

Making the Most of Community Colleges on the Road Ahead

Mark David Milliron and Gerardo E. de los Santos

In this article the authors explore the educational, economic, and social dynamics that position the community college as a key player on the national and international scene. Making the most of community colleges in the face of these dynamics, however, will mean grappling with and planning for key trends. To take a big picture look at these trends, the authors detail the results of the third study in a series of League for Innovation in the Community College road-ahead studies. The 2003 study included reviews of research, a national survey of CEOs, and a series of focus groups. The results point to seven key cluster areas surrounding issues of (1) learning swirl, (2) partnership programs, (3) funding agony and opportunity, (4) teaching, reaching, and leadership transitions, (5) learning dialogues and documentation, (6) high tech and high touch creativity and connection, and (7) courageous catalysts.

“In a time of drastic change, it is the learners who inherit the future. The learned usually find themselves equipped to live in a world that no longer exists.”

—Eric Hoffer, 1973

Few would argue that this is not a time of drastic change. Issues of national security, demographics, education, economy, and technology continue to drive debate and dialogue, only to become more complex as we consider the confluence of these forces on American society. In times of drastic change, educational leaders must resist the urges to hunker down or to simply charge ahead. It is much more useful to take a deep breath and a good look at the broad spectrum of influences on our work, particularly if we are to engage agendas that make the most sense for our time. Doing nothing or doing things as they have always been done, even if more quickly, efficiently, or with more technology, will prepare us for “a world that no longer exists.”

In an attempt to take a bigger picture view of our work, this article seeks to (1) explore the dynamics of change that point to community colleges as powerful catalysts of adult learning and economic development and (2) document the major trends and related policies impacting today’s community colleges. With this gestalt perspective, we will be better prepared to make the most of the community college movement on the road ahead.

Educational, Economic, and Social Dynamics

Beginning as junior colleges and technical institutes, moving toward more comprehensive programming and community engagement through the 1947 Truman Commission on Higher Education, and burgeoning with the baby boom that hit higher

education in the 1960s, America's community colleges have now matured into essential engines of educational, economic, and social development. To be sure, William Rainey Harper Jr., the president of the University of Chicago credited with conceptualizing the first two-year college, could not have known what lay in store for his Joliet Junior College or its sister technical institutes. Today the comprehensive community college is woven into the fabric of American life, and increasingly into the social tapestry of

the world. The students of community colleges run multinational corporations, fly through space, star in movies, provide leadership in statehouses, and map the human genome.

(American Association of Community Colleges, 2002).

Given the rising prominence of community colleges on the national scene, it is not surprising that policymakers are beginning to embrace them as lynchpin institutions — essential to the health and welfare of their communities and this country. As our community leaders explore the educational, economic, political, and social dynamics on the road ahead, we believe they increasingly will bring the role of the community college to the center stage of their discussions. Educationally,

“The students of community colleges run multinational corporations. . . provide leadership in statehouses, and map the human genome.”

many community colleges have become a nexus of lifelong learning in their communities. Today more than 1,100 community colleges serve more than 10 million students across the United States. The broad range of programs in comprehensive community colleges makes it hard to pin down a single mission for these institutions, but, generally, community college students continue to obtain certificates, diplomas, and degrees in credit and noncredit areas, including college transfer programs, terminal and transfer technical programs, vocational training, workforce development programs with industry, workforce development programs with displaced workers, basic skills and remedial programs, adult basic education and GED, seniors programs, and vocational noncredit programs. In addition, community colleges are often the primary educational source to prepare learners for external certification programs, for example, information technology (IT), allied health, financial services, and hazardous materials certification. Most importantly, community colleges do all these things as integral community partners, tightly tying their programming to local community needs.

The emergence of the community college is a testimonial to the fact that America is becoming a nation of lifelong learners. Increasing numbers of jobs are moving from the manufacturing to the knowledge sector. Jobs in the knowledge economy require not only more education but also — and more importantly — continuing education. A recent Faces of the Future (Philippe & Valiga, 2000) study from the American Association of Community Colleges noted that almost 25 percent of students served by community colleges nationwide across credit and noncredit programs already have attained a bachelor's degree or higher. These students are what the National Alliance of Business

(NAB) Certification Panel members referred to as “golden hires,” students well versed in the liberal arts but also committed to attaining greater skills, particularly in the technical arena. In this way, the education dynamics related to the community college are deeply tied to our national economy.

On the economic scene, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan noted in his September 2000 testimony to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the U.S. House of Representatives that community colleges have become an essential element of the U.S. economy, particularly in this time of great change:

This process of stretching toward our human intellectual capacity is not likely to end any time soon. Indeed, the dramatic increase in the demand for on-the-job technical training and the major expansion of the role of our community colleges in teaching the skills required to address our newer technologies are persuasive evidence that the pressures for increased learning are ongoing (Alan Greenspan, 2000).

“ . . . community colleges have become an essential element of the U.S. economy, particularly in this time of great change...”

As the need for learning increases, particularly in the area of technology, community colleges are seen as major drivers of economic growth. In addition to information technology, the need for K-12 teachers, nurses, biotechnology, and homeland security has driven community colleges to respond to meet the economic challenges caused by shortages in these occupations. Community colleges are designing fast-track programs to transfer teacher candidates to local universities, developing programs for alternative teacher certification, and offering staff development opportunities for existing teachers (Boggs & Bragg, 1999; Education commission of the states (ECS), 2002; National Association of Community College Teacher Education (NACCTE), 2002). Community colleges also are playing a critical role in recruiting, retaining, supporting, and graduating nurses. Nationally, Associate Degree Nursing graduates are highly successful on the Registered Nurse (RN) exam, and are in high demand as transfer students to Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) programs. Closely related to the allied health programs that support nursing are the emerging biotechnology programs at community colleges nationwide. These programs are working to provide the workforce necessary to fuel the biotechnology boom that is predicted to be coming our way in the next decade.

In short, when it comes to meeting workforce needs that impact the economy, community colleges are increasingly turned to for the development of flexible, fast-track, and quality programs. The value of community colleges in the American economy has become so prominent that the international community is looking to the U.S. to model these open access institutions that are considered the engines of the middle class (Davis & Wessel, 1998).

Beyond these educational and economic dynamics are the social dynamics. In an increasingly diverse, dynamic, and connected society, community colleges are essential to help citizens live and learn well. Community colleges are champions of access, opening the door of higher education to those traditionally less likely to engage this pathway to possibility. Almost half of all first-year college students begin their work with community colleges. And with a tradition of open-door admissions, low tuition,

“ . . . well-designed and strongly supported developmental and remedial education programs at community colleges are often the bridge that bring these students into productive lives in society . . . ”

flexible programming, customized student services, and quality learning opportunities, community colleges continue to be the pathway to higher education for minorities. Based on U.S. Census Bureau data, by the year 2015, minority enrollments in community colleges are projected to increase by approximately 12 percent, while the white student population is projected to decrease by approximately 8 percent. Overall, 46 percent of all African-American students, 55 percent of all Hispanic students, 55 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander students, and 55 percent of all Native American students in higher education attend community colleges (National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 1998). In addition, more than half of community college students are first-generation students. Clearly, the open-door

philosophy of the community college is meeting, and will continue to be called to meet, the social need for access to higher education.

Increasing numbers of students entering community colleges lack the academic or social preparation to succeed in education. In *No One to Waste: A Report to Public Decision-Makers and Community College Leaders* (2000) and the follow up book *Yes, We Can!* (2003), Robert McCabe documents this increase in underprepared students and also shows how well-designed and strongly supported developmental and remedial education programs at community colleges are often the bridge that brings these students into productive lives in society, helping them to help themselves and move toward a brighter future. Closely mirroring this issue are the concerns of many surrounding the Digital Divide. In *Access in the Information Age* (de los Santos, de los Santos, & Milliron, 2001) and the subsequent book *From Digital Divide to Digital Democracy*, (de los Santos, de los Santos, & Milliron, 2003) the authors document the burgeoning populations with limited-to-no access to technology, particularly African-American and Hispanic populations. Given their extensive presence within low-income and disadvantaged populations, community colleges are particularly well positioned to help these communities avoid being “disenfranchised spectators in a digital world that is passing them by, bit by bit” (Milliron & Miles, 2000 p.56). The community college is one vehicle that can help adults access the hardware, software, and training necessary to work in an information economy, not to mention provide the technology and change-savvy necessary to live in a connected world and not be manipulated by it.

Key Trends on the Road Ahead

Given these educational, economic, and social dynamics, those seeking to make the most of community colleges need to begin leveraging these institutions to make a powerful difference. However, before we charge ahead, we need to fully examine these dynamics in the context of the protean range of key trends that impact policy and practice within our institutions. These trends are closely related to, and in some cases driven by, the broader educational, economic, and social dynamics. Still, they provide us with further understanding and perspective on the road ahead.

Beginning in 1997, the League for Innovation in the Community College began a community-college movement key trends survey, which it updates every three years as part of its ongoing strategic planning (Milliron & Leach, 1997; Milliron & Miles, 2000). The League for Innovation in the Community College (www.league.org) is an international consortium of colleges dedicated to catalyzing the community college movement. The

trends explored here emerged from the 2003 study. As was the case with the earlier studies, the beginning set of issues was drawn from a review of conference programs and educational literature. The issue groups were initially clustered using Miles and Huberman's (1994) cluster analysis techniques. These clusters were then tested for validity and importance in a survey of 735 community college CEOs as part of the League's CEO survey service, "What Do CEOs Want to Know About ...?" The population surveyed is made up of the CEOs of the League for Innovation board member institutions and its Alliance. (For a complete listing of this population, visit www.league.org.)

Other surveys of the Alliance population show it to be more diverse in terms of gender and ethnicity than the national cohort of CEOs (Milliron & Doty, 1998). The average age of the CEOs surveyed in this study was 57, with an average tenure as CEO of 9.2 years. The overall response rate was 47 percent (n = 345).

The survey featured 42 issue questions (see Appendix A). In addition, the survey prompted the CEOs to offer other ideas or trends for us to consider. The issue questions were posed with a beginning question of, "Do you believe that in the next three years at your institution:" and were then followed with statements such as "credit enrollment will increase." Our goal was to have leaders respond based on what they believed to be happening at their own institutions. The CEOs' responses were recorded on a variation of a standard, seven-point Likert scale that used the following response keys:

YES! Yes yes ? no No NO!

"The community college is one vehicle that can help adults access the hardware, software, and training necessary to work in an information economy . . ."

This response scale has been demonstrated to differentiate levels of intensity well and to intuitively appeal to respondents (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987; Milliron, 1995). Several questions were negatively phrased to help identify and avoid pattern responses. The results of this survey are reported in the Appendix.

Finally, we use these survey results as the basis for a focus groups with both the League Board of Directors (http://www.league.org/league/about/board_of_directors.htm) and then with the League Representatives

(http://www.league.org/league/about/league_reps.htm). These focus groups help us to clarify the cluster groups and flesh out the key issues of importance on the road ahead.

It could be argued that the CEOs of the Alliance institutions, along with the members of the League Board and Representative groups, are different from a broader random sampling of community college CEOs because of their expressed interest in fostering innovation and change. Indeed, the published purpose of the League Alliance states: “By joining the Alliance, you associate yourself with cutting-edge community colleges nationally and internationally.” However, the stated goal of being on the cutting edge makes this population ideal for exploring future trends. Arguably,

these leaders have their eyes pointed down the road ahead, and are likely to be more sensitive to powerful trends that may influence the community college.

Again, as with previous League trend surveys, this study did not capture every key issue that community college leaders will face in the coming years. As ambitious as this project may be, neither the researchers nor the surveyed CEOs are either infallible or clairvoyant. However, every attempt was made to remain open to new possibilities and ideas that should be included in our research framework.

Seven Issue Clusters

Learning Swirl

The first issue cluster that emerged from our research protocol was, Learning Swirl. Learning swirl is made up of a number of interrelated and dynamic enrollment patterns. For example, many colleges are experiencing double-digit enrollment growth for a number of reasons: (1) the baby-boom echo, (2) increased need for continuous upgrade workforce development, and (3) a down economy leading to an increase in displaced workers (See Q1, Table 1). In addition to enrollment number increases, students are more diverse (Q3; Q5) and increasingly “swirled” — using community colleges for short-cycle training, industry certification, reverse transfer, or “graduate school” options (Q2; Q35; Daggett, 2001; Quinley & Quinley 1998). Calling community

“ . . . almost one out of four community college students across credit and noncredit offerings already has a four-year degree and is coming back for additional, often job-specific, training. ”

colleges the “new graduate school” has become more common as increasing numbers of students with bachelor’s degrees use community colleges to obtain technical training and certification past their BA or BS (Q7). As noted earlier, the AACCC/ACT Faces of the Future survey demonstrates that almost one out of four community college students across credit and noncredit offerings already has a four-year degree and is coming back for additional, often job-specific, training.

In some cases, however, students will be coming to community colleges for their full four-year degree (Q41). While not a dominant trend, it clearly is an emerging issue and is more common in cities and states where there are key needs not being met in targeted occupational areas. A particular need noted by our focus group participants included “occupations of heart”: teachers, nurses, firefighters, and police officers (Q16).

Even as we explore these four-year programs, we need to embrace our longstanding role in serving the at-risk. Enrollments in developmental education programs will likely increase as a greater percentage of high school graduates require “some college” to obtain meaningful work (Q34; Carnevale & Fry, 2000).

Our focus group participants noted the likely cultural conflict for those institutions that develop four-year programs, yet try to maintain a focus on quality developmental education.

“ . . . high-tech firms are turning to community colleges, as our institutions increasingly have become hubs of certifications for Cisco, Microsoft, Oracle, and Novell. ”

Partnership Programs

Another cluster set deals with the trend of governments, businesses, and educational partners working more closely with community colleges. We refer to this cluster as Partnership Programs. One-stop centers, customized training, dual-credit offerings, and rapid-transfer programs are only a few of the dynamic partnerships community colleges engage (Q2; Q4; Q20; Q22; Q33; Q36; Q41; Andrews, 2000/2001). Moreover, high-tech firms are turning to community colleges, as our institutions increasingly have become the hubs of certification for Cisco, Microsoft, Oracle, and Novell. Particularly in the world of business and industry, community colleges are becoming well known and often used training provider. However, for-profit training providers will still provide key competition as evidenced by the recent divestiture of the K-12 division of Sylvan Learning to facilitate their focus on the adult learning market.

Funding Agony and Opportunity

The issues surrounding Learning Swirl and Partnership Programs are particularly difficult to address when state funding is cut at the time that students are

flooding into community colleges (Q1; Q17; Q25). While a compelling argument can be made that, especially in a down economy, policymakers should consider investing even more in these economic development engines and centers of adult learning, this logic is rarely heeded. This state of affairs leads to the issue cluster we call Funding Agony and Opportunity. Indeed, it will often be our students who will be in agony, as a great majority of colleges in our survey noted that their tuition is likely to significantly

“ . . . many institutions are not handling well the process of saying goodbye gracefully to those who have dedicated 30-40 years of their lives to our communities. ”

increase (Q42). With the agony of the ubiquitous budget cuts and rising tuitions (and they are significant enough to question our commitment to open access in some cases) have come the same opportunities, for example, becoming more creative in programming (Q40) and turning to a newer trend in community colleges — external fundraising. Indeed, one of the strongest responses on our trend survey was in relation to the question about the increasingly important role of the president in supporting foundation efforts to raise external money (Q21; Babitz, 2001; Reid, 2002). Clearly, expectations of the community college CEO are changing to include this function as a central part of the job description. Our focus group participants noted that the majority of them started their presidential careers with little to no expectation

of leading fundraising efforts; but that it is now a requirement for the job and can take as much to 40 percent of their time.

Teaching, Reaching, and Leadership Transitions

At a time when more learners are coming our way in an array of patterns and as we struggle with a lack of resources, more faculty, administrators, and staff are leaving at alarming rates (Q8; Q10). We refer to this trend cluster as Teaching, Reaching, and Leadership Transitions. These turnover waves are often due to the large cohorts approaching retirement age. Correspondingly, there is an acute need to prepare new faculty and staff for the realities of work in the community college and build their commitment to the unique educational mission of our institutions (Q12; Q26). However, in times of rising enrollment and diminished budgets, community colleges are often forced to rely heavily on part-time faculty; which can bring its own challenges of creating positive and productive inclusion (Q11; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1996). Moreover, the role of leader in the community college is becoming difficult to fill. Indeed, many high-qualified professionals do not even consider putting their proverbial toe in the water because of the rising stress and increasing political exposure of these positions (Q27).

We note, also, a key issue in this cluster that emerged during the focus group. We may be facing these transitions and wrestling with the issues of new faculty and

staff; however, many institutions are not handling well the process of saying goodbye gracefully to those who have dedicated 30-40 years of their lives to our communities. Poignant stories about individuals struggling to make sense of the transition and searching for lasting connections challenge us to bring a better effort to honoring the past even as we move to the future.

Learning Dialogues and Documentation

As we move to the future, our transitioning teams will be challenged with another cluster of issues surrounding compelling Learning Dialogues and Documentation (Q31; Q32). In short, community college educators want to have more complete conversations about research that describes what works in learning and provides models of asking the hard question, “How do we know students are learning?” (McClenney, 2001; O’Banion, 1997). However, many community college performance measures are geared for other educational sectors. The clearest example of this is the focus on the number of associate degree graduates. Focus group participants noted that community colleges are often

criticized for students not completing in two years, even when the vast majority of their students are working adults — many working more than 40 hours per week. The “two-year” terminology is based on the assumption of full-time college attendance with no outside work, which is a residential university model.

The vast majority of students in community college academic transfer programs never intend to graduate from the community college. They transfer successfully with 30 or more credit hours — clearly a success; however, they are not calculated as such in most state funding formulas. Many community colleges offer in excess of 90 certification programs, providing instruction and training to industries ranging from health care to teacher education to information technology. Most performance funding formulas fail to value the certifications as much as the degree criteria, even in the face of data that show that certifications often lead to higher wages and better jobs. While almost all community college leaders embrace the notion of accountability, we need help from policymakers to champion measures based on our missions — not those of universities or K-12 institutions. We will need to send this message loudly and clearly, because legislators do not seem less interested in accountability these days (Q24).

Increasing accountability, combined with rising societal expectations, is driving many community colleges to embrace a philosophy of “learning first.” Community colleges are looking through their policies, practices, and programs to ensure they are supporting learning in the best way possible (Q28; McClenney, 2001; O’Banion & Milliron, 2001). By listening to everyone from their best teachers to frontline support

“Many community colleges offer in excess of 90 certification programs, providing instruction and training to industries ranging from health care to teacher education to information technology.”

staff, they are considering all options to improve and expand learning — and to document the outcomes. There is a specific interest in how technology can support these learning-centered strategies and help in documenting learning (Q14; Q29; Q30). Several respondents noted the need for good training in how to best use technology to improve learning and create lasting connections to students (Q9; Q19).

“Community colleges of the future will need to be adept at blending high-tech and high-touch as they create strong connections with their learners.”

High-Tech and High-Touch Creativity and Connection

Another trend cluster that emerged closely relates to Learning Dialogues and Documentation is High-Tech and High-Touch Creativity and Connection. Several of the write-in comments and responses noted the need for an exploration of the return on technology investment (Q15), in particular seeing results in creative and connective learning outcomes. Community colleges have long been noted for their creativity and connectivity. Particularly in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, community colleges were often called the “speedboats” of American higher education (Gleazer, 1980). Today, we are seeing a similar dexterity, with community colleges working

hard to provide anytime, anyplace learning and service in a wide variety of modalities to all students (Q6; Q13; Q19; Q40; Q41). Whether in-class, online, over microwave broadcast, via cable stations, through video classes, or in simple open-entry/open-exit labs, community colleges often provide compelling examples of creative educators solving learning challenges. A good number of respondents noted that they are bringing a strong high-tech/high-touch focus to their design of new buildings (Q38), including the rise of cyber cafes and wireless service strategies.

Generation Y has come to expect technology tools — phone systems, websites, e-mail, and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)/Customer Relationship Management (CRM)/Learner Relationship Management (LRM) systems, and returning students increasingly need these tools to obtain access to education while working or living at a distance (Carnevale & Fry, 2000). The explosion of proprietary institutions offering online services illustrates the growing learning needs of our country, but even more, it underlines the imperative for strong support of our community colleges in the use of quality technology to teach and reach students (Q23). The best policy shift in this area may be to mirror information technology investment policy in how we fund capital projects — particularly buildings. Community colleges of the future will need to be adept at blending high-tech and high-touch as they create strong connections with their learners.

Another creative connection is the emergence of more closely aligned campus-based and online dual enrollment programs between high schools and community

colleges (Q4). The College Board and ECS are advocating these programs because they create strong connections to students, which help prepare these students well for the world of higher education (College Board, 2002; ECS, 2002d). Dual enrollment programs help advanced students get a head start on their college education, instead of “wasting” their senior year, as many studies indicate often happens (Andrews, 2000). Along similar lines, community colleges are championing policies that foster transfer of students from community colleges to four-year schools and the workplace (Q22).

Courageous Catalysts

The final issue cluster emerged as a strong sentiment from conference programs, write-in respondents, and focus groups: Courageous Catalysts. Just as a catalyst in chemistry starts a reaction, so, too, do community colleges help students spark the fire, experience the “ah-ha” and turn on the lights. By being catalysts of learning, community colleges can enable educational advancement. To advance this principle, we should do the hard work of supporting policies and programs that further catalyze the economic potential

of our students. Several focus group participants noted that this will require more consistent and effective funding for workforce development and lifelong learning (Warford, 2001). In many communities, there is no more powerful role for the local community college than the valuable services it provides through workforce and economic development. Yet because of traditional funding mechanisms based on K-12 or university models, community colleges are forced to target their efforts toward academic, credit-based programs because these earn full-formula funding.

We must also be courageous catalysts of learning that provides life, civic and engagement skills (Q18; Q32; Q37; Q39). These “habits of life” or “higher learning” includes key skills in communication, numeracy, technology, information management, personal management, interpersonal relations, community awareness, critical thinking, and problem solving (Freidman, 2000, 2002). It is the need for these skills that should drive us to support what has been called in other venues “education in a digital democracy” (Gonick & Milliron, 2003; Milliron, 2003). Without these skills, our cities, states, and countries will be hard-pressed to face the dynamics of the next decade.

In order to take this courageous catalyst stance, we must model it internally. Survey respondents and focus group participants noted the special need to develop a culture that is open to change, respectful of others, and open to creative solutions (Q18; Q26). In essence, we need to “walk” our “talk” on campus before we can truly make a difference in the lives of our students and communities. All too often educators sit back and let “dogmatic diatribes” dominate campus dialogues (Milliron & Johnson, 2002). We will need to do better if we truly wish to make the most of the community college.

“If we can rise to this challenge, and learn in the process, we are sure to inherit the future and truly make the most of community colleges as we travel down the road ahead.”

Conclusion

As professional educators, we are always well served to explore the dynamics and trends that impact our work. Clearly, this time of drastic change will not leave us anytime soon. Moreover, community colleges are well positioned to meet the economic, educational, and social challenges our society faces during these dynamic times. However, to play the best role possible in facing these challenges, we need to wrestle with and develop strategies surrounding the key trends impacting our field: trends like, learning swirl; partnership programs; funding agony and opportunity; teaching, reaching, and leading transitions; learning dialogues and documentation; high-tech/high-touch creativity and connection; and courageous catalysts. If we can rise to this challenge, and learn in the process, we are sure to inherit the future and truly make the most of community colleges as we travel down the road ahead.

This article originally appeared in *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, February, 28, 105-122, and is reprinted here thanks to the support of Dr. Barbara Selke-Kern, Executive Vice Chancellor, TSTC System. Dr. de los Santos was a featured speaker at TSTC's Edge 2005 in Harlingen, Texas.

INDEX

What Do CEOs Want To Know About Key Trends in the Community College?

A Survey of and for League Alliance CEOs

This survey is a follow-up to our extensive 1997 and 2000 studies of key trends in the community college. Like the previous studies, it is composed of questions exploring major trends in the community college field as identified in current national literature and conference programs.

These survey results are composed of the responses submitted by your fellow CEOs as part of the Alliance quarterly CEO survey service. The response rate for this survey was 37% (n=267).

A. Demographic Information: Male: 73%; Female 27%; Age: 57 (mean)

Tenure as President in Years: 9.2 mean

B. Do you believe that in the next 3 years at your institution:

	YES!	Yes	yes	?	no	No	NO!
1. Credit enrollment will increase.	52%	32%	10%	0%	3%	2%	1%
2. Noncredit, workforce enrollment will decrease.	11%	11%	9%	5%	18%	22%	24%
3. Minority enrollment will increase.	27%	33%	28%	5%	3%	3%	1%
4. Dual-credit programs with local high schools will expand.	22%	30%	27%	8%	6%	5%	2%
5. International student populations will decrease.	2%	5%	19%	19%	31%	17%	7%
6. Information technology access and instruction for low-income students will be an increasing institutional priority.	14%	35%	32%	8%	8%	2%	1%
7. More incoming students will already hold at least a bachelor's degree (e.g., in programs such as allied health, technology).	3%	23%	49%	10%	12%	3%	0%
8. Your institution will experience significant employee turnover.	11%	24%	28%	3%	20%	12%	2%
9. Technology support costs will increase with rising needs and expectations.	32%	43%	21%	2%	2%	0%	0%

INDEX

	YES!	Yes	yes	?	no	No	NO!
10. More full-time faculty will retire in the next three years than did in the last 10 years.	18%	27%	20%	5%	20%	8%	2%
11. The number of part-time faculty will decrease.	2%	3%	8%	3%	25%	36%	23%
12. Orienting and training new faculty and staff will be an increasingly important institutional priority.	26%	46%	25%	1%	2%	0%	0%
13. Web-based tools will be used as a key part of Student Services.	40%	36%	23%	1%	0%	0%	0%
14. You will replace at least part of your Student Info. System, HR System, or Finance System.	31%	24%	16%	4%	12%	6%	7%
15. Governing boards and legislatures will be less interested in seeing a return on investment from information technology.	1%	7%	9%	13%	22%	29%	19%
16. There will be a greater need for public service workers (e.g., teachers, nurses, police officers, EMTs) in your service area.	40%	39%	18%	2%	1%	0%	0%
17. Budget cuts will force program closings and redesigns.	25%	32%	29%	6%	6%	2%	0%
18. You will engage strategies to promote more civility in the campus community.	14%	27%	38%	15%	6%	0%	0%
19. High-tech initiatives will be more likely to include high-touch (e.i., more personal contact) components.	9%	42%	36%	10%	2%	1%	0%
20. Developing and maintaining partnerships with local corporations will become less important.	4%	2%	2%	1%	11%	33%	47%
21. Supporting foundation efforts to raise funds to support institutional activities will become an increasing expectation for CEOs.	56%	35%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%
22. Better facilitating successful transitions between the college and other educational sectors and between the college and the workplace, will be an increasing priority.	38%	46%	14%	2%	0%	0%	0%

INDEX

	YES!	Yes	yes	?	no	No	NO!
23. For-profit educational providers will expand their operations in your service area.	19%	32%	27%	11%	8%	3%	0%
24. Legislators will call for less accountability from colleges.	1%	0%	1%	1%	8%	22%	67%
25. Flux in funding will make it increasingly difficult to meet the challenges of rising enrollment.	49%	32%	16%	1%	2%	0%	0%
26. Helping foster a culture that can positively manage change will become essential.	50%	38%	10%	0%	1%	1%	0%
27. Recruiting professionals for leadership positions will become increasingly difficult.	25%	42%	17%	6%	7%	3%	0%
28. You will adopt strategies from the learning-centered education movement.	27%	39%	27%	6%	0%	1%	0%
29. Knowledge management strategies— using technology to capture key expertise in functional areas (e.g., advising)— will be used to adapt to increasing employee turnover.	13%	32%	38%	11%	4%	2%	0%
30. Fewer attempts will be made to base decisions on quality data from college information systems.	1%	1%	2%	3%	12%	35%	46%
31. Findings from brain-research and learning studies will be used to guide new curriculum development.	6%	19%	39%	22%	9%	4%	1%
32. Steps will be taken to modify the general education core to meet the learning needs of the 21st century student.	15%	33%	42%	6%	3%	1%	0%
33. The mission of workforce training will become less important.	0%	1%	3%	1%	10%	29%	56%
34. Basic skills=developmental programs will increase enrollment.	19%	39%	29%	5%	5%	2%	1%
35. The number of certificate programs will decrease.	3%	2%	6%	4%	30%	34%	21%
36. The number of alternative program offerings (accelerated degree programs, inter-institutional program partnerships)will increase.	22%	36%	29%	6%	4%	1%	2%

INDEX

	YES!	Yes	yes	?	no	No	NO!
37. Your college will expand programming to help encourage the civic engagement of students (e.g., voting, volunteerism, civic involvement).	11%	30%	41%	12%	6%	0%	0%
38. New facilities will be built for campus-based programs.	28%	29%	32%	4%	1%	4%	2%
39. Fostering students' personal responsibility and empowerment will become less important.	0%	2%	2%	3%	22%	44%	27%
40. Your college will be challenged to more creative with programming and services.	49%	38%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
41. You will explore offering bachelor 's degrees in specific programs.	12%	11%	12%	9%	18%	15%	23%
42. Your institution will significantly increase tuition.	21%	27%	28%	5%	10%	4%	5%

References

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2002). Notable alumni [On-line] Available: www.aacc.nche.edu
- Andrews, H. (2000/2001, December/January). The dual-credit explosion at Illinois' Community College. *Community College Journal. American Association of Community Colleges*, 71,12-16.
- Babitz, B. (2001). Building on your foundation. Phoenix, Arizona: League for Innovation in the Community College [On-line]. *Leadership Abstracts*, 14(4). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leadership/labs0801.htm>
- Boggs, G., & Bragg, S. (1999). Teaching the teachers: Meeting the National Teacher Preparation Challenge. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College [On-line]. *Leadership Abstracts*, 12(1). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leadership/labs0299.htm>
- Carnevale, A., & Fry, R. (2000). *Crossing the great divide: Can we achieve equity when generation Y goes to college?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Cheney, G., & Tompkins, P. K. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal*, 38,115.
- The College Board. (2002). *Office of Community College Relations* [On-line]. Available: www.collegeboard.org/about/programs/com/com.htm
- Daggett, W. (2001). *The skills and knowledge our future graduates will need: The charge to community colleges*. In keynote presentation: Conference on Information Technology, League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Davis, B., & Wessel, D. (1998). *Prosperity: The coming 20-year boom and what it means to You*. New York: Random House.
- de los Santos, G., de los Santos Jr., A., & Milliron, M. (2001). *Access in the information age: Community colleges bridging the digital divide*. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- de los Santos, G., de los Santos Jr., A., & Milliron, M. (2003). *From digital divide to digital democracy*. Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Education Commission of the States.(2002a). *Community college role in teacher preparation*. Available: www.communitycollegepolicy.org/html/policy_issues.htm
- Education Commission of the States. (2002b). *Education issue document* [On line]. Available: www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/22/86/2286.htm
- Education Commission of the States. (2002c). *Policy issue: Remedial education* [On-line]. Available: www.communitycollegepolicy.org/html/Issues/Remedial/overview_RE.htm
- Education Commission of the States. (2002d). *Transfer/articulation* [On-line]. Available: www.ecs.org/html/IssueSection.asp?issueid¼142&s¼Overview.
- Friedman, T. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Anchor.
- Gleazer, E. (1980). *The community college: Values, vision and vitality*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Gonick, L., & Milliron, M. (2003). The imperative to respond to global forces with a

- global education strategy. *Converge Magazine*, February/March.
- Greenspan, A. (2000). *Committee on Education and the Workforce testimony*. U. S. House of Representatives.
- Hoffer, E. (1973). *Reflections on the human condition*. New York: HarperCollins.
- McCabe, R. (2000). *No one to waste, a report to public decision-makers and community college leaders*. Washington, DC: Community College Press, American Association of Community Colleges.
- McCabe, R. (2003). *Yes we can*. Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College, American Association of Community Colleges.
- McClenney, K. (2001). *Learning from the learning colleges: Observations along the journey* [On-line]. Phoenix, Arizona: League for Innovation in the Community College. *Learning Abstracts*, 4(2). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/learning/lleabs0103.htm>
- Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded Sourcebook*. London: Sage.
- Milliron, M. (1995). *Toward a model of part-time faculty integration in American community colleges*. Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Milliron, M. (2003). On the road to dotcalm in education. In *From digital divide to digital democracy*. G. de los Santos, A. de los Santos and M. Milliron (Eds.) Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College, pp. 127-145.
- Milliron M., & Doty, A. (1998). *What do CEOs want to know about .. leadership transitions?* Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Milliron, M., & Johnson, S. (2002). Avoiding the dialectic dialogue of dogmatic diatribes. *Converge Magazine*, June-July.
- Milliron, M., & Leach, E. (1997). Community colleges winning through innovation: Taking on the changes and choices of leadership in the twenty-first century. Special Edition Leadership Abstract. Commissioned by IBM and Peoplesoft. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Milliron, M., & Miles, C. (2000). Seven signs on the road ahead for Community colleges. In M. Milliron & C. Miles (Eds.), *Taking a big picture look@technology, learning, & the community college*. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College, pp. 145.
- Milliron, M. D. & Miles, C. (2000). Education in a digital democracy: Leading the charge for learning about, with, and beyond technology. *Educause Review*, November-December.
- National Association of Community College Teacher Education Programs Report.(2002). National Association of Community College Teacher Education Programs Proposal Maricopa Community Colleges, Cerritos College.
- NationalAlliance of Business (2001) Certification panel. [Online]. Available: www.nab.com.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1998). *Projections of educational statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: Onyx Press/American Council on Education.

- O'Banion, T., & Milliron, M. (2001). College conversations on learning [On-line]. Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College. *Learning Abstracts*, 4(5). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/learning/lleabs0109.htm>
- Phillippe, K., & Valiga, M. (2000). *Faces of the future: A portrait of America's community college students*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Quinley, J., & Quinley, M. (1998). From pipelines to cycles: Changing the way we think about learning and learners [On-line]. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College. *Learning Abstracts*, 1(2). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/learning/lleabs9811.html>
- Reid, B. (2000). Rising star: A community college foundation at work [On-line]. Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College. *Leadership Abstracts*, 13(6). Available: <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leadership/absl1200.htm>
- Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1996). Developing a part-time faculty support system that makes sense. *Academic Leadership: Journal of the National Community College Chair Academy*, 3(4).
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Census 2002*. Washington, D.C: Department of Commerce.
- Warford, L. (December/January, 2000/2001). Funding, a national priority. *Community College Journal*. American Association of Community Colleges, 71,1623.

© 2005 by Mark David Milliron and Gerardo E. de los Santos