

AACJC

K. Patricia Cross
Conner Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Carolyn has given us great information about the attributes of leadership as seen by those who are in the best position to know -- today's practitioners of the art and science of educational leadership. Richard has described the implementation of a successful program of in-service training where success is judged by the pragmatic criterion of whether it works in practice. My assignment is to look to the future. What will tomorrow's leaders need, and how can we prepare them for a world in which the leadership tasks are unknown, but at least are the "best guesses" of people who have given some thought and attention to the future of community colleges?

For professional and thoughtful "best guesses" about the directions in which community colleges **should** move in the future, I am going to take as my text the report of the AACJC Commission on the Future of community colleges. And then I am going to try to match the leadership needs for the future as seen by the Commission to the preparation of doctoral students who are in training now to provide leadership for community colleges in the 21st century.

My task, as I see it this morning, is to talk about two activities in which I have been closely involved in the past two years. I had the opportunity to serve on the AACJC Commission on the Future, which exposed me to stimulating conversations with community

college leaders from across the nation. Coming together for meetings over a period of 18 months gave us an unusual opportunity to meld a diversity of viewpoints from the commissioners and from the field into a shared vision of what community colleges should be in the 21st century.

The second activity in which I have been privileged to participate is the development of a new doctoral program in higher education at the University of California, Berkeley. Here too I found that the task was to meld a variety of viewpoints and perspectives into a shared vision of how to train community college leaders for California and the nation. In this case, the task was to merge the academic emphases of a research university and its graduate divisions with the demands for practical realities of real world leadership of community colleges.

Let me start this inquiry into the requirements for the next generation of community college leadership by selecting from the Commission report those visions of the future that seem to me to have the greatest relevance for graduate training.

The report, Building Communities, has a dual theme, which the Commissioners expressed in these words, "Building Community through dedicated teaching is the vision and the inspiration of this report." (p. 8). To some extent, the title of the report has eclipsed the importance of the dual objectives of building community through directing the attention and energies of all faculty and staff to the shared mission of educating students.

The concept of "building community" has both internal and external components. Perhaps the most widely quoted phrase from

the Commission's report is "We define the term 'community' not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created." Most people think first of the external reaching out mission of community colleges to form partnerships with others in the geographical region - high schools, four-year colleges, employers, community agencies and the like. By and large, today's community college leaders have been quite successful in establishing the image of community colleges as serving the needs of the region through cooperation and partnerships. They have been less successful, according to their own perceptions, in creating a climate of community in their own colleges.

When I analyzed data from the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI) (Cross and Fideler 1989), I found that the greatest discrepancy between what administrators thought was desirable and what they saw on their own campuses occurred on the dimension of "College Community." Community college presidents did not see the trust, commitment, open communication, and respect that make up the the Community scale of the Community College Goals Inventory. Lack of a "climate" of community was, in short, the single greatest source of discomfort and dissatisfaction of community college leaders in 1985.

If *building community* is, in the eyes of the Commissioners, the call of the future, and if today's CEOs are dissatisfied with it now, the question for all of us is, how do we help leaders to create the "climate" of community on their own campuses?

Most books and courses on leadership emphasize the interpersonal and organizational skills involved in building high

morale and camaraderie in organizations. The Commission, however, perceives morale as an **outcome** of a shared vision rather than a goal in itself. The subtitle of the chapter on "College as Community, for example, is "A Vision Shared," and the Commissioners observe that, "Community colleges have begun to lose their vitality precisely because there is no vision widely shared." (p. 29) The college must be held together, says the Commission, by a larger vision that pulls people together in a common task

The extraordinary vitality of the community college movement in the 1960s was stimulated and maintained for several decades by the vision -- widely shared -- of the community college as the "open door" of access to higher education. Once the doors of higher education have been opened, however, what is the vision that provides vitality for the community college?

The Commission sees the new vision as the provision of an education of quality for the new segments of the population so recently gaining access. "The community college should be the nation's premier teaching institution," say the Commissioners. "Quality instruction should be the hallmark of the movement." (p. 25). While community colleges have always been teaching institutions, this report challenges them to be the best of those. "Teaching," say the Commissioners, "is the heartbeat of the educational enterprise and, when it is successful, energy is pumped into the community, continuously renewing and revitalizing the institution. Therefore excellence in teaching is the means by which the vitality of the college is extended and a network of intellectual enrichment and cultural understanding is built." (p. 7-8).

My conclusion from the conversations and recommendations of the Commission on the Future is that the next generation of community college leaders will have to be able to do two things: First, they will have to create a climate on their campuses of a shared vision of community colleges as the nation's "premier teaching institutions," and second, they will have to make "quality instruction the hallmark of the movement."

With that very brief synopsis of what I think is the major message of the Futures Report, I have set the stage for the second part of my assignment today which is to attempt to answer the specific and challenging question, What are we at UC Berkeley doing to train future generations of community college leaders? How can we help them provide the type of leadership that will unite the faculty and everyone else at the college in the shared vision of the community college as "the nation's premier teaching institution?"

My experience at Berkeley, as in the Commission, is that visions, programs, missions are strongest when they are gained through the hard work of taking the best of diverse perspectives and merging them into a shared vision that is stronger than any single vision. Our task in developing the doctoral program at Berkeley is to merge the strengths of a great research university with the practical and realistic needs of the community college.

Somewhat to my own surprise and perhaps yours, I am not going to spend much time talking about the Berkeley doctoral program as a sequence of courses. The curriculum is important, and we as a faculty spend most of our time in "developing" a program and recruiting faculty to teach in it. But a sequence of courses does

not a program make. A doctoral program dedicated to the serious business of training the next generation of community college leaders should be more than a set of courses, more than an endurance test to see who can persist in spite of adult pressures to quit "going to school and get on with life," more than a toolbox of skills enabling one to deal with the practical realities of budgets and management. Given the enormous commitment of time and resources on the part of both individuals and the state, it is not too much to demand that three to eight years of doctoral study should be an experience unlike any other.

Let me talk first about what is probably our strongest and most controversial feature--the requirement that all first-year students be full time students in residence at the University. People have said to me, how can you of all people, who have written persuasively about the needs of adults for part-time programs that recognize their responsibilities as workers, parents, and citizens of the community, espouse a requirement of full-time study?

My answer is that we too are in the business of creating a climate of community, a shared vision, a learning experience that immerses students in a learning experience that gives them a sense of who they are and what they stand for as leaders. Ideally, that experience would involve participation in seminars, lectures, concerts, and some of the other activities associated with a great university, but above all it should provide bonding with fellow students and close association with faculty and mentors from a variety of disciplines. I simply don't believe that rushing from one's job, after a long and exhausting day, to attend one or two night

courses each semester, year after long-drawn-out-year can provide such a learning experience.

I think this first year of the residential requirement at Berkeley has demonstrated its value to students and faculty alike, and I do not foresee backing off from that requirement. That is not to say that we have made that once-in-a-lifetime year of opportunity all that it could and should be; it is to say that without it, we have much less chance of building a distinguished program.

A second feature of the Berkeley program that distinguishes it from most doctoral programs of the past and many programs today is the emphasis on **education**, writ large. We believe that we are primarily in the business of preparing leaders for colleges and universities, and only secondarily concerned with the training of **managers** of organizations. For the past quarter of a century, the curriculum in graduate schools of education has been barely distinguishable from that in graduate schools of business -- and possibly legitimately so.

In the 1960s, we were dealing with enormous growth, and administrators had to direct their energies to building and managing an expanding enterprise. The late 1970s found us still dealing with numbers and management issues, but this time it was with decline or the threat of decline. Survival, retrenchment, and the contraction of programs were the issues that challenged managerial skills.

In the mid 1980s, the entire education enterprise moved from the largely quantitative concerns of growing or declining student populations to qualitative concerns about the quality of teaching and learning. A good manager could accomplish the tasks of the eras

of growth and decline; a good manager cannot lead his or her college to distinction in addressing the quality issues that have emerged in the last five years and will predominate well into the 21st Century. Quality education will demand effective leadership of the faculty and the educational program to bring about the shared vision of a teaching institution that is called for by the Commission on the Ffuture of Community Colleges.

In conclusion, I believe that the new 21st Century community college movement is going to have to develop leaders that have a vision as great and as compelling as the vision of those who built the community colleges. That is the not immodest goal that we have set for ourselves at Berkeley.