several interviews, several hiring committees, and I see the same mistakes over and over again. People that are internal feel like you already know what they do, so they don’t practice and they don’t articulate well what they are able to do.

Other suggestions for program improvement from Jason and Grant included adding job shadowing and spending more time doing problem solving and role playing, including assigning participants projects to work on outside of the workshops, with
products or outcomes reported to the group. These practices would facilitate learning outside of the workshops.

Participant comments on unmet expectations and recommendations for program improvement indicate an interest in more experiential learning opportunities and community college-specific curriculum. Similar to the comments on program format and content, addressing the unmet expectations of mentoring and specific content focus do not reflect any of the AACC Competencies but do indicate the absence of adult learning theory in the design of the program learning experiences. Prospective participants were not involved in the design of the program or the development of the curriculum, which indicates an absence of adult learning theory in the program. This absence is discussed further in the response to the research question on Knowles’ assumptions of andragogy.

**Research Question Findings (RQ 1-RQ 6)**

This case study addressed six research questions. The responses to these questions were obtained through a combination of qualitative strategies including participant interviews and document analysis.

**RQ 1—GYO Program Participant Characteristics and Backgrounds**

The Sea Side Community College District’s MLDA program is designed to provide training for current and new managers in the District, experienced supervisors, and faculty in coordinator positions who have a professional goal of advancement to higher level management positions. The MLDA program was initiated in the 2009-2010 academic year, with the first cohort of participants starting in fall 2009, the second cohort starting in spring 2010, and the third cohort starting in spring 2011. The first cohort of participants was selected by the campus presidents and included new managers,
employees who were new to the District/campus, and employees identified by the
presidents as having an interest in and potential for career advancement. The second and
third cohorts were all self-selected. The three cohorts received only the workshop
component of the program. Experiential learning opportunities of mentoring and career
path counseling are still under development, with a plan for implementation in the fall of
2012.

The SSCCD GYO program has served 64 employees as of the date of this study. A total of 30
individuals participated in the first GYO Academy, 17 participated in the second Academy,
and 17 participated in the third Academy. The characteristics of the participants within each
of the three cohorts varied because of the selection process and interest levels of the
participants in the program. The program coordinators did not collect educational
background information on the first cohort. Therefore, this information is not available
for comparison. A review of the demographic information of the three cohorts reflects a
larger percentage of females and managers in the first two cohorts, and a larger
percentage of males and classified supervisors in the third cohort. The ethnicity
distribution also reflects an increase in the representation of Caucasians in the
second and third cohorts when compared to the first cohort. Table 13 provides
demographic information on MLDA participants, as collected by the coordinators of the
Sea Side Community College District’s MLDA program.

**RQ 2—Reason for Participation in the GYO Program**

All of the program participants in the first cohort were nominated or selected by their
presidents or supervisors. This was the first cohort of a new program, and each of the
District sites was given an allotment of seats in the program. When asked why they
Table 13

**MLDA Cohort Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Classification (%)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age (%)</th>
<th>Ethnicity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Managers (63)</td>
<td>Male (33)</td>
<td>30-39 (7)</td>
<td>Caucasian (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>Supervisors (37)</td>
<td>Female (67)</td>
<td>40-49 (47)</td>
<td>Hispanic (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 (37)</td>
<td>African American (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-69 (10)</td>
<td>Filipino (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Managers (53)</td>
<td>Male (41)</td>
<td>30-39 (18)</td>
<td>Caucasian (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td>Supervisors (47)</td>
<td>Female (59)</td>
<td>40-49 (41)</td>
<td>Hispanic (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 (41)</td>
<td>African American (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-69 (0)</td>
<td>Asian (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Managers (40)</td>
<td>Male (53)</td>
<td>30-39 (18)</td>
<td>Caucasian (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td>Supervisors (60)</td>
<td>Female (47)</td>
<td>40-49 (41)</td>
<td>Hispanic (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 (41)</td>
<td>African American (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-69 (0)</td>
<td>Asian (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* In some instances, the percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Participated, the employees from the first cohort stated that their president or supervisor asked them if they would participate and they agreed. In contrast, the participants in the second and third cohorts learned about the program through word of mouth from the first cohort and through an email invitation that was circulated from the District Human Resources Department. Participants indicated that they responded to the invitation because they typically take advantage of professional development opportunities. Most participants noted that they participated to gain a better understanding of the District and its operations, improve their skills and management abilities, or increase their visibility and opportunity for advancement within the district.
When asked why they participated in the MLDA program, Susan, Sabine, Trish, and Carl wanted to learn more about the District structure, culture, and processes. Susan shared that her reasons for participating in the program were “to learn more about the District, the philosophy, the process, structure, expectations, culture, and how they handle situations.” Sabine added that her interest in participation was “to learn about the District, how the District and community colleges operate, get to know other people in the District, put a face to a name to get the job done faster.” Carl offered the following reflection on why he participated in MLDA, saying that he “wanted to learn more about the District as well as leadership. I expected to gain more tools to manage and supervise and lead my employees in meeting my office’s mission.”

Other participants reported an interest in improving or refining their management skills and acquiring management tools. Trish asserted her reasons for participation were “to learn more about the functions of the college and District, how to be a better manager and get some tools to be effective in my new position.” David explained his interest in participation was “to refine my skills and knowledge, deeper understanding of all the generic management stuff, also Title 5, AFT contract, and District policies.” Rachel commented, “I was looking to try to improve the way that I lead. I was looking for some better skills, not just with leadership wise, but with discipline for employees. It was just going to help me get better.”

Those who participated to increase their own visibility within the District expressed an interest in career advancement and viewed this program as providing opportunities to get a better understanding of the District, build their own management skills, and make connections with colleagues that would increase visibility within the
organization. Rachel, Yasmine, Anne, and Scarlet expressed an interest in career advancement. Scarlet shared the following comment: “I’m hoping that participation in this program and, of course, my own work that folks can see, touch, and feel will be enough for me to advance in the future.”

RQ 3—Professional Goals of Program Participants

The professional goals of the program participants were similar to their reasons for participation in the MLDA program. Several of the managers and two of the three classified supervisors did not have any intentions of career advancement when they entered the MLDA program, while others participated as part of a career advancement plan. The two faculty supervisors, one of the classified supervisors, and two of the managers, did have career advancement goals when they entered the program. Some of the individuals noted that participation in the program affirmed their career advancement plans, while others noted a change in career goals but could not attribute the change to participation in the program.

Karen noted her career goals upon entering the MLDA program were “to just be a dean—my goal was to learn enough or more about how I’m supposed to do my job well.” She noted that after participation, “I see myself as a super support person. I’m a 10-year person. I have 6 more years in this position. Then we will see what happens.” David commented that he had no interest in career advancement upon entering the program and that his goal has not changed. Rachel, who is interested in career advancement, noted that her career goals were affirmed through participation in the program. She explained her sentiments after completion of the program: “I don’t know if they changed. It made me confident that I could move to the traditional side of the house. The next step is vice
Similar to Rachel, Yasmine noted her career goals after completion did not change, and that she was encouraged to pursue her goals. She shared: "No change, participation solidified my goal and encouraged me . . . to go for it."

Several respondents noted that their career goals did change after program participation. Carl commented, "My career goals changed—to becoming a director or vice president in the District or perhaps other colleges." Sabine shared that her interest in career advancement has changed but noted that it was as a result of a combination of participation in the program and experiences she has had since program completion. She explained, "Since then, moving on and taking on a more challenging job would be all right. I’m willing to jump to a higher position than dean." Trish’s career goal has changed from being a good dean, upon program entry, to pursuing a vice president’s position, and she attributes this change to encouragement she has received from others during the program and since program completion.

Those who entered the program with goals of career advancement received affirmation and encouragement to pursue their goals, while some of those who did not have career advancement goals were more open to the idea after program completion and work experiences that followed the program. The comments received from those who did change their career goals noted that they attributed the change to a number of factors, not just program participation.

RQ 4—Postprogram Career Advancement Behaviors of GYO Program Participants

Three of the four classified supervisors stated their experiences in the MLDA program facilitated their career advancement behavior and saw this as a valuable succession planning strategy. One of the classified supervisors has been promoted to
manager since participation in the program. Other GYO program participants have
applied for various positions that represent career advancement within the District but
were not successful in being hired. Carl applied for acceptance into an Ed.D. program in
Community College Leadership while participating in the Academy. He has not applied
for any other jobs since participation in the program as he is very busy in the doctoral
program. Grant said that he felt renewed after the training and was excited about his job
and the District. He reiterated that the program is a valuable succession planning strategy
because some of the participants have already started moving up. He shared, “I think the
District is starting to reap the benefits. Some of those people have already moved up into
higher positions. So, I think it is something we should continue to do.” Carl has not
advanced in his career but has advanced his ideas and leadership role in the District after
participation in the MLDA program. Specifically, he has assumed a leadership position
in his labor organization and has taken on high level projects in the District. Yasmine
said that participation in the Academy gave her the confidence to pursue her goal of
becoming a dean in the District. She saw how other participants who were deans had
reached this level and felt that she had similar qualifications.

The majority of the managers in the program were new to their positions when
they participated in the program. They saw this program as an orientation to the District
and an opportunity to network and develop relationships across the District. Several
participants stated that these relationships have helped them to do a better job in their
current positions. All of the managers have continued professional development by
attending short-term workshops and conferences sponsored by professional associations
involved in community college leadership development. Only three of the seven
managers interviewed had an interest in career advancement at some point in their careers. One of these managers has been promoted from a dean to an interim vice president’s position, and another manager was promoted from an interim assignment to a permanent dean since participation in the program. The other manager started a doctoral program and has applied for other positions but had not advanced at the time of this study.

Both of the faculty supervisors expressed an interest in career advancement and have applied for dean positions since participating in the program. They have yet to secure a new position but remain optimistic in their ability to perform at a management level as a result of the affirmation they received from program participation and networking with colleagues in the program.

The employees who had an interest in career advancement have pursued these interests through participation in professional seminars, attendance at conferences, and active job seeking efforts. A few employees have secured career advancement positions, while others continue applying and interviewing for interim and permanent positions. Table 14 provides information on career advancement behavior of participants by job classification.

RQ 5—AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders

The analysis of program documents indicated that five of the six AACC Competencies of Organizational Strategy, Professionalism, Collaboration, Communication, and Resource Management were evident in the program planning materials and curriculum. The Competency of Community College Advocacy was not observed in any of the program documents. Table 8 (see p. 116) summarizes the
Table 14

Career Advancement Behavior by Job Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Career advancement professional development</th>
<th>Career advancement education (Ed.D.)</th>
<th>Career advancement job applications</th>
<th>Career advancement new job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Supervisors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

observations of the AACC Competencies in the documents. Reille and Kezar (2010) found weak emphasis of Community College Advocacy among GYO programs. They noted that while this competency area requires a focus on external representation of the college’s mission and role, GYO programs are typically designed to address internal organizational culture and decision making strategies.

The Competency of Organizational Strategy was observed in the program overview, the PowerPoint presentation to the Board of Trustees, the District Strategic Plan for 2009-2012, and the program curriculum. The program was developed to ensure long-term organizational health of the District by preparing personnel for advancement within the District and fostering an understanding of the organization’s mission, structures, and resources. The presence of the Organizational Strategy Competency was confirmed during the interviews. Suzie commented that she gained an “understanding of where the driving forces of our business comes from, and in this case it is from the students and everything else kind of revolves around that.” Scarlet noted her reason for
participation was to “get a better understanding of the District . . . to add to the success at the college or the college mission.” Carl had a similar comment: “I expected to gain some more tools to manage and supervise and lead my employees in meeting my office’s mission.”

The program curriculum, PowerPoint presentation to the Board, and the printed graduation program, provide evidence of the Competency of Collaboration through organization wide participation in a team-based professional development effort. The comments on collaboration from the participants reflect the appreciation of the District-wide networking opportunity provided in the program. David commented, “It’s advantageous to the institution to get wide cross-sections of us together and develop mutual understanding.” Karen acknowledged one of the benefits of her participation in the program was that “there are people who have gone through the program that have been valuable for me moving into this position.” Sabine furthered: “The connection with folks on other campuses is important—I knew exactly who to contact for use of their facilities. Making the personal connection helped the most.”

The Competency of Professionalism appears in the program documents, the PowerPoint presentation to the Board, and the curriculum. The program overview includes the stated purpose of the MLDA program “to provide a professional development program to grow college and district personnel and fill future leadership vacancies.” Program participants acknowledged growth in their skills as managers. David shared, “I can always improve in my area, that’s why I value these kinds of opportunities.” Sabine added, “Knowing and affirming my strengths and knowing my weaknesses are important.” Grant described how he has applied management strategies
learned in the program: “I have learned things about employee supervisor/subordinate
relations and applied them during the labor relations issues that I had to deal with. . . .
Dealing with people is probably the most challenging aspect of my job, I think.”

The Competency of Resource Management was addressed in the MLDA program
curriculum in the workshops that provided tools for employee performance management
and the overview of the District budgeting process in the 3-day intensive session. David
shared a lesson he learned about resource management: “You should spend 20% of your
time reinforcing strong people and giving positive feedback.” Yasmine shared the
following comment about her growth in resource management as a result of program
participation, stating that she “learned the benefit of candid conversations where my
employees would gain a greater perspective of their role and how they can contribute to
success of the department.”

The Competency of Communication was addressed through the PowerPoint
presentation to the Board, the District Strategic Plan of 2009-2012, the program
evaluation results and cohort demographic reports, and the program curriculum. Several
of the participants noted learning gains in communication as a result of their program
participation. Rachel shared the following comment on her learning growth: “I’m trying
to sit back and listen, instead of giving somebody an answer or giving my opinion. This
has helped me to step back and ask questions to see if I actually know what the situation
is.”

There was evidence of five out of the six AACC Competencies in the document
review and the interviews with program participants. As noted previously, the only
competency not addressed was Community College Advocacy, confirming findings from the literature review that this area is the least covered in GYO program curricula.

**RQ 6—Knowles’ Andragogical Assumptions**

There was little evidence of adult learning theory being implemented in the Sea Side Community College District’s MLDA program. Specifically, Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of self-directedness in learning and use of participants’ prior experiences were not incorporated into the program design, format, or curriculum. In self-directed learning, the learner has some level of control over the planning and management of learning experience (Garrison, 1992). Self-directed learning involves learners taking responsibility for their own learning and pursuing their learning goals with a sense of purpose, assuring what they learn has meaning, and is applied in practical settings. The absence of adult learning theory in GYO programs is a common criticism of these succession planning programs in the literature (Reille & Kezar, 2010).

Most GYO programs do include a self-assessment and career plan development component that provides participants with the opportunity to self-assess and create professional development plans that build on their past experiences and identify areas of professional development growth. However, few of these programs utilize instructional methodologies that incorporate participant experiences. Program planners may make decisions about program format based on convenience rather than adult learning theory (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

The MLDA program was designed by the Human Resources Department without involvement of potential participants in planning the curriculum or program format. This practice explains the feedback received from some of the participants: a need to
customize the management curriculum, which is generic in nature, to include strategies that can be applied in a shared governance and union environment; and the need for a mentorship component to foster career advancement and experiential learning. As in other GYO programs described in the literature, the MLDA program does not include participant self-assessment in five out of the eight modules (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). The modules that did use participant self-assessment included communication style, strengths, and leadership competencies. However, the workshop format does not foster much self-directed or independent learning.

None of the interviewees indicated the program structure fostered independent learning. The curriculum modules and format were pre-established by the program coordinators. The workshops included a combination of lecture and small group work; not all participants were comfortable with these types of small group exercises or role playing. Written resources for the workshops were identified by the facilitators and made available to the participants in a library that the program coordinators created for participants wishing to do additional reading. Only a couple of the classified supervisors and one of the faculty supervisors used the additional printed resources.

Although the program curriculum did not reflect Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of self-directedness in learning because the participants were not actively involved in program planning and development, participants came to the program as adult learners exhibiting self-direction in what they wanted to learn and expected to gain from the program. The program delivery strategy of small group discussions did address Knowles’ assumption of experiential learning by providing the opportunities for participants to learn from each other and their prior experiences. Evidence of
self-directedness in learning and the existence of opportunities to build on prior experiences were noted in the participant interviews. Each one of the employees interviewed identified areas where he or she wanted to grow and improve professionally. Susan came from the private sector prior to becoming a manager in the District and shared:

"Coming from the private sector I knew it was different and needed to know for my own perspective how it was different, and how to handle myself in certain situations that would be handled differently than you would handle in a business setting."

Karen, who had been a faculty member prior to becoming a manager, shared: “I knew the program would be good for me because I am in a new stage of my life.” Sabine added:

“I’m always interested in learning more. I expect to get more knowledge in general . . . the budget has always been of interest to me. It became clear that there are certain things I do need to work on. I’m trying to see if I can follow those rules, figuring out how as a person I can fit those in. I’m pretty independent . . . I’m always interested in learning more things . . . about how as a person I can become better.

Most of the participants interviewed said that the program content did build on their experiences, and that they took advantage of the experiences of others in the cohort when discussing content material. The interviewees stated that the peer interactions during the group activities helped them to learn about themselves and identify areas in which they needed to improve in their interactions with others. Yasmine said that the program built on her previous knowledge and explained how she learned from others:
The workshops enhanced what I already knew. There is always something new to learn. Looking at how others have done it [career advancement], things I didn’t know, I built on. I learned a lot from my fellow participants, my colleagues and their experiences.

Carl shared a comment about learning from others’ experiences: “I also learned from my coworkers about some management skills when they discussed about their experiences and how they handle different situations. Their insights really benefitted me.” Scarlet reflected on her self-direction in learning and how she shared her experiences to help others learn. She explained:

When I knew what was coming up, I would break out my old textbooks and go through some stuff. It was a great refresher of what I already knew. I grew because it was continuing my learning of leadership. It built on a better understanding of the district. It gave me the opportunity to share what I already learned . . . it kept the dialogue going.

While the MLDA program curriculum and format did not incorporate adult learning theory into the delivery, the participants as adult learners brought their own experiences and self-direction to the learning environment.

**Summary of Findings**

The findings of this study indicate that this GYO program is building a sense of community within the District, across campuses, sites, and departments, through capacity building and networking. The MLDA program facilitates a shared learning experience where a diverse group of employees develop an understanding of the SSCCD’s operations, structure, and culture; employee management techniques and tools; and
their own strengths and communication styles. Participation in this program builds organizational community, loyalty, and visibility by clarifying the role of each employee within the organization in relation to others in the organization. It builds capacity by providing tools for managing employee issues and conflict and stimulating an interest in career advancement or performance improvement in one’s current position. The program fosters employee self-discovery and professional growth through connections with colleagues.

The program curriculum and format focus on building organizational capacity and preparing the next generation of leaders. It facilitates employee growth and improvement through self-discovery and learning about the organization, effective management techniques, and communication strategies. The cohort model provides participants with the opportunity to network and develop professional relationships with colleagues, learn about their own strengths and communication styles through Strengths Finder and DISC assessments, and gain an understanding of their organizational roles in relation to others in the District. This interaction with cohort members provides insight and understanding of the diverse perspectives on administrative issues that exist within the District. Learning about the District structure and operations through the chancellor, vice chancellors, college presidents, vice presidents, and District level deans provides participants with the opportunity to learn about the organization through others. It stimulated interest in career advancement to these higher level positions for some participants.

This case study assessed the effectiveness of Sea Side Community College District’s MLDA program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career
advancement behavior of managers and supervisors in the District. The program impacted the organization and participants by engaging the District community in a capacity-building program with the stated objective of preparing the next generation of leaders in support of succession planning. The individual program participants connected with colleagues and networked with District leaders, while learning about management tools for dealing with conflict and personnel. Participants gained a better understanding of the District’s organizational structure and relationships.

The succession planning element of this program is clearly articulated in the program planning documents and is stimulated by interactions with other cohort members, as well as the opportunity to interact with executive and District-level administrators during the 3-day intensive component of the program. Participants who entered the program with goals of career advancement received affirmation and encouragement to pursue their goals. Some participants who did not have career advancement goals upon program entry were more open to the idea of advancement after program completion and subsequent work experiences. Those employees who did change their career goals after program completion noted that they attributed the change to a number of factors, not just program participation. The classified supervisors interviewed in this study noted that they grew from the experience of learning with managers, specifically deans, in the cohort. They found value in learning about how these deans advanced to their current positions. Two of the classified supervisors said that they were energized and inspired to pursue a dean’s position after interacting with the deans in their cohorts. In contrast, the managers were not stimulated to advance in their careers through their experience in the program alone. A few of the managers did note that the GYO
program experience combined with experience in their jobs for 1 to 2 years following the program have brought them to the point of being interested in career advancement. They did not credit this interest directly to the program.

The managers who participated in the program noted it was more of a capacity building and networking opportunity than a succession planning program. Some of the managers were looking to advance in their careers, while others were not interested in career advancement. Most of the managers reported wanting to do their jobs better. The classified supervisors and faculty supervisors viewed the program as a valuable succession planning experience. They enjoyed being in the workshops with the managers. They learned about the managers’ career advancement stories and what it took for managers to get to their current positions. These stories contributed to participants’ desires to advance professionally and their sense of affirmation that they too could pursue similar pathways.

Employee motivation to participate in the program included improvement of performance in current positions and enhancing knowledge of District operations in an effort to better serve the organizational mission. For those participants who were interested in career advancement, participation in the program provided a better understanding of career path possibilities within the District. Of the 13 program participants interviewed in this study, Suzie, Sabine, and Trish have advanced in positions since participation; Rachel and Carl have both started doctoral programs; Rachel, Anne, and Scarlet have applied for jobs that represent career advancement, and all employees have participated in additional professional development workshops or conferences. It is difficult to prove causality of career advancement after GYO program
participation (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2012). The challenge in assessing program effectiveness lies in determining whether someone advanced to another position as a direct result of program participation. Only Carl said that he enrolled in the doctoral program because he was inspired during the MLDA Program.

All employees interviewed noted that the greatest value of participating in the program was the networking opportunity and professional relationships they developed with colleagues in their cohorts. Participants benefitted from making connections with colleagues across the District and noted that these connections facilitated job performance. In most cases, these connections stimulated a sense of camaraderie, and in one participant’s case a renewed interest in job performance. Grant summed up the value of participation in the program in his last statement of the interview: “We . . . underestimate the affective side of things like this because we tend to focus on the interim, cognitive things, but it is emotions that are the juice that makes things flow.”
CHAPTER 5—SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This case study assessed the impact of Sea Side Community College District’s Grow Your Own (GYO) program on fostering career advancement behavior of employees who participated in the program and thereby helping to fill the leadership pipeline. The researcher conducted a case study research design to investigate the participants’ experiences in a GYO program, with a focus on understanding why employees participated in the program, how they constructed knowledge from their social interactions and participation in the program, and how participation in the program has impacted their career advancement behavior.

The problem under investigation in this study was the crisis in community college leadership occurring as a result of the tidal wave of retirements of the baby boomer presidents and vice presidents who started their careers in the 1960s and 1970s. Exacerbating the situation is the fact that those faculty leaders and executive level managers who have historically been trained to fill the vacancies created by retiring community college executives also are retiring. Community colleges across the nation have been facing the challenge of replacing approximately 1,500 community college leaders within a 5 year time period. This critical mass of retirements was predicted by higher education experts during the last decade (Hassan et al., 2010; O’Banion, 2007; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). O’Banion (2007) predicted the retirement of 50% (600) of the community college presidents and 25% (900) of the chief instructional officers between 2007 and 2012. Results from the Career and Lifestyles Survey (CLS)
(Weisman & Vaughan, 2007) indicated that 84% of the community college presidents across the nation planned to retire by 2016. At the time of the study (2006), 24% of the respondents planned to retire in 1 to 3 years, 32% in 4 to 6 years, and 28% within 7 to 10 years. The average age of sitting presidents was 58. This high number of retirements among community college presidents and vice presidents, combined with the lack of a trained workforce to fill the projected demand, has created a leadership crisis in community colleges (Piland & Wolf, 2003; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

The projected demand for trained presidents, vice presidents, and other administrative leaders across the nation during this time period signals an urgent need for a system-wide approach that provides a continuum of leadership development programs and services for community colleges. This professional development system must (a) link the current leadership development options available to prospective community college leaders and (b) include a mechanism that recruits current employees who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline (Ebbers et al., 2010; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Robinson et al., 2010).

This study was intended to inform those who develop community college leadership development programs, and current and aspiring community college leaders, about the status of one GYO program. Grow your own programs are strategies to recruit and train future leaders, and serve as valuable professional development options for addressing organizational continuity of leadership for colleges. Therefore, this study is significant for members of college and district boards of trustees, who are facing a shortage of trained leaders, to assume executive level positions as college presidents and vice presidents retire. This study also is significant for management-level community
college leaders who are seeking trained employees to fill vacant mid-level positions of the deans and associate deans who also have retired.

The review of the literature on community college leadership programs in Chapter 2 identified three key approaches to executive staffing problems: university-based doctoral programs focused on community college leadership; short-term professional association sponsored conferences, institutes, and workshops; and the emerging strategy of college and district-initiated succession planning GYO programs. Several articles in the literature noted that the number of university-based leadership development programs focused on community college leadership was not sufficient to address the need for trained executive leaders (Campbell, 2002; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Kehoe, 2008; Reille & Kezar, 2010). The review of the literature on university-based leadership development programs (there are approximately 100 in the nation) indicated that the number of programs focused on community college leadership (approximately 16) was not sufficient to address the need for trained executive leaders. Furthermore, university-based doctoral programs tend to focus on conducting research rather than applying knowledge for community college practitioners in the field.

Short-term workshops, institutes, and seminars typically supplement formal university-based doctoral programs. Short-term leadership development workshops and seminars are a valuable supplemental professional development strategy. These professional development workshops and seminars also provide networking opportunities for those participants who are interested in engaging in dialogue with current leaders.

Succession planning or GYO programs have emerged as alternative strategies to recruit current employees into a career advancement pipeline and prepare them for
leadership positions. The GYO programs provide the first step in the leadership development continuum by identifying potential leaders and providing capacity building and organizational networking to stimulate their interest in career advancement. The literature review focused on GYO program publications since 2005 to identify emerging and more recent trends in content development, methods of delivery, and outcomes for leadership development programs. Succession planning programs known as GYO programs emerged in 2000 as one strategy used to recruit current employees who are interested in career advancement into the leadership pipeline and prepare them for career advancement. As the first step in a leadership development continuum, GYO programs provide an entree to further career development opportunities. Grow your own programs provide the first step in the leadership development continuum by identifying potential leaders and providing capacity building and organizational networking that stimulate interest in career advancement.

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Competencies for Community College Leaders are used in the development of programs and curriculum in both GYO and university-based doctoral programs focused on community college leadership (Friedel, 2010; Hassan et al., 2010; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Application of learning through experiential learning, such as mentoring and job shadowing, is a vital component in developing leadership skills, and is recognized as an effective strategy for adult and professional learners (Ebbers et al., 2010; Jeandron, 2006; McNair et al., 2011; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Leadership development programs for current employees need to incorporate adult learning theory into their program design and delivery (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Malcolm Knowles (1990) promoted andragogy as an adult learning theory that
makes key assumptions about adult learners, including the need for adults to be self-directed in their learning, and learn from their experiences. However, Reille and Kezar (2010) noted that these components were rarely implemented in GYO programs because of challenges in coordination.

The literature does not address whether GYO programs are filling the leadership pipeline with qualified employees (Reille & Kezar, 2010). It is still unclear whether employees pursue leadership positions and/or continue to participate in professional development activities after completion of GYO programs. Employee motivation to participate in GYO programs also is not addressed in the literature. Due to the relative newness of GYO programs, there is no published data on actual career advancement among GYO program participants, making it difficult to attribute career advancement to program participation.

The purpose of this study was to explore the results of a GYO succession planning program in preparing community college leaders for the second decade of the 21st century. Specifically this study focused on the Sea Side Community College District’s GYO program. This study used qualitative data analysis through a case study of program participants to gain an in-depth understanding of the GYO program participants’ experiences in the program, and the impact of the program on their career advancement behaviors. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics and professional backgrounds of the GYO program graduates?

2. Why do community college employees participate in the GYO program?
3. What were the professional goals of the participants when they entered the program? Did these goals change after program participation?

4. What are the postprogram career advancement behaviors of GYO program participants, including: continued education, application for career advancement positions, and actual career advancement?

5. How are the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders addressed in the program curriculum?

6. How are Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of participant self-directedness and participant experiences reflected in the GYO participants’ learning experiences?

The researcher used the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders and two of Malcolm Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of self-directedness in learning and use of participants’ prior experiences as frameworks to guide investigation of the GYO program. The researcher assessed the effectiveness of the program in filling the leadership pipeline and fostering career advancement behaviors in program participants. The AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders were used as the primary conceptual framework to review the program’s content. Knowles’ two key assumptions of adult learning and andragogy were used to study the program format and the participants’ learning experiences and career advancement behavior.

The findings from this study indicate that the SSCCD’s GYO program impacted the organization and participants by engaging some members of the District community in an organizational capacity-building program with the stated objective of preparing the next generation of leaders. The individual program participants connected with
colleagues and networked with District leaders while learning about themselves, generic management tools for dealing with conflict and personnel, and gaining a better understanding of the District’s organizational structure and relationships.

The SSCCD GYO program appears to be more an orientation to District operations than a succession planning program. Although the program curriculum includes a comprehensive orientation to the District operations and structure and provides a generic level of management training, it lacks an experiential learning component or preparation for actual career advancement. Participants learn about the District culture, operations, structure, and about themselves and others. But they did not learn about management strategies and techniques that were applicable within the District’s shared governance and collective bargaining environment. Program participants made critical comments about application of learning because of the generic nature of the content and the lack of hands-on application of learning through a mentoring or job shadowing component. Not all employees who participated in the program were interested in career advancement opportunities within the District. Employee motivation to participate in the SSCCD’s GYO program included interest in career advancement, improvement of performance in current positions, and enhancement of knowledge and understanding of District operations to better serve the organizational mission.

The major themes that emerged in this study were building community, building capacity, the individual, and the program. The GYO program builds internal District communities and networks through the connections made by and between program participants and District personnel. The program provides a solid source of networking for participants with other colleagues within the program cohorts and with District-level
personnel who presented the 3-day intensive component. Employees commented that the most valuable outcome of their participation in the GYO program was the connections they made with members of the cohort and other District employees. These connections and interactions helped participants learn about the organizational structure and relationships. Participants who were interested in career advancement gained an understanding of some possible career paths within the District, and received encouragement to pursue career advancement opportunities within the organization.

The document review and participant interviews indicated program efforts to address five of the six AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders in the program planning materials and curriculum: Organizational Strategy, Professionalism, Collaboration, Communication, and Resource Management. The Competency of Community College Advocacy was not observed in any of the program documents or mentioned by the interviewees. The literature notes that there is a weak emphasis of Community College Advocacy among community college leadership programs (Hassan et al., 2010; Reille & Kezar, 2010). This Competency requires a focus on external representation of the college’s mission and role, while GYO programs are typically designed to address internal organizational culture and decision making strategies (Reille & Kezar, 2010). Communication and Organizational Strategy were the AACC Competencies that appeared most often in the SSCCD’s GYO program materials, indicating a program focus on growing personnel, building organizational community by developing an environment that supports teamwork, and articulating the organizational mission and goals to internal audiences.
There was little evidence of adult learning theory as a foundation for the SSCCD’s GYO program, reflecting a common criticism of succession planning programs in the literature (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010). While the program format and curriculum did not include Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of self-directedness in the program development and implementation, comments made by participants during the interviews reflected self-directedness in learning and the existence of opportunities to build on prior experiences. The participants noted construction of knowledge and learning through interactions with colleagues in the cohort and the District. Employees learned about themselves had the opportunity to explore their personal goals and interests, received affirmation of what they knew about management techniques and responsibilities, and were encouraged by colleagues and program facilitators to pursue career advancement goals or improve in their performance in current positions. Most of the employees entered the program expecting to learn about the District operations, structure, and culture, management tools, and career advancement opportunities within the District. They were surprised by the amount of self-discovery that occurred through interactions with others in the open and safe environment provided by the program cohort. The opportunity to connect with others and learn through these interactions was noted as the most valuable outcome of the program experience.

All of the participants in this study participated in some sort of career advancement behavior after completion of the GYO program. Three of the 13 employees interviewed have advanced in their career since participation in the program in 2009 and 2010. One participant advanced from a classroom faculty position to a dean, another participant advanced from a dean’s position to an interim vice president, and a third
participant advanced from a classified supervisor to a manager. Participation in the program did not lead to new positions for the remaining 10 participants in this study; the time period after participation has been short, and not all participants in this study were interested in career advancement. Three of the employees who were not interested in career advancement upon entering the GYO program in fall 2009 stated that after 2.5 years of experience in their current positions, they are now open to further advancement in their careers. One of the participants credited his participation in the GYO with influencing his decision to pursue a terminal degree. All of the participants in this study, regardless of their career advancement goals, did exhibit the career advancement behaviors of enrolling in additional training.

**Conclusions**

The findings of this study indicate that this program touches lives by connecting diverse groups of individuals to each other, providing a shared professional development experience that fosters growth of knowledge and understanding about the employees and the District, and supporting the formation of employee networks across the organization. Participation in the program built a sense of community among employees in each of the three cohorts and encouraged career advancement behaviors for those employees who were interested in career advancement. While the program encourages career advancement through discussions about employee strengths and professional goals, it does not support organizational succession planning because the program design lacks all of the components necessary to prepare employees to advance in their careers. In addition, the ways the employees were selected for participation in the program does not mesh with a succession planning strategy. These missing program components include
experiential learning through job shadowing or mentoring and preparation for the job
application and interview process. The selection process for cohorts two and three was
based on an open admissions approach and there was no attempt to identify employees
with the potential or desire to aspire to upper-level leadership positions in the District.
This GYO program is not filling the organizational pipeline to leadership within the
District with employees who have been trained to assume leadership positions. It does,
however, provide networking opportunities for current employees, and create a sense of
community among program participants. This sense of community fosters a sense of
belonging to the organization and promotes loyalty to the mission and goals of the
organization.

Succession Planning

The stated purpose of this GYO program is to prepare the next generation of
leaders by providing employment orientation, performance management training, and
leadership development in support of succession planning. Instead, this GYO program
appears to be providing a comprehensive orientation to the District and some
performance management training, but is lacking the leadership development experiences
necessary to support succession planning within the District.

A total of 64 employees have participated in the SSCCD’s GYO program since
the program inception in the fall of 2009. The literature notes an absence of information
on what motivates employees to participate in GYO programs (Reille & Kezar, 2010).
Members of the first cohort of participants were hand-selected by their presidents
based on several criteria: exhibiting the potential for career advancement, interest in
advancement to management, or being new to the District. This cohort was comprised of
63% managers and 37% supervisors. The second and third cohorts were self-selected, and saw a shift in proportion of managers to supervisors. The second cohort was comprised of 53% managers and 47% supervisors; the third cohort was reversed in proportion compared to the first cohort, and included 40% managers and 60% supervisors. This shift from mostly managers to mostly supervisors in the second and third cohorts could indicate a stronger interest in organizational capacity building and participation in a program with the stated purpose of succession planning opportunities among supervisors, who would be farther removed from top leadership positions within the District. This shift in interest also could be attributed to the dissatisfaction among managers in the first cohort with the generic curriculum and absence of experiential learning component in the program. Managers from the first cohort may not have promoted the program to their peers within the District because of the program shortcomings noted above.

Not all employees who participated in the program had career advancement goals. Reasons for participation in the program varied, and included career advancement, professional development, or for new employees to learn about the District. A few of the employees participated in the program because they were interested in career advancement opportunities within the District, and saw this as an opportunity to learn about the District, develop additional management skills, and increase their visibility within the organization. Other employees participated in the program to improve their performance in their current positions by learning about the District’s mission and goals and acquiring additional management tools. Those employees who were new to the District or to community colleges participated in the GYO program to learn about the
District operations, organizational structure, policies and procedures, and expectations of middle managers and supervisors.

Participation in the program provided a thorough orientation for all employees regardless of their reason for participation. Employees who participated in the program for professional development purposes were disappointed in the lack of depth in the curriculum and the absence of job shadowing and mentoring to support leadership development. Those employees who were interested in career advancement gained a better understanding of the District structure and relationships and a view of some career path possibilities within the district. However, these employees did not receive actual program support for the pursuit of career advancement opportunities through preparation for job application and interviewing.

The program does not include opportunities to explore the demands of higher-level positions and learn from District leaders through job shadowing opportunities or mentoring relationships. Employees learned about some of the roles of certain leaders in the District, and learned about generic management tools in the workshops. They did not receive hands-on learning experiences about the roles and responsibilities of positions they may be interested in advancing to, and did not discuss the application of learning in the workplace with District leaders. They also did not receive opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the level of responsibility and issues that these leaders deal with in the daily performance of their jobs. In addition, the program does not prepare participants with job seeking, application preparation, and interviewing techniques. These are skills that are very important for employees who are interested in pursuing advanced level positions.
There was no evidence of leadership development curricula that support succession planning within the District in this GYO program. The program curriculum is generic in nature and focuses on providing a comprehensive orientation to the District’s culture, people, structure, and operations. The eight workshops include three sessions on generic strategies for managing human resources and dealing with conflict, three workshops on participant self-assessment of leadership strengths, communication styles, and professional development needs, and two workshops on the District Strategic Plan and core values. In addition to the workshops, the program includes a 3-day intensive orientation to the District structure and operations. Dealing with employee issues and conflict and learning about general management tools appeal to employees at the classified supervisor levels, but these approaches do not appeal to managers. Managers have more day-to-day demands to deal with employee discipline matters and conflict in compliance with the collective bargaining agreements. They need discussion about more complicated employee discipline matters and interpretation of the collective bargaining contracts. If this program is designed to prepare employees for mid-level management positions as dean or director, then the curriculum does need to provide management tools that are appropriate to the organization’s environment.

Job shadowing and mentorship relationships that support leadership development and preparation for career advancement are integral components of a succession planning program (Hassan et al., 2010; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Employees with master’s and doctorate degrees would benefit most from mentoring and job shadowing experiences, in addition to learning about management tools and strategies for a shared governance and collective bargaining environment. These employees have the education and experience
in their current positions needed to qualify for advanced positions. They need additional learning experiences with District leaders that could prepare them for higher-level positions as deans and vice presidents. Experienced managers and classified supervisors with higher-level degrees need to accumulate real work experiences that would strengthen their qualifications when applying for advanced positions. Typically, dean and vice president positions require experience in management positions. A job shadowing or internship position with a mentor for a period of 3 to 6 months could be used as work experience on a resume or application.

Most of the employees who participated in the GYO program did not change their career goals. A few of the managers and a classified supervisor who had no intention of advancing in their careers when they began the program did seem to change their career goals since participation in the GYO program but could not directly credit their change to participation in the program. Causality is difficult to prove, and the SSCCD does not track employees’ career advancement behavior after program participation. However, of the 13 employees who participated in this study, 3 have advanced in positions, 2 have pursued advanced degrees, and all employees have participated in additional professional development workshops and trainings. This career advancement behavior indicates a greater interest in continued participation in professional development opportunities rather than actual career advancement.

The purpose of a succession planning program is to prepare current employees for future career advancement opportunities. The career advancement behaviors of the employees in this study reflect a minimal number of actual promotions within the District. Either the positions do not exist due to the current budget situation, or the
majority of participants in this study were not interested in or prepared for advancement. This GYO program provides more of an orientation to the District operations than succession planning because it does not specifically target employees who are interested in career advancement in the program recruitment efforts, and lacks curriculum content and experiences needed to prepare employees for advancement. The SSCCD’s GYO program is not filling the organizational pipeline with employees who are trained to assume leadership positions.

**Building Community**

The SSCCD’s GYO program builds internal District communities and networks, which are advantageous to the District but not necessarily associated with succession planning. Participation in the program provides employees with a shared learning experience and the opportunity to build connections and network with other colleagues within the cohorts and District wide. Through interactions with other employees in the cohorts, participants learn about themselves and the interrelationships of diverse employees within the structure of the District. These connections highlighted some career paths for participants who were interested in career advancement and provided these employees with encouragement to pursue career goals from their colleagues and the program facilitators. For those employees who were not interested in career advancement, these connections provided a deeper orientation to the culture and structural relationships within the District. These connections and shared learning experiences allowed employees to build communities within the District that fostered capacity building and helped to improve job performance. The cohort model provided program participants with the opportunity to gain an understanding of their roles within
the organization in relation to others in the District. Meeting other employees within the District and learning about the functions and roles of other employees at various sites and departments across the District seemed to appeal to long-time District employees. They discovered the foundation for certain practices and policies, appreciated learning about the impact of decisions on other sites, and opened themselves up to diverse perspectives of employees in diverse roles throughout the District. This observation reinforces the “orientation” and “networking” opportunities provided by the program, even for long-time employees.

Organizational loyalty was a by-product of this GYO program. This result could be an important aspect of organizational capacity building that needs to be further developed and fostered in the SSCCD GYO program to support succession planning. Organizational loyalty fosters commitment to the organization and is demonstrated by employees’ interest in making contributions to the mission of the organization, college, or department; understanding the organizational structural relationships; and support of other units (department, colleges, and District offices) within the District.

The sense of community that was developed within the cohorts did not continue after program graduation. The program coordinators made efforts to assemble the cohorts after program completion to foster discussions of application of learning and to share issues or challenges faced by cohort members. However, not all participants attended these reunions due to conflicts in scheduling and lack of interest due to a perception that there was no substantive purpose for the meetings. This appears to be a missed opportunity to take advantage of an unintended outcome of the program. The SSCCD has an opportunity to nurture and continue to support the growing sense of community and
foster loyalty to the organization in support of succession planning through this GYO
program. However, the lack of follow-up activities focused on real work issues and
projects after program completion appears to be a lost opportunity to use the
organizational capacity that was developed through these employee networks to address
the needs of the District.

**AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders**

The five AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders of Organizational
Strategy, Professionalism, Collaboration, Communication, and Resource Management
appeared in the program curriculum and were noted in participant comments. The
Competency of Community College Advocacy was not observed in any of the program
documents or mentioned by the interviewees. The literature notes a weak emphasis of
Community College Advocacy among GYO programs (Hassan et al., 2010; Reille &
Kezar, 2010). This competency requires a focus on external representation of the
college’s mission and role, while GYO programs are typically designed to address
internal organizational culture and decision making strategies (Reille & Kezar, 2010).

Communication and Organizational Strategy were the AACC Competencies that
appeared most often in the program materials, indicating a program focus on growing
personnel, building organizational community by developing an environment that
supports teamwork, and articulating the organizational mission and goals to internal
audiences. These two competencies were reflected in the connections made among
employees and networking opportunities with District leaders. This GYO program builds
organizational community, but does not foster continuation of networking and the
connections that were formed between District employees after program completion.
Participants noted that the most valuable outcomes of the program were the networking and connections made with other employees, which indicates that they are interested in cross-District relationships for the purpose of improving job performance.

The absence of the AACC Competency of Community College Advocacy in the program indicates that this GYO program is focused on internal organizational culture and operations rather than the role of community colleges in addressing the educational and training needs of the surrounding community. Community college presidents rated this competency as the most important competency in performing in executive level positions (Hassan et al., 2010). If the GYO program focus is on succession planning and filling vacancies at the executive level of the organization, then the program needs to include a component that fosters an understanding of the role of the SSCCD in the community. Employees need to be prepared to articulate the mission and goals of the District and represent the District in the surrounding community.

**Knowles’ Assumptions of Andragogy**

There was little evidence of adult learning theory in the Sea Side Community College District’s GYO program. This GYO program was developed by the District’s Human Resources Department without input from or assessment of the needs of potential program participants. This drawback resulted in the development of a program curriculum that was generic in nature and did not address the capacity building needs of several of the employees in the program. While adult education experts emphasize the importance of incorporating adult learning theory in community college education, it is interesting to note the absence of adult learning theory in this community college GYO program. This absence of adult learning theory in GYO programs reflects a common
criticism of succession planning programs in the literature (Jeandron, 2006; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

While the program format and curriculum did not reflect Knowles’ andragogical assumptions of self-directedness in the program development and implementation, there was evidence of self-directedness in learning and the existence of opportunities to build on prior experiences. These opportunities resulted from some of the learning strategies used in a few of the program sessions; such as role-playing, group discussions, and self-assessment tools. These opportunities were extremely limited in scope and duration during the sessions that comprised the program as it was delivered to participants.

Even though the GYO program curriculum and format did not incorporate adult learning theory, the participants as adult learners brought their own experiences and self-direction to the learning environment. Construction of knowledge and learning through interactions with colleagues in the cohort and the District resulted from participant interactions. The value of connections and interactions with other employees has implications for the GYO program coordinators and the District. The cohort model of the GYO program is providing a safe environment for employees to open up to learning about themselves and others. Learning through social interactions appeared to be an effective adult learning strategy.

Final Observations

The SSCCD GYO program builds a sense of community among employees and encourages career advancement. However, it does not support succession planning and is not filling the leadership pipeline with employees who have been trained to assume leadership positions. The program provides a comprehensive orientation to the District
and builds internal organizational community by fostering networks of program participants within the cohorts. It is primarily a District orientation program rather than a succession planning program. However, the short time frame of this study with only three cohorts having completed the program does not accommodate full determination of the success of the program in preparing people for leadership positions within the District. Even with substantial turnover in community college leadership positions (Hassan et al., 2010; O’Banion, 2007; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007), several factors can impede the progress of employees to top leadership positions. The dire financial condition of community colleges in California, including the SSCCD, may have postponed filling positions vacated through retirements, attrition, or other reasons. In addition, SSCCD has a history of appointing internal people to “acting” or “interim” positions, sometimes for years, rather than hiring permanent administrators. “Time-in-grade” is often a prerequisite to advancement to higher level positions, and the time requirement may well exceed 5 years before an employee is ready to move up the organizational ladder. Therefore, few employees can go through a succession planning program and within a few years be selected for top-level leadership positions in community colleges. In addition, the hiring process in this District is highly structured, and being an internal candidate does not necessarily confer advantage. It could be that external candidates have more qualifications and are better matches for leadership positions than in-house candidates, who may or may not have completed a succession planning program.
Recommendations

The findings of this study are significant for the coordinators of SSCCD’s GYO program and other community college districts that are planning to implement succession planning programs to address the leadership void by filling the pipeline to leadership positions with qualified personnel.

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations for SSCCD’s GYO program are offered based on the results of this study.

1. The coordinators must recruit those employees who are interested in career advancement. If this program is truly a succession planning program, then it must promote leadership by design rather than by default by recruiting employees who are interested in career advancement and building a program to address employee-assessed needs.

2. The program curriculum should be revised to provide leadership development learning experiences that focus more on career advancement and less on District orientation and are appropriate to the skill level of the employees participating in the program. Learning about generic management tools does not address the professional development needs of managers. The program curriculum needs to include strategies for dealing with more complicated issues.

3. The GYO program developers need to customize the program curriculum to more accurately reflect strategies that are applicable in shared governance and a collective bargaining work environment. A succession planning program
needs to build capacity of current employees to lead within the District. Therefore, the curriculum must reflect the culture and allowable practices of the District.

4. The GYO program coordinators should incorporate strategies into the GYO program design to support employees who are further away from qualifying for top-level positions by providing organizational capacity-building opportunities for employees while they pursue advanced degrees. These opportunities could include topics-based short-term workshops and seminar series scheduled throughout the year. This will help to maintain their loyalty to the organization as they continue their professional development.

5. The District should include experiential learning opportunities to support career advancement for all employees who are interested in career advancement, regardless of education level or job classification. The program should include a component that provides employees with opportunities to learn from other leaders and gain hands-on experiences in advanced level positions within the District. Introduction of experiential learning strategies into the program design will assure the application of some elements of adult learning theory in this GYO program, and will help to address the leadership development component stated in the purpose of the program.

6. This GYO program should include a component that prepares employees for the job seeking and interviewing process. Employees who have the requisite preparation and interest in career advancement need training in resume
writing, application preparation, and job interviewing techniques to prepare them for the pursuit of promotional opportunities.

7. The program coordinators should build on the value of the connections made between employees in the program by forming work-based project teams or task forces comprised of cohort members for the purpose of assisting with the redesign of the GYO, development of organizational systems and processes, and resolution of problems in support of achieving the organizational mission and goals. This practice will build on the shared learning experience among program participants, while enhancing the program focus on the AACC Competencies of Collaboration and Communication.

8. The program curriculum should incorporate strategies to address the AACC Competency of Community College Advocacy. This can be accomplished by requiring employees to attend District Board meetings and report observations made on the role of the Board in providing organizational oversight and responding to the interest and needs of the surrounding community who elect them. A job shadowing or mentoring component also could be used to provide employees with opportunities to accompany mentors or job-shadow supervisors to community events, forums, and presentations, and even assist with the presentation of information.

9. The AACC Competency of Resource Management can be incorporated into the curriculum through work-based projects that focus on developing an organizational plan that incorporates resource allocation and supports decision making in a shared governance environment.
10. The GYO program format should organize the learning content and experiences based on prospective participant self-assessment of need, identification of areas of interest for learning and professional development, and preferred learning style. It should include more opportunities for self-direction of learning and self-reflection of learning and growth. Opportunities for self-direction in learning could include conducting research or working with cohort members to identify and solve real problems. Introduction of these strategies into the program design will assure the application of some elements of adult learning theory in this GYO program. Based on the results of this study, the following general recommendations for planning GYO programs in community colleges are offered.

1. Participant recruitment. Grow your own programs that are designed to promote leadership and foster succession planning must target recruitment to those employees who are interested in career advancement and have the requisite educational preparation to qualify for advanced level positions. The recruitment process for GYO program participants can include targeted outreach to employees in job classifications that are lower than mid-level or executive level positions, and collect educational background and job classification information on program application forms. This information can then be used to determine the type of capacity-building program and experiences that need to be developed and offered to support career advancement for interested employees.
Employees who are interested in career advancement but lack the educational preparation may be engaged in capacity-building programs that encourage them to pursue advanced degrees and are designed to meet the leadership development needs for the next level on the career pathway. For example, if these employees are interested in mid-level management positions, such as program director or dean positions, then they need orientation to the college or district policies, procedures, and employee agreements. They also need experiences job shadowing and mentoring with college or district leaders in these positions, and preparation for the job application and interview process. These capacity building services can be designed based on assessment of employee needs and scheduled throughout the year to build the capacity of employees while they are engaged in educational preparation to earn advanced degrees and qualify for higher level positions.

Employees who have the requisite educational preparation (master’s and doctorate degrees) and who are interested in career advancement to mid-level or executive level positions, such as vice president and president, may be engaged in leadership development training designed to build leadership capacity based on their assessed needs. These employees also need an experiential component that includes mentoring or job shadowing to gain the hands-on experiences and career guidance from community college leaders, and preparation for the job application and interviewing process.
2. Experiential learning. A succession planning program must provide the necessary capacity-building content and hands-on learning experiences to support employee interest in and success in advanced positions within the college or district. Hands-on learning through mentorship and job shadowing with current community college leaders should be a component of GYO programs that runs concurrently with the formal workshop training. This component would provide opportunities for networking with community college leaders and direct application of learning under the guidance of an experienced leader. Grow your own program participants should be matched with mentors or job shadow supervisors at the beginning of their participation in the program. It would be helpful to have the mentors or supervisors trained and familiar with the program curriculum. This experiential component would provide employees with opportunities to practice the techniques learned in the workshops in a real work environment, with guidance and feedback from experienced leaders. It also would provide employees with opportunities to network with and observe community college leaders, learn about their roles, responsibilities, and the daily challenges of the positions. These experiences also would support employee decision making on career advancement goals and direction.

3. Adult learning theory. Grow your own program developers should develop the program curriculum and organize learning experiences based on prospective participant self-assessment of need, preferred learning style, identification of areas of interest for learning and professional development.
Program developers must involve potential participants in GYO program planning to ensure that employees as adult learners have the opportunity for self-direction in learning, and that the programs are developed to address the specific leadership development and capacity building needs of employees who are interested in career advancement. According to the andragogical assumption that adults are self-directed learners, GYO program participants need to be involved in the selection and implementation of learning strategies. The GYO program format should include opportunities for self-direction of learning through research, outside assignments, and real-world problem solving and projects. It should provide opportunities for self-reflection of learning and growth in addition to the standard program evaluation after each learning module and at the conclusion of the program. Involvement of participants in GYO program planning would ensure that the learning builds on their prior or existing knowledge and on their experiences.

4. Participant diversity in GYO programs. Grow your own programs should maintain diversity of demographics and job classifications among program participants to foster learning through the experiences of others and building of collaborative relationships with employees in diverse positions across the organization. There is value in including managers, classified supervisors, and faculty leaders in the same cohort because it promotes learning about the roles and perspectives of other employees within the organization. The GYO program design could be modularized to address the diverse backgrounds and capacity building needs of potential program participants. For example, a
sequence of targeted professional development opportunities could be provided. Such as:

*Phase 1:* Conduct an orientation for all new employees to learn about the organization and people in it. To be held in the first year of employment.

*Phase 2:* Build capacity for a select group of employees who show promise and interest to develop management and leadership skills, possibly after 3-5 years on the job. Include content specifically focused on district applicability and usefulness for all job classifications. Include a component that connects employees to the district and fosters loyalty to the organization.

*Phase 3:* Focus on succession planning to prepare employees for leadership positions. Employees should learn how to position themselves for top leadership roles. Include job search experiences like resume preparation, answering written application questions, mock interviewing, town hall presentations, and all aspects of the hiring process for community college leaders.

5. Build community. Grow your own programs build cross-district communities and networks through the connections made by and between program participants in a shared learning experience. These organizational networks and communities need to be supported and nurtured after program completion to cultivate the relationships and support of succession planning within the organization. Grow your own programs should include work-based projects that connect employees to the organization during program participation and
facilitate continuation of these connections after program completion. The District leadership can identify current or future projects that require formation of task forces and recruit employees who participated in GYO programs to participate on these task forces. This could build on the relationships formed in the program and further connect the employees with the organization for the benefit of the organization. For example, colleges and districts need cross departmental input and effort in projects, such as:

- Developing enrollment management plans and student tracking systems;
- Developing comprehensive master plans;
- Developing and implementing student success initiatives; and
- Budget development and resource allocation strategies.

6. The AACC Competency of Community College Advocacy. Community college leaders need to know about the role of community colleges in addressing the needs of the surrounding community. Succession planning programs that are designed to promote interest in executive-level positions in community colleges need to integrate the importance of Community College Advocacy into the GYO program curriculum and learning experience. The GYO program curriculum should include both content on the community needs that are addressed by the college’s degree and certificate programs and services and experiential learning opportunities that require interactions with the external community. Grow your own program participants need experience outside of the college environment promoting the college mission and programs to the community. This could be accomplished through
attendance at board of trustee meetings, community functions sponsored by chambers of commerce, professional associations and organizations, and special interest groups.

7. Regional GYO programs. Colleges that are too small to develop an internal succession planning program could partner with other community colleges in the region to develop a program that addresses their shared needs for trained leaders. The colleges could pool resources and expertise and develop a GYO program and learning experience based on the assessed need of employees in the region who are interested in career advancement. The colleges should form a planning group with representation from each college and agree on distribution of workload. If there is a doctoral program in community college leadership in the region, the colleges could engage the doctoral program director in the program development and implementation efforts. The doctoral program might serve as the lead for development and implementation of the regional GYO program, or one of the colleges in the region could perform this function.

The phases of program planning and implementation include:

- Assessment of employee interest in career advancement and need for capacity-building.
- Development of program curriculum based on assessed need.
- Selection of subject matter experts to deliver program content.
• Identification of training location and program schedule. The locations could be rotated among the participating college locations for convenience and to foster learning about other colleges in the region.

• Development of participant selection process and determination of the size of the program cohorts.

• Recruitment and training of mentors and job shadow supervisors, and match of mentors and mentees once participants are selected.

• Development of program budget. The cost of the program must be determined before the program is initiated so that the resources needed are available. Grant funds could be sought to support the program, or the colleges may share in the cost based on a per-participant or college rate.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Community colleges will continue to struggle with the needs to fill vacancies in leadership positions in the foreseeable future. Opportunities for further study of career advancement of employees into leadership positions in community colleges include:

1. Investigate career advancement behavior of faculty relative to their discipline or area of expertise to identify trends or potential sources for recruitment of future leaders. Do most of the community college leaders who advance from faculty to administrator positions have a background teaching in the sciences, mathematics, or business?

2. Conduct a longitudinal study of GYO program participants after program completion to collect data on actual career advancement. Causality will be
difficult to prove, so a follow-up study should focus on a qualitative analysis of application of GYO program content in support of career advancement.

3. Identify classified supervisors and managers without teaching experience who have advanced into community college leadership positions. Study their backgrounds and the types of professional development they used to build their leadership capacity.

4. Study the impact of community college CEO leadership styles on the organizational culture of succession planning and career advancement of employees at a college or within a district. What are the qualities of those current leaders who have promoted a number of community college leaders from within their organizations?

5. Replicate this study by making the following changes

- Add a question to the interview about why the employees volunteered to participate in the research study. Did they participate in the study to have an opportunity to provide more feedback on the program, to self-reflect, or to learn about conducting research?

- Conduct joint interviews with participants who made connections with each other to explore the true depth and value of these relationships in fostering improvement of performance in current positions. A few of the interviewees named colleagues who they met and established working relationships with as a result of participation in the GYO program, but those colleagues were not part of the research sample and had not volunteered to be interviewed.
• Follow up with participants in 3- to 5-year intervals to determine their career advancement behaviors and how many acquire new positions within the District or other districts.

This study closes with a comment of appreciation from one of the participants in the GYO program. Although the GYO program in this study is missing components necessary to fill the pipeline with trained leaders in support of succession planning, Scarlet appreciated the SSCCD effort to initiate the program and shared: “I’m thankful that the district recognizes that we do have folks within that could become leaders or could be future leaders, and that it just makes sense to grow . . . to grow our own.”
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APPENDIX A

Management Leadership Development Academy
Curriculum and Schedule

Training provided for current and new managers, and experienced supervisors who have a professional goal to promote to a management position. Curriculum consists of a combination of organizational management skills and enhanced leadership development training. Additional training is available in the form of elective topic workshops, coaches/mentors, experiential assignments, peer networking, and recommended reading.

Two half-day modules are scheduled monthly for a total of eight and are facilitated by leadership development professionals. The academy is supplemented by a 3-day Management Training Intensive seminar which provides a high-level orientation to the role and responsibilities of District leaders in key subject domains and is presented by several SSCCD executive managers. The Academy includes a total of 60 hours of training.

---

**January 2011**

- **Module 1 – Friday, 1/28/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, District Office, Room 111**
  - 30 min **Introduction**
    - Overview & Expectations of MLDA
    - Introduction of Facilitators
  - 4 hr **Being an Effective Leader**
    - Current challenges faced by SSCCD Leaders-Managers
    - Changing role & expectations of Managers in the workplace
    - Management and leadership skills to succeed
    - Five Mindsets of Managers/Leaders
    - Strengths Finder assessment and discussion
    - Top ten tips for Managers
    - **Refreshments will be served**

---

**February 2011**

- **Module 2 – Friday, 2/11/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, College, Room R-110**
  - 1 hr **College Overview & Application of District Core Values**
  - 4 hr **Building Teams and Workplace Engagement**
    - TeamBuilding Model
    - Assess your team (Survey)
    - Team tools to enhance engagement and effectiveness
    - Meeting management/facilitation skills
    - **Refreshments will be served**
Module 3 – Friday, 2/25/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, College, H117/H118

- 1 hr College Overview & Importance of Shared Governance
- 4 hr Communication
  - DISC Communication Styles Instrument
  - How to recognize other communication styles
  - How to get “yes” with reports, peers and superiors
  - How to flex your style for maximum effectiveness
  - Refreshments will be served

March 2011

Module 4 – Friday, 3/11/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, Room A-122

- 1 hr Overview & District Vision & Mission
- 4 hr Strategic Thinking & Planning
  - What is strategy?
  - Strategic thinking tools (SWOTT and Scenario Building)
  - Conduct Mock SWOTT Analysis
  - Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan: two different things
  - Creating a strategic plan
  - Creating relevant metrics and monitoring goals
  - Refreshments will be served

Management Training Intensive (MTI)
Monday-Wednesday, 3/21/11-3/23/11, 8:00 – 4:30 - off-site conference facility

- Management Training Intensive (MTI) - separate agenda
  - Chancellor & District Leaders
  - Continental Breakfast, Full Buffet Lunch, and Refreshments will be served

April 2011

Module 5 – Friday, 4/1/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, College, Room S5-103

- 1 hr College Overview & District & Campus Responsibilities
- 4 hr Understanding Competency-Based Performance Management
  - The SSCCD Performance Management System
  - What is Performance Management?
  - What are competencies?
  - Setting standards of performance for Goals and Competencies
  - Giving competency-based performance feedback
  - How to coach employees who meet and exceed expectations
  - Practice feedback exercise
  - Refreshments will be served
□ Module 6 – Wednesday, 4/13/2011, 8:00 – 12:00, College, Room H117/H118
   ◊ 4 hr  Coaching for Performance Improvement
         o How to be 100% effective in conversations about performance
         o How to avoid the manager’s trap when addressing performance issues
         o Maintaining composure during difficult conversations
         o Candid conversations: How to deliver negative feedback and maintain a good relationship
         o Refreshments will be served

□ Module 7 – Friday, 4/29/2011, 8:00 – 12:00, District Office, Room 245
   ◊ 4 hr  Valuing Differences and Intergenerational Issues in the Workplace
         o What “diversity” exists in the workplace?
         o The benefits of differences
         o Intergenerational issues
         o Tips and tools to effectively optimize differences
         o Refreshments will be served

May 2011

□ Module 8 – Thursday, 5/5/2011, 8:00 – 1:00, District Office, Room 245
   ◊ 4 hr  Professional Development for Yourself & Others
         o SSCCD Leadership Competencies- Self assessment
         o How to build a professional development plan for yourself and your employees
         o Participants identify one professional development goal for themselves
         o Participants define how they will measure success
         o Participants commit to 3-5 development activities to achieve the goal
         o Participants coach each other on their development plans
         o Facilitator will model coaching and provide feedback
         o Refreshments will be served
   ◊ 1 hr  Graduation / Celebration !!!!
         – Chancellor
         o Managers of participants are invited to celebrate participants’ achievements
         o Award of Management Leadership Development Academy Certificates
         o Refreshments will be served

---------------------
Total       60 hrs.
MANAGEMENT TRAINING INTENSIVE
Agenda -- Day 1 -- Monday, March 21, 2011

8:00 – 8:15 AM  DISTRICT OVERVIEW

Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Welcome, Introductions

8:15 – 9:40 AM  STUDENT SERVICES

Vice Chancellor, Student Services
Student Services Strategy and System Support
FTEs, FTES, FTEF, and Other Headcounts
Student Clubs and Organizations

9:40 – 9:50 AM  Break

----------------------------------------

9:50 – 10:30 AM  STUDENT SERVICES – cont’d

Director, Disabled Student Programs and Services
DSPS and other Student Services

10:30 – 11:10 AM  INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

Director, Information Technology
Services for Students, Faculty and Staff

11:10 – 11:20 AM  Break

----------------------------------------

11:20 – 12:00 PM  COLLEGE POLICE

Lieutenant, College Police and
Chief, College Police
Campus Police Services – Students, Faculty, Staff, and Campus
Community Emergency Management Team – Role and Responsibilities

12:00 – 1:00 PM  LUNCH

----------------------------------------
1:00 – 2:20 PM  **DISTRICT OVERVIEW**
Chancellor
National, State & Community Context for the SS CCD
District Overview of Planning
Strategic Directions and Challenges

2:20 – 2:30 PM  **Break**

2:30 – 3:10 PM  **DISTRICT OVERVIEW – cont’d**
Director, Public Information & Government Relations
Importance of District Interaction in State & Local Political and
Public Environments

*Closing Announcements*

3:30 PM  **Adjourn**

---

**MANAGEMENT TRAINING INTENSIVE**
Agenda -- Day 2 – Tuesday, March 22, 2011

8:00 – 9:00 AM  **INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES**
Dean of Online Instruction and Distributed Learning
Role of Technology in Access to Education

9:00 – 10:00 AM  **Executive Director of Military Education**
Military Education in the Community College Environment

10:00 – 10:15 AM  **Break**

10:15 – 11:00 AM  **Dean of Curriculum & Instructional Services**
Curriculum Development

11:00 – 12:00 PM  **BUSINESS SERVICES**
Executive Vice Chancellor, Business Services
Understanding Our Financial System and Managing Operational
Budgets
12:00 – 1:00 PM    Lunch

1:00 – 2:00 PM    Business Services – Continuation of Morning Session
                 Q&A

2:00 – 2:10 PM    Break

2:10 – 3:10 PM    INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES – cont’d
                 Dean of Economic Program Development
                 Grants and Instructional Research
                 Workforce and Economic Development

3:10 – 4:10 PM    Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning
                 Instructional Services, Planning & Technology
                 District’s Strategic Planning
                 New & Innovative Initiatives

            Closing Announcements

4:30 PM    Adjourn

__________________________________________________________________________

MANAGEMENT TRAINING INTENSIVE

8:00 – 9:20 AM    HUMAN RESOURCES
                 Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
                 Human Resource Management
                 District Policies and Procedures

9:20 – 9:30 AM    Break

__________________________________________________________________________

9:30 – 10:10 AM    Equal Opportunity & Diversity Officer
                 Diversity Appreciation and EEO

10:10 – 10:50 AM    Director, Employee Services
                 Compensation, Payroll, and Benefits
                 HR Systems
10:50 – 11:00 AM  Break

11:00 – 11:30 AM  Director, Employee Relations
Labor Relations in a Union Environment

11:30 – 12:00 PM  Employment & Professional Development
Employment and Related Services

12:00 – 12:20 PM  HR Technician, Employment & Professional Development
Scope of Employee Professional Development Program

12:20 – 1:20 PM  Lunch

FACILITIES SERVICES

1:20 – 2:30 PM  Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management
Facilities Management:
New Facility Development

2:30 – 2:40 PM  Break

2:40 – 3:20 PM  Director, Facilities Services
Maintenance and Grounds

3:20 – 4:00 PM  Director, Employment & Professional Development
Questions & Answers
Closing Comments

4:00 PM  Adjourn...........and Thanks to Everyone!
Dear MLDA program graduate:

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Benard, graduate student in the EdD program in Community College Leadership at San Diego State University. The purpose of the study is to explore the experiences of participants in the MLDA program and career advancement behaviors as a result of participation in the program.

Ms. Benard is interested in speaking to MLDA program participants about your experiences in the MLDA program. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary and confidential. Please note that your choice of participating or not participating in this study will not affect your relationship with the MLDA program coordinator or human resources. If you are interested in participating or would like to learn more about this study, please contact Mary at mbenard@sdccd.edu. If you agree to participate in this study, Mary will contact you to arrange a one-on-one interview to talk about your experience in the MLDA program.

The interview will last approximately 60 minutes and will be tape recorded for the purposes of data collection and analysis. Following the interview, you will have the opportunity to review the themes that emerge from the interview and confirm preliminary findings and themes that emerge in the data. This follow up will involve reading printed material and then participating in the follow up phone call that may take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

You will receive a $25 gift card from Starbucks for your time and participation in the research study. In addition, the potential benefits of this study are possibilities to enhance future succession planning leadership development programs.

To confirm your interest in participating in this study, please complete the attached questionnaire. Mary then will contact you to establish a time and place for the interview at your convenience. Thank you for considering this invitation to participate in this research study.

MLDA Program Coordinator
APPENDIX C

MLDA Program Participant Questionnaire

1. If you are interested in participating in this study please provide your name, email address, and phone number.

   Name
   email address
   phone number

2. When did you participate in the MLDA Program?
   ○ Fall 2009
   ○ Spring 2010
   ○ Spring 2011

3. What is your gender?
   ○ M
   ○ F

4. Please identify your age.
   ○ 18-25
   ○ 26-35
   ○ 36-50
   ○ 51-64
   ○ 65 and older

5. What is your ethnicity?
   ○ Asian/Pacific Islander
   ○ Black/ African American
   ○ White/Caucasian
   ○ Hispanic/Latino(a)
   ○ Native American
   ○ other
6. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   - Associate
   - Bachelor
   - Masters
   - Doctoral

7. How many years have you worked at the District?
   
8. What is your current job classification?
   - manager
   - classified supervisor
   - faculty

   Thank You
Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Benard, graduate student in the EdD program in Community College Leadership at San Diego State University. You were selected as a participant for this study because you graduated from the Management Leadership Development Academy (MLDA) and can help us to better understand the experiences of participants in this succession planning program. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to explore the experiences of participants in the MLDA program and their career advancement behavior since completion of the MLDA program.

PROCEDURES
If you agree to participate in this study, the principal investigator will ask you questions about your experiences in the MLDA program and your career advancement behavior since your participation in the program. Participation in the study includes completion of a questionnaire and participation in one interview. The length of time to complete the questionnaire will be approximately 3 to 5 minutes. The one-on-one interview will last approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be conducted at your convenience, either in your office or a public location, and during times that fit within your schedule of availability.

The interview may be followed by a phone call with the principal investigator to discuss and confirm preliminary findings and themes that emerge in the data. This follow up will involve reading printed material and then participating in the follow up phone call lasting no more than 15 minutes.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
Potential risks and discomforts in participating in this study include disclosing reasons for participating in the MLDA program and career goals. Participation in this study requires that you be audio taped, which may create some anxiety or discomfort. If you begin to feel uncomfortable for any reason you may discontinue your participation either temporarily or permanently without consequences. If you choose not to be audio taped you may still participate in the interview.
POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR SOCIETY
You will not directly benefit from this study; however, the potential benefits of the study are the possibilities to enhance future succession planning Grow Your Own (GYO) leadership development programs. This study is significant for community college human resources personnel who are charged with creating professional development programs to address current and projected organizational leadership needs.

PAYMENT/COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION
You will receive a $25 gift card from Starbucks for participation in the study. This incentive is not contingent upon your completion of the interview. If you choose to discontinue the interview you will still receive the gift card. The gift card will be awarded at the time of the interview.

CONFIDENTIALITY/PRIVACY
The interview will be audio taped and transcribed for data analysis and writing reports of the findings of this study. You will have the opportunity to review the preliminary findings and make any changes to the themes that emerged as a result of statements you offered during the interview. The audio recording and transcript will be stored under password protection on the principal investigator’s home computer to prevent access by unauthorized personnel. Once the audio tape is transcribed it will be deleted. The transcript will be maintained under password protection on the principal investigator’s office computer for one year after the end of the project. All data related to this study will be destroyed one year after the conclusion of this study.

Your name (you will choose a pseudo name) and any other identifying information you provide will be coded from the information you provide before it is analyzed so as not to be identified with you. The code book for this study will be stored separately from the transcripts in a lock file cabinet in the principal investigator’s home.

When the results of the research are published or discussed in conferences, no information that can potentially reveal your identity will be included. Federal regulations require that the institutional review board (IRB) periodically review all approved or continuing projects that involved human subjects. To ensure that your rights as a subject are being protected in this study, it is possible that representatives of the Institutional Review Board at San Diego State University may come to this research site to inspect study records.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your choice of whether or not to participate will not influence your future relations with San Diego State University or the Community College District. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to stop participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are allowed.
CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact an IRB representative in the Division of Research Affairs at San Diego State University (telephone: 619-594-6622; email: irb@mail.sdsu.edu). You may also contact Mary Benard at (619) 607-2048 or mbenard@sdccd.edu.
APPENDIX E

Document Analyzer Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>AACC Competencies</th>
<th>Knowledge Assumptions</th>
<th>Andragogy</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Self-Directedness</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

MLDA Program Participant Interview Questions

Motivation to participate and self-directedness

1. How did you find out about the Academy?

2. Whose idea was it to participate in the program? Yours, your supervisor’s, or a coworker’s?

3. Why did you participate in the Academy?

4. What did you expect to get out of the program?

5. Did the program meet any or all of your expectations? Which ones were met and which ones were not met?

6. What did you learn about yourself as a result of participating in the program?

7. How did you change or grow as a result of your participation in the program?

8. How did you apply the lessons learned or skills developed in your job or daily life? (for example, conducting employee evaluations or application of behavioral management techniques)

Career Goals

9. What were your career goals when you started the Academy?

10. Have your career goals changed as a result of participation in the Academy?

Career advancement behavior

11. How did participation in the academy impact your future career plans?

12. What has been your career advancement behavior since participation in the program?
13. Have you attended other professional development workshops or conferences, or applied for graduate study?

14. Have you applied for any new positions, secured any new positions, left the district?

Building on experience

15. How did the program content of community college leadership add to your existing knowledge and experience?

16. Tell me about the program format. How was this an effective way to learn for you?

17. How could the program be changed or improved?

18. How did the program format allow you to take control of your learning and act as an independent adult learner?

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add about your experience in the MLDA program?