CHALLENGES OF DEANS FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS IN THE TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

by

TERESA ANNE ALLEN

(Under the Direction of Wanda Stitt-Gohdes)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this descriptive study was to develop a profile of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) to include identified perceived job challenges related to their responsibilities. Job challenges were analyzed to see if the challenges differed based on the size of the colleges. Demographic information was gathered from the Deans, including specifics regarding the division supervised and college represented. Determining the perceived job challenges related to the daily work of deans provided awareness of where leadership development opportunities may be needed.

Deans' positions are standard personnel positions in the Academic Affairs divisions of TCSG colleges. The design for this study was exploratory and descriptive focusing only on identification of perceived job challenges of TCSG Academic Deans. To gather data for the study, an electronic survey was administered to 109 TCSG Deans representing 24 TCSG colleges. The study was modeled after the Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer (1994) national study of chairpersons in community colleges.

Midlevel academic leadership in community and technical colleges provide support to chief academic officers. One may be speculate that midlevel academic leaders have always been

a part of higher education, these positions only have come into being in the past few decades (Robillard, 2000). A wide variety of job titles can be found for these midlevel academic leaders. Gillett-Karam (1999) and Wild, Ebbers, Shelley, and Gmelch (2003) reported common job titles for midlevel academic leaders include deans, academic deans, assistant deans, directors, department heads, department chairs, division chairs, and program coordinators.

Midlevel academic leaders "wear many hats." The multiplicity of responsibilities are demanding an the leader may need to use different leadership approaches, motivational techniques, and creative strategies that offer intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards. The midlevel academic leader has a responsibility to assist faculty in understanding the mission, purpose, and goals of the college. Midlevel academic leaders should be focused on eliminating problems hindering goal attainment. Adjustments may need to be made according to the needs of the faculty and based on the complexity or understanding of the tasks required (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Tucker, 1984).

INDEX WORDS: Deans, Department Chairs, Technical Colleges, Technical Education, Technical College System of Georgia, TCSG, Community Colleges, Leadership, Professional Development, Deans' Challenges

CHALLENGES OF DEANS FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS IN THE TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

by

TERESA ANNE ALLEN

B.S.Ed. Georgia Southern College, 1995

M.Ed., Georgia Southern College, 1996

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

CHALLENGES OF DEANS FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS IN THE TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

by

TERESA ANNE ALLEN

Major Professor:	Wanda Stitt-Gohdes
Committee:	Karen H. Jones
	Robert C. Wicklein

Electronic Version Approved:

Julie Coffield
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2014

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family: my husband T-Bone, our daughter Tiffany, our "extra" daughter Jessica, my parents, and my siblings.

T-Bone, it wouldn't ever have been possible if you had not been so supportive and understanding of the fact that I just wanted this degree. It certainly hasn't been easy; in fact, our lives have had some definite twists and turns during the process of me working on my doctorate. But through it all, the ups and downs, the good and the bad, you loved me, you believed in me, and so very often told me you were proud of me when I needed it the most.

Tiffany, if you take anything from me in my life, I hope that is it that you will pursue the direction for your life with the same passion and persistence that I have dedicated to earning this degree. Our endeavors over the past few years have been very similar—a lot of struggles and a lot of unfortunate circumstances crossing our paths. But through it all there is a plan for our lives. I hope you discover your plan and live it to its fullest. Always remember how much I love you!

Jessica, you came into our home as if you were ours. I hope that over the years, I've taught you the importance of standing on your own, learning from everything you do, and the importance of an education. I hope you continue to pursue your educational goals, be dedicated to your career, and have a happy and successful life. Keep in mind a saying I said to you often—nothing is given to us in life, you have to earn it. I'm proud of you!

To my mother and daddy, Eugene and Geneva Bowen. Throughout my life you instilled deep values concerning the importance of education and an undeniable work ethic. I'm proud of

my value system and attribute that to your love, your dedication to our family, and your unwavering faith. To my other parents, Don and Sybil Allen, thank you for loving me and always being supportive of my career goals, even when it took us away from home.

Growing up I always had the support of my siblings (Gene and Kay, Ellen and Barry, and Mike and Terri). You were always there to give lots of advice. Thank you for loving me, encouraging me, teaching me so many things, and pushing me to be the best at whatever I did. You all mean the world to me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thank you to my major professor, Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes. You always encouraged me and told me that I could accomplish this goal. Thank you for your help and guidance in this entire process. I'm not sure if I would have ever been able to complete everything if it hadn't been for you. Thanks also to Dr. Karen Jones and Dr. Robert Wicklein for serving on my committee and providing guidance in this endeavor. Also, thanks to Dr. Desna Wallin for serving as a major inspiration in pursuing this degree. I'm very appreciative to have had your guidance during the pursuit of this degree. Thank you to a lot of friends and coworkers for believing I could finish this degree. Some of you didn't think I could do it, and sometimes that's what kept me pushing to finish. To Amanda, Vince, Margaret, Glenn, John, Jim, Thomas, and Laree—thank you from the bottom of my heart—you were there when I needed you and stuck it out with me to the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary community college literature has documented an imminent leadership crisis (American Council on Education, 2009; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Boggs, 2003; Cejda & Jolley, 2013; Duree, 2008; Duree & Ebbers, 2012; Eddy, 2009; Eddy, 2013; Filan & Seagren, 2003; Luna, 2010; Robison, Sugar, & Miller, 2010; Shults, 2001). Community and technical colleges across the country have seen these predictions become reality as they have experienced a large number of retirements, specifically in the ranks of senior leadership. Community college senior leadership has begun to examine the topic of future leadership to ensure that upcoming leaders are being developed to step into vacant positions (Wallin, Cameron, & Sharples, 2005). The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the national umbrella organization representing community and technical colleges, has increased its commitment to leadership development as integral to the success of the community college system in America (Shults, 2001).

In examining some of the first university organizational structures, Tucker (1992) noted that in the second half of the 1700s, "colleges were administered by presidents who personally served as scholar, leader, teacher, chief disciplinarian, librarian, admissions officer, keeper of student records, business manager, secretary of the faculty, and secretary of the board of governors" (p. 14). In the late 1800s, administrative structures for higher education organizations began to change. Librarians, registrars, and academic deans became the next level of administration. Academic deans may have had a variety of responsibilities including students,

curricular matters, and disciplinary proceedings. Additional administrative levels began to appear including student services personnel, admissions staff, and business managers. All of these positions were generally considered part-time responsibilities because the persons performing these duties also were faculty. Through the years, faculty began to organize themselves into separate departments, generally grouping themselves into similar curricular units (Tucker, 1992).

Contemporary community and technical colleges have organizational structures similar in nature to the university structures in the 1800s. As Cohen and Brawer (1996) described the administration of community colleges, they used phrases such as governance, administration, state-level coordination, college organization, and leadership models. Regardless of the terms used to describe community college organizational structures, Cohen and Brawer said "the one constant is that the colleges are complex entities, and a description of one never quite fits the other" (p. 101).

Typically, community colleges have a chief executive officer, commonly referred to as a president or director. Beyond the chief executive officer, community college departmental structures vary in nature and scope, but commonly are organized according to the specialization of job responsibilities such as academic affairs, student affairs, and administrative operations (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

The academic affairs division for community colleges usually employs the largest number of persons primarily because faculty is included in this division. Positions include a chief academic officer, deans, department chairs, and faculty. Deans and department chairs are considered midlevel academic leaders. Their purpose is to ensure that the academic responsibilities are organized and handled in a manner that promotes a high degree of accountability and instructional integrity (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Midlevel academic leadership in community and technical college structures provides support to the chief academic officers; and although it may be speculated that midlevel academic leaders have always been a part of higher education, these positions only have come into being in the past few decades (Robillard, 2000). A wide variety of job titles can be found for these midlevel academic leaders. Gillett-Karam (1999) and Wild, Ebbers, Shelley, and Gmelch (2003) reported common job titles for midlevel academic leaders include deans, academic deans, assistant deans, directors, department heads, department chairs, division chairs, and program coordinators. According to a study conducted by Gillett-Karam, Smith, and Simpson (1997), job titles usually reflect the specific area of responsibility, such as Director for Health Sciences or General Education Department Chair.

Midlevel academic leaders often "wear many hats." The multiplicity of responsibilities is demanding in that the leader may need to use different leadership approaches, motivational techniques, and creative strategies that offer intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards. The midlevel academic leader has a responsibility to assist faculty in understanding the mission, purpose, and goals of the college. And, the midlevel academic leader should be focused on eliminating problems that hinder goal attainment. Adjustments may need to be made according to the needs of the faculty and based on the complexity or understanding of the tasks required (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Tucker, 1984).

This study focused on specific academic midlevel leaders, the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG). This leadership position is a standard personnel position in the Academic Affairs divisions of all TCSG institutions, reporting directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This study was launched to identify the challenges these leaders face. This section includes statement of the problem, conceptual

framework, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations, and a summary.

Statement of the Problem

While Georgia has a rich history of offering postsecondary technical education opportunities for its citizens dating back to the 1940s, the current structure of the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) is relatively young; in fact, it is only 26 years old. In 1988, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE) was created. In 2008, the GDTAE was renamed the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG).

Prior to 1988, Georgia's postsecondary vocational and technical education system existed as area vocational schools, managed by local boards of education. Later, the schools were classified as technical institutes; and in the year 2000, the institutes were renamed colleges. From 1999 - 2013, the technical colleges in Georgia experienced rapid growth in student enrollment and graduate numbers. Unduplicated enrollment increased from 93,431 students in 1999 (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 1999a]) to 151,150 students in 2013 (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013a]), an increase of 62%. Unduplicated graduates increased from 13,960 in 1999 (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 1999b]) to 28,278 in 2013 (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013b]), an increase of 103%.

The system has been successful by concentrating on workforce development needs, focusing on customers and their needs, developing and enhancing relationships and partnerships with business and industry, and delivering quality programs and services (Breeden, n.d.).

As Georgia's technical college system developed, the organizational structures of the individual colleges experienced change. When GDTAE was formed in 1988, the colleges generally had a flat organizational structure consisting of only one or two divisions. Today

Georgia's technical colleges commonly have an organizational structure comprised of multiple divisions. While each technical college in the system has the latitude to establish its own administrative structure, each college typically has the following divisions: President's Office, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Institutional Effectiveness, Administrative Services, and Economic Development.

The Academic Affairs Division is supervised by a Vice President for Academic Affairs. This division is responsible for hiring and supervision of faculty; designing, developing, and delivering instruction for occupational programs and general education components; ensuring that classrooms and laboratories are equipped with appropriate equipment, tools, and supplies; overseeing curricula matters; and establishing and evaluating learning outcomes (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013c]).

The Academic Affairs division also includes midlevel administrators—Deans for Academic Affairs, Associate and/or Assistant Deans, Library Services staff, and other support staff. The midlevel academic leaders, Deans for Academic Affairs including Associate and/or Assistant Deans, oversee the faculty and the instructional programs areas of the colleges. Furthermore, the number of Deans, Associate, and/or Assistant Deans varies in number generally based on the number of educational programs, the number of faculty, and/or the size of the technical college. While a definite number of Deans' positions at TCSG technical colleges are not regulated by TCSG, colleges typically employ two to ten midlevel academic leaders as reported by the Academic Affairs or the Institutional Effectiveness divisions at each technical college.

The position of Dean for Academic Affairs is a relatively new employee classification in the Technical College System of Georgia. When the system was first created in the late 1980s,

the academic divisions were managed by a vice president or director who dealt directly with faculty issues. As Georgia's technical college system grew, additional staff was needed. TCSG's job description for Deans for Academic Affairs' responsibilities include, but are not limited to, tasks such as hiring and supervising full-time and adjunct faculty, designing course schedules, assigning faculty class loads, evaluating faculty, developing new programs, overseeing off-campus programs, dealing with student issues, reviewing curriculum changes, complying with accreditation guidelines, and managing budgets (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013d]).

TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs are assigned supervisory responsibilities according to broad or specific instructional program groups. The Deans for Academic Affairs supervise divisions or departments organized according to the type or similarity of programs such as Allied Health, Business, Professional Services, General Education, or others as determined by the college. The number of Deans per technical college generally varies based on the size of the college as determined by enrollment, the number and location of campus sites, and the distinctiveness of programs offered at the technical college.

Like other technical and community colleges across the country, the TCSG has also experienced new leadership in senior administration including Deans for Academic Affairs. Much of this new leadership has resulted from retirement, consolidation of colleges, and/or normal attrition. From 2009-2012, seventeen technical colleges were consolidated into eight colleges resulting in the reduction of presidents, vice-presidents, and other administrative positions, including Deans for Academic Affairs (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013e]).

In the late 1990s, Georgia's Technical College System recognized that senior administration leadership development had to be a priority for the continued success of Georgia's technical colleges. The University of Georgia's College of Education began to offer a doctoral program for the development of executive leaders for Georgia's technical colleges. The program expanded beyond Georgia's technical colleges and included access for others who may be interested in the leadership development for community and technical colleges. Georgia's technical colleges took an important step in planning for succession by partnering with the University of Georgia to offer the Community and Technical College Leadership Initiative (CTCLI), a doctoral program emphasizing leadership. This program has since been replaced with the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Workforce Education offered at the University of Georgia, Griffin campus.

Although the CTCLI assisted in leadership development for TCSG College administrators, including Deans for Academic Affairs, the TCSG has devoted little attention in developing specific leadership development opportunities for Deans in Georgia's technical colleges. In fact, discrepancies exist as to the prerequisite skills, educational qualifications, and/or previous work experiences needed by Deans for Academic Affairs. Questions abound as to whether the Deans for Academic Affairs have been provided the necessary leadership training to carry out one of the most important functions of Georgia's technical colleges—overseeing the day-to-day instructional processes. Many of these midlevel academic leaders may have been forced to learn their jobs by simply participating in "learn as you go" experiences" or "on-the-job" training.

As the TCSG began to form in the late 1980s, new positions were developed in the system, and peer groups were established to provide an avenue of meeting routinely with others

in similar positions in the system. These peer groups exist for most every professional level of personnel including presidents, vice-presidents for academic affairs, student affairs, administrative services, economic development, and institutional effectiveness; director level positions such as registrars and informational technology personnel; and program specific faculty. However, an organized peer group for Georgia's technical college Deans for Academic Affairs to interact with and share common experiences was not in existence until 2008. Even with the establishment of this peer group, the Deans of Academic Affairs Council did not regularly meet or function as a peer group in the same manner as other TCSG peer groups. In 2013, efforts were made to revitalize the peer group for the Deans for Academic Affairs with the establishment of a planning group of Deans Executive Council Members to plan future peer group meetings for TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs (Technical College System of Georgia, 2014).

Conceptual Framework

Central to the overall mission of community colleges is the ability to adapt to changes in the social and political dimensions of society, primarily to meet the workforce needs of business and industry (Levin, 1998; Goldberg, 1990). Cohen and Brawer (2003) believe that community college success is grounded on effective leadership and the understanding of how to lead colleges, encouraging optimal effort in achieving goals. Midlevel academic leaders perform an array of responsibilities, have varying sets of skills, experience a multitude of stress factors, and have inconsistent career paths (Anderson, Murray, Olivarez, 2002; Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gillett-Karam, Cameron, Messina, Mitelstet, Mulder, Sykes, & Thornton, 1999; Robillard, 2000; Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, 1994; Wild, Ebbers, Shelley, & Gmelch, 2003). However, when researching studies related to

midlevel academic leaders in the Technical College System of Georgia, only two research studies were found. Daniel in 2009 investigated factors influencing performance of academic middle managers. Reddick (2007) conducted a study examining emotional intelligence and leadership development of department chairs.

Community college midlevel academic leaders commonly enter their positions from the faculty ranks (Thomas & Schuh, 2004). In referring to department chairs, one type of midlevel academic leader, Birnbaum (1988) believed that chairs usually have two common characteristics, "…they have served successfully as a faculty member, and they have little or no formal preparation for their new position" (p. 13). Rarely is there a formal education degree or a specific training program that outlines the responsibilities of community or technical college midlevel academic leaders. Thomas and Schuh claim that serving in a midlevel academic position requires two sets of distinct skills and behaviors, management and leadership.

Management and leadership bear a resemblance, yet they exist independent of each other. Management theories are probably best described as the approaches used to maintain control and order among groups of people, organizations, or societies, and are justified in the use of processes that assist in maintaining order and providing control (Montana & Charnov, 2000). Leadership theories, on the other hand, are based on the approaches that leaders use to guide people, organizations, or societies. Leadership typically is thought of as being involved in the activities of subordinates and seeking ways to motivate them (Northouse, 2004).

In today's society, both managers and leaders are needed in community and technical colleges. Thomas and Schuh in their support of academic midlevel positions needing management and leadership skills, explained that management skills can be learned such as budgeting, policy development, maintaining documentation on faculty and students, producing

reports, attending to accreditation matters, providing support to students, overseeing the administration of grants and contracts, conducting meetings to disseminate information, and working with external constituencies such as advisory boards.

Leadership skills, however, are more difficult to acquire and learn. Gmelch and Miskin (1995) stated that the "…leadership challenge is to be aware of your department's past and present and to anticipate the trend of future changes that give direction, focus, and vision to inspire your faculty toward these mutual purposes" (pp. 118-119). As noted by Ebbers, Conover, and Samuels (2010), "Succession planning will become critical in the next decade. Part of the process necessitates creation of programs that will help develop future leaders" (p. 59). In order to establish and provide community and technical college leaders with appropriate leadership skills, professional development opportunities should be created and participation encouraged.

The path-goal leadership theory is considered a situational leadership approach centered on the notion that a leader's primary role is to enhance subordinate performance, expectancies, and valences (Wofford & Liska, 1993). Robert House's path-goal theory was first published in 1971 and based on employee motivational theories (House, 1971). The theory was summarized in his first path-goal article as a way to improve "personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and make the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route" (p. 324). The path-goal leadership theory focuses on a leader using four dimensions in leading others: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented. Northouse (2004) stated that the theoretical framework of the path-goal theory "informs leaders about how to choose an appropriate leadership style based on the various demands of the task and the type of subordinates being asked to do the task" (p. 131).

Path-goal leadership is applicable for midlevel academic leaders in that they often need to vary their leadership of others based on the characteristics of the subordinates. Midlevel academic leaders need to be flexible in working with the varying ability levels of faculty, provide direction for ambiguous tasks, offer words of encouragement, and carefully listen and allow participative input from faculty. Their role is complex because they serve two groups of people who often have differing opinions, college administrators and faculty. The path-goal theory provides the framework for this study as it looks specifically at midlevel academic leaders' responsibilities and the challenges they face in performing their jobs.

The path-goal leadership theory is relevant to Georgia's technical colleges. A variety of occupational areas is clustered on technical college campuses and reflects on the individual personality traits or characteristics often associated with those occupational areas. Academic midlevel leaders continually have the challenge of serving as a mediator with students and faculty members, between faculty members, and amongst academic departments. A successful and effective academic midlevel leader has to possess a high degree of interpersonal and communication skills.

An academic midlevel leader may not necessarily manage or lead all instructors in the same manner. For instance, an academic midlevel leader may not provide guidance to a practical nursing instructor in the same manner as he/she does with an automotive technology instructor. The academic midlevel leader often alters his/her approach depending on the individual and sometimes the issue at hand. The academic midlevel leader provides guidance, nurtures, elicits participation, and provides challenges to faculty. While serving in all of these roles, the academic midlevel leader may adjust his/her approach with faculty based on the varying dimensions of the faculty group. The academic midlevel leader should be observant and responsive in removing

obstacles that may hinder performance. Thus, the academic midlevel leader must be responsive to faculty members who have diverse personalities, varying educational backgrounds and range of work experiences, and generally, limited involvement in teaching/learning environments.

The midlevel academic leader's job is multifaceted. However, his/her key purpose is to assist a division in fulfilling the college and division's mission, purpose, and goals. Gmelch (2004) and Hecht (2004) proposed that in order to assist midlevel academic leaders in performing their jobs, college administrators need to identify what the midlevel academic leaders' responsibilities are and then provide leadership development opportunities to support those responsibilities. The path-goal theory of leadership emphasizes "motivating subordinates to achieve designated goals" (Northouse, 2004, p. 123). This theory provides a useful framework from which to view the challenges of the academic affairs deans in the Technical College System of Georgia.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study was to develop a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) to include identified perceived job challenges related to their responsibilities. Job challenges were analyzed to see if the challenges differed based on the size of the technical colleges. Demographic information was gathered from the Deans, including specifics regarding the division supervised and the college represented. Determining the perceived job challenges related to the daily work of the deans provided awareness of where leadership development opportunities are needed.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What perceived job challenges were identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG?
2. Do the perceived job challenges identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG differ based on the size of the technical college they represent?

For the purpose of this study, the Deans for Academic Affairs were asked to identify challenges they experience in performing their job responsibilities. Demographic information was gathered based on the Seagren et al. study (1994), *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*. This data includes (a) age, (b) gender, (c) ethnicity, (d) highest academic degree achieved, (e) number of years as a technical college faculty member, department chair, dean/director, and other administrative positions, (f) previous work experience in business/industry, four-year college or university, two year college/technical college, and K-12 schools, (g) identification of number and types of academic programs supervised, (h) number of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty supervised, and (i) number of academic deans on campus. The demographic data gathered provided a profile of the characteristics of the Deans for Academic Affairs, and contributes to the body of information concerning community and technically colleges, specifically the Technical College System of Georgia.

Importance of Study

In fulfilling the mission of the TCSG, the Deans for Academic Affairs perhaps may be one of the most important midlevel administrators in the system. The Deans interact with faculty daily, and faculty has the greatest capacity to impact student lives' either positively or negatively. Therefore, the midlevel academic leadership role is of utmost importance. This study will assist TCSG and local college administrators in better understanding the identified challenges that Deans for Academic Affairs face in fulfilling their job responsibilities. The study

also will inform the TCSG about basic demographic information concerning the Deans for Academic Affairs and the academic divisions they supervise.

This study was designed around a problem the researcher experienced firsthand. Having served as a midlevel academic leader for many years, a great deal of thought was put into how midlevel academic leaders gained the knowledge necessary to handle the responsibilities associated with the job. Perhaps an outstanding leadership characteristic existed in a person, or an instructor demonstrated exceptional teaching qualities and had been "rewarded" with a leadership position. Perhaps midlevel instructional leaders just learned how to do their jobs while they went about performing their responsibilities. A clear-cut answer could not be determined as to how midlevel academic leaders gained the knowledge they needed to lead an instructional division. Technical college constituencies— administrators, midlevel academic leaders, faculty and students—will benefit from the Deans' characteristic profile and the identification of the challenges faced by Deans for Academic Affairs in Georgia's technical colleges. This study may serve as a source of information for system staff to provide professional development opportunities aligned with the perceived challenges disclosed by the Deans for Academic Affairs in this study. Furthermore, this study may also be beneficial to community and technical college leaders beyond the state.

As a result of the rapid growth of Georgia's technical colleges, the hiring of midlevel academic leadership positions increased in the past 20 years. These midlevel academic leaders are expected to handle the day-to-day responsibilities associated with the delivery of instructional programs to students. However, many of these midlevel instructional leaders have been assigned their responsibilities with little training or professional development opportunities provided. Therefore, a gap exists in the understanding of their job responsibilities and the

challenges faced in the performance of those responsibilities. This study will attempt to bridge the gap for community college leaders, in particular Georgia's technical college academic midlevel leaders, so that Deans for Academic Affairs can provide better leadership for faculty as they carry out the mission of Georgia's technical colleges.

Limitations

According to Creswell (2003) and Farmer and Rojewski (2001), a researcher should establish the boundaries of the study. Following are a list of limitations of this study.

1. This study examined exclusively technical colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia.
2. This study only explored the perceived challenges of Deans, including Associate and Assistant Deans for Academic Affairs and not the perceived challenges of any other midlevel leadership position in the Technical College System of Georgia.

Summary

This chapter provides an overview of American community colleges and a brief history and organizational structure of the Technical College System of Georgia. The chapter presented the statement of the problem, the conceptual framework that guided the study, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the significance of the study, and the limitations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

No one could have predicted centuries ago the prominence that two-year colleges would have in the American education system today. The founders of the two-year postsecondary colleges did not speculate about what the future would be, but rather they worked to build a system that would offer students significant educational opportunities. The creators of the early two-year college system were committed to making an education accessible to anyone desiring an education. Peter Drucker, one of the most renowned management experts of the 20th century, might have been speaking about the history of two-year colleges when he stated "Predicting the future can only get you in trouble. The task is to manage what is there and to work to create what could and should be" (Drucker, 2004, p. 73). The pioneers of two-year colleges worked to create a structure they envisioned could be and should be in existence to provide students the opportunity to pursue higher education.

As community colleges grew, so did the need for leadership. One of the outcomes of this growth has been the increase in midlevel management. Midlevel academic management is of particular interest for this study as it relates to the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG).

This chapter explores the development of two-year colleges, discusses two-year colleges, and presents an overview of the TCSG. The path-goal theory of leadership will be presented, responsibilities of midlevel academic leaders discussed, challenges of midlevel academic leaders

revealed, a profile of academic leaders offered, community college size factors will be presented, and a summary provided.

Development of Two-Year Colleges

Junior Colleges

The origin of two-year colleges can be traced to the early years of the 20th century (Quigley & Bailey, 2003; Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The first public junior college in the United States, Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, was developed primarily to provide the first two years of academic coursework to students, allowing the universities to focus on providing specialized academics and graduate programs (Quigley & Bailey, 2003). During the early 1920s, junior colleges were defined as colleges that offered lower-level college courses under the governance of either a university or a secondary school system. In 1922, the American Association of Junior Colleges, known today as the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), advanced the definition to include any institution that offered two years of collegiate coursework (Bogue, 1950). And, in 1925, the definition was amended to allow junior colleges to "develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the college is located" (Bogue, p. xvii).

Community Colleges

As World War II came to an end, military men and women returned to civilian life in need of jobs. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, known today as the GI Bill, provided the avenue for removing financial obstacles for veterans to attend college. In 1947, the President's Commission on Higher Education, more commonly referred to as the Truman Commission, staunchly promoted that the American public should have unlimited access to two

years of education beyond the secondary school level (Quigley & Bailey, 2003). President Harry Truman charged the Commission to develop a system of education that would increase the availability of higher education to everyone who desired to pursue postsecondary education, and financial assistance should be available for such educational endeavors. The Commission accepted the charge and laid the momentous groundwork for the development of the community college system (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Quigley & Bailey).

The Commission felt that these new institutions needed to be called community colleges because they were designed to serve local community education needs. The organizational structures may have varied, but the prevailing feature of community colleges as dictated by the Commission was that community colleges should have close and personal relations with the community it served (Quigley & Bailey).

Technical and Career Institutes

In 1963, the federal Vocational Education Act was passed in Congress, providing an unprecedented avenue of aid to schools. So in the 1960s and 1970s, a different, but not entirely new, provision of postsecondary education began to rouse the interest of many with the development of technical and career institutions. Career and technical education programs were designed to provide support to most professional occupations. The career and technical education programs would provide college degrees below the baccalaureate level. A workforce was needed that was trained in specific support skills necessary for the continued success of professional occupations such as doctors, lawyers, and engineers (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Today's Two-Year Colleges

Two-year colleges originally emerged in the middle, serving as a bridge between high school and universities. These two-year educational institutions, whether they are referred to as

junior colleges, community colleges, or technical colleges, continue to operate in the middle. Unfortunately, these institutions still carry the label placed on them many years ago, an alternative educational option for those unable to attend four-year colleges or universities (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). However, America can be proud of its two-year educational system's beginnings, and the system should not be regarded as an alternative educational choice but rather admired as a system that was created to provide educational accessibility for its citizens. "For a remarkably diverse student population, they have long served as the gateway to higher education and thus to the middle class. It is a record for which all Americans can take great pride" (American Association of Community Colleges, 2012, p. viii).

Depending on the mission of the institution and the state governance structure of higher education, two-year colleges exist today to serve the educational and workforce needs of the communities served by the institution. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), community colleges enroll 45% of all United States undergraduate students entering college. The average age of students is 28, 57% are women, 48% are minorities, 40% are enrolled full-time, and 36% represent the first generation to attend college (American Association of Community Colleges, 2014).

Governance also is a component that varies widely in higher education institutions. In 2001, Townsend and Twombly reported that approximately nine states had at least two governing boards overseeing higher education. These states have a combination of state and/or local governance structures that coordinate community and technical colleges. These varying structures have been called into question as to whether the structures provide integrated, cost-effective systems that are meeting the current needs of higher education (Townsend & Twombly, 2001). Speculating about the future of community colleges, Cohen and Brawer (1996) wrote,

"The public's view of community colleges as agents of upward mobility for individuals seems to be shifting toward a view of the institutions as occupational training centers" (p. 246). The public has continued to support technical colleges and their workforce development mission. So is the case with Georgia.

Currently, Georgia's higher education system has two governing boards. The Georgia Board of Regents oversees the operation of the 33 public colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia (Board of Regents, 2014). The Technical College System of Georgia oversees the operation of 24 technical colleges (TCSG, 2014).

The Technical College System of Georgia

Georgia's history includes the creation and development of a postsecondary education system that was committed to providing vocational education for its citizens. Beginning in the 1940s, the Georgia State Board of Education established the provision for area trade schools; and in 1944, North Georgia Trade and Vocational School in Clarkesville became the first vocational school in Georgia with South Georgia Trade and Vocational School in Americus established in 1948. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, additional trade and vocational schools were added throughout the state. In 1984, Governor Joe Frank Harris created a third board in the state's education system and delegated the responsibilities of administering vocational education to this new board. The State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education (later changed to the State Board of Technical and Adult Education) stepped into the arena with the State Board of Education and the University System of Georgia's Board of Regents. In 1986, the conversion process began of changing the 27 area vocational schools from local Board of Education governance to state governance (Breeden, n.d.).

The Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE) was created to enhance the workforce development needs in Georgia (Breeden, n.d.). A new way of thinking began in that Georgia's leaders "recognized the need to link technical education to the needs of Georgia's businesses and industries, its people and its communities" (Breeden, n.d., p. 3). Teaching the traditional trade occupations remained important, but Georgia needed to strengthen the technical education system in order to increase the state's capability to attract and expand new economic development opportunities for the promotion of growth for Georgia. The system would progress by focusing on customers and their needs, developing and enhancing relationships and partnerships with business and industry, and committing to the delivery of quality programs and services (Breeden, n.d.).

Organizational Structure of the Technical College System of Georgia

When GDTAE was formed, the state organizational structure was primarily organized with five functional units. When the system was renamed to the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) in 2008, the organizational structure remained fundamentally the same. The Office of Administrative Services is responsible for overseeing the financial and personnel matters for the agency. The Office of Economic Development Programs is responsible for overseeing an array of workforce development initiatives including customized training for existing industries. The Office of Adult Literacy administers programs and services designed to promote the implementation of adult education programs and GED preparation. The Office of Technical Education is responsible for overseeing the academic administrative aspects for the technical colleges including curriculum design for occupational programs, student affairs functions, and institutional effectiveness design. The Office of Information Technology, Planning, and Development provides informational technology support including data

management, strategic planning, and resource development initiatives. Each of the areas is responsible for providing assistance to the technical colleges in relation to the specific function.

The State Board of Technical and Adult Education was the governing body for TCSG, establishing standards, regulations, and policies and for TCSG operations.

Beginning in the twenty-first century, Georgia's technical institutes experienced great change starting in 2000 when the institutes changed the names to technical colleges and associate degrees began to be offered. The governance body also changed its name from the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE) to the State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia (SBTCSG) in 2008. With 33 technical colleges comprising the system in 2009 and the economy experiencing a recession that was deeply affecting the state's economic status, SBTCSG began consolidating colleges. From July 2009 to July 2014, a total of 19 colleges have been consolidated into 9 colleges, reducing the number of TCSG technical colleges in Georgia to 23 (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013e]).

Each of the 23 technical colleges in Georgia has an organizational structure that is similar to TCSG's structure. Each college has a president who is responsible for the overall administration of the college. While the individual organizational structures may vary at the college level, generally divisions exist that oversee the following major functions: Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Economic Development, Student Affairs, and Institutional Effectiveness. The level of supervision for these divisions is generally a vice president who oversees the division. In some cases, a vice president may be responsible for more than one division.

The next level of administration includes directors and deans. The responsibilities of the directors and deans become more specific. For example, the Director or Dean for Library

Services is responsible for the functions of the library. In most cases, directors report directly to a vice president, but there are some directors who report directly to the president. The directors and deans are considered midlevel leaders in that the majority of day-to-day operations flow through these leaders. It is common that a college may have at least one director per division, with the exception of the Academic Affairs Division which may have multiple directors or deans. The increase in the number of directors in the Academic Affairs Division can be attributed to the multiple responsibilities found in the division. The directors in the Academic Affairs Division may be responsible for areas such as Adult Education, Information Technology, Academic Programs, Off-Campus Operations, and Library Services. The academic affairs programs generally are grouped by program similarities such as Business Technologies, General Education, Health Sciences, Industrial Technologies, etc. Deans for Academic Affairs are charged with the responsibility of overseeing certain academic programs. However, there is not an exact manner in how these programs are assigned to the deans. Many times the programs do align with the dean's professional expertise, but not necessarily. In addition, these departments may or may not have department chairs.

Current and Future State of Georgia's Technical College System

TCSG is committed to providing student access to educational opportunities through the technical colleges located in the state of Georgia. The technical colleges are charged with promoting seamless educational opportunities by partnering with local high schools to promote dual and joint enrollment opportunities, as well as colleges in the University System of Georgia. Improving basic literacy rates continues to be a focus for the technical colleges. The technical colleges work to ensure that quality educational opportunities are provided so students may succeed in their educational endeavors.

TCSG is committed to strengthening Georgia's economy by producing a trained workforce. Currently, TCSG is a leading contributor to Georgia's prosperity. Over the last 26 years, the system has served as a leader in the nation for delivering excellent workforce development programs. TCSG colleges operate using a standardized, quality driven curriculum established by business and industry leaders across the state. Businesses and industries have moved to Georgia and existing industries have expanded services and added product lines because of the QuickStart program affiliated with TCSG. And continuing education and customized training programs are a leading force in promoting the state's economy.

For the past several years, TSCG has focused on improving the visibility of the agency. The agency name change in 2008 was done to better promote to all Georgia's citizens the mission of providing technical and academic preparation for a competitive workforce in Georgia In addition, all of the technical colleges have been pursuing regional institutional accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The year 2015 is the projected date that all TCSG colleges will have SACSCOC regional accreditation.

With the TCSG's college mergers that began in 2009, structural changes have impacted the administrative status of the merged colleges including the composition of local technical college boards and administrative positions such as presidents, vice-presidents, and other middle leadership positions, including deans for academic affairs. Organizational structural changes such as this require a great deal of commitment from the people who work in the organization. Organizational behavior and cultures have been altered. O'Banion (1997) discussed some of the key organizational aspects that educational agencies must recognize when making organizational changes: (a) improving employee quality and productivity, (b) ensuring that investment in

valuable resources is put into place, (c) capitalizing on the diversity of employees and students, and (d) empowering people to serve as motivators so they will embrace and commit to change instead of resisting needed changes.

TCSG continues to focus on enhancing the organizational development and capability of the agency. Leadership development and training for system and college personnel has always been a focal point. With the system's structure changes, technical colleges have been impacted. Academic leaders at all levels need to be trained to meet the challenges brought about by changes. In particular, midlevel academic leaders need to continue to enhance their abilities to handle the multitude of job responsibilities. With the organizational changes occurring in the system, a need for additional academic midlevel leaders to handle the increased sizes of Academic Affairs divisions, may emerge. Certainly, academic midlevel leaders' job responsibilities are complex. Therefore, this study may provide helpful information in designing professional development opportunities that will support midlevel academic leaders in performing their jobs.

Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

Simply understanding the characteristics of leaders, the methods they use, and the ultimate results of leadership does not make one a great leader. Kouzes and Posner (2002) believe the keys to becoming a great leader can be condensed into five practical phrases: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. The most notable mark of a leader who has been deemed a "great" leader lies in the ability of the leader to influence others to move along a path toward an established goal. The true meaning of leadership cannot be found in the magnitude of the leader's accomplishments, but rather revealed in the accomplishments of the people led by that leader. Kouzes and Posner's five

practices support that the key to great leadership focuses on relationships of leaders and those being led.

House's path-goal theory is centered on how people are treated by leaders. The leader who chooses to lead according to the path-goal principles has a responsibility to adjust his/her leadership style based on subordinate needs and underlying environmental conditions in an effort to improve morale and productivity.

Robert J. House is credited with being the primary developer of the path-goal leadership theory that was first published in 1971. House explained his theoretical groundings in the formation of the path-goal theory as being derived from his 1960s research of the expectancy theory of motivation presented by Vroom, Atkinson, Portor and Lawler, Galbraith and Cummings, Graen, and Lawler (House, 1971). Robert House also worked closely with Martin Evans in the design of the path-goal theory.

House had been conducting research on leader/subordinate relationships in which the leader provided a strong proponent of structure. Research conducted prior to House's studies had shown only a negative correlation. Through the examination of Evans' work, House concluded that the positive satisfaction level of employees who were managed by leaders who provided a high degree of structure might be contingent on if the employees needed the structure in order to perform their jobs appropriately. House recognized that all subordinates may not need such structure; but for those who did, the structure was appreciated and the employees were able to accomplish goals (House, 1996).

Continuing to study the research findings, House returned to examine more closely Vroom's work with expectancy theory in that he believed a relationship existed between employee behavior and motivational influences (Evans, 1996). Through careful study of both

Evans and Vroom, House realized their findings suggested that leader behaviors in relation to employee satisfaction might depend on the organizational structure, climate, and context in which the leader and the subordinates work. The path-goal theory began to take shape.

Structured during a period in which the concept of organizational behavior was still fairly new (Evans, 1996), the path-goal theory has lent much to the understanding of organizational behavior in that there is not one proven leadership theory that has been incorporated into the successful management of all organization structures. The theory provides an explanation of leadership styles, contingency factors, subordinate needs, accomplishment of tasks required to meet organizational goals, and the relationship of these features to subordinate satisfaction. After 43 years, the path-goal theory still remains relevant. It continues to be analyzed and has earned the respect of many theorists throughout the years.

Leader Behaviors

The leader's behaviors are instrumental to the performance, satisfaction, and motivation of an individual or group by clarification of the path taken in order to attain established goals, removing obstacles that may hinder the accomplishment of the goals, and offering rewards for the achievement of goals. The theory's components can be summarized by a match being made that incorporates: (a) leader behaviors, (b) subordinate characteristics or needs, and (c) task uniqueness.

The use of four leadership approaches has been identified with the path-goal theory. The leader will choose to be directive, supportive, participative, or achievement oriented with his/her subordinates depending on the complexity of the task and the style needed by the subordinate.

The directive style may be used when a leader needs to provide structure to the task and/or the subordinate. The leader tells the subordinate what needs to be done, outlines and

conveys the expectations, and provides advice. The leader's behaviors include planning, establishing timelines for completion of tasks, and detailing the rules, regulations, and procedures to be followed. The subordinate has very little say in how the task will be accomplished, but rather is expected to follow the leader's directives (Daft, 1991).

The second approach a leader may choose in leading subordinates is the supportive style. The leader provides encouragement and shows concern about the subordinate's well-being. The behaviors displayed by the leader are open, friendly, approachable, and non-threatening, emphasizing the development of positive relationships among subordinates. Efforts are made to ensure that subordinates are comfortable with the work setting and the tasks to be accomplished. The leader also ensures the subordinate has everything needed to perform (House, 1996).

The third leadership approach the leader may use is the participative style. The key component in the participative style is the process of decision-making; the leader seeks input from subordinates and incorporates their suggestions in the work environment (Higgins, 1994).

The leader may choose to use the fourth approach, the achievement-oriented leadership style. High expectations are conveyed and subordinates establish ambitious performance goals. The leader displays a high degree of confidence in the subordinate's ability to perform and achieve the goals set (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995).

A leader is not limited to using just one approach with subordinates. In fact, leaders are given the flexibility to use an approach or several approaches depending on the subordinate's characteristics displayed and/or the task complexity. The leader may find that some circumstances require a combination of leadership styles that integrates more than one style at a time (Northouse, 2004).

Subordinate Characteristics and Needs

The path-goal theory of leadership shows a relationship between which leadership style the leader chooses to use and the characteristics or needs displayed by subordinates. A leader needs to be keenly aware of the distinguishing, individual personalities and the functioning ability levels of the subordinates while also staying attuned to any unique situations or circumstances that surround the subordinate in the workplace.

Previous research demonstrates that subordinate needs differ and the satisfaction levels of their leaders vary according to the type of leadership behaviors exhibited. Subordinates typically express their workplace needs to be affiliation, structure, control, and a self-belief in oneself to accomplish (Northouse, 2004). Through the path-goal theory, House believed that a leader could choose his/her leadership style by analyzing subordinates' personal characteristics and needs in relation to the job tasks, therefore leading to greater levels of goal attainment and subordinate satisfaction.

According to Northouse, subordinates who display rigid, inflexible, narrow-minded characteristics usually prefer to work under a directive leader, primarily because it offers boundaries, relays a psychological security, and delineates specifically how one is expected to perform. The path is clear in how the goal is to be accomplished. Subordinates who display the need to be associated with others perform best under a supportive leader. These subordinates need a working environment that is friendly, caring, and compassionate. The supportive leadership style encourages relationship development among subordinates and leaders. Subordinates who need to feel in control of their work function more appropriately under a participative leadership style. Subordinates appreciate being included in the decision-making process of the organization allowing them to feel in control of their destiny. Subordinates led

with an achievement-oriented leadership style are provided challenges and usually are ones who need to excel or are highly competitive (Northouse, 2004)

Task Characteristics

The types, levels of difficulty, and nature of job tasks in the workplace also have a direct relationship with the type of leadership style the leader decides to employ. The leader should understand the variety of tasks required in his/her division. Certainly, the leader may not know how to perform all of the skills or tasks involved in every job; however, the leader should have a keen awareness of the overall structure of tasks. Initiating motivation in subordinates to accomplish work unit goals is the overall aspiration for any leader. Therefore, a leader has a responsibility to analyze tasks and utilize approaches in the supervision of subordinates that provides motivation.

The path-goal theory of leadership categorizes tasks to determine the level of involvement needed by the leader in guiding subordinates. Tasks that are difficult to achieve, perhaps having ambiguous goals and results, or tasks being demanded of individuals with little experience may require the leader to use a directive leadership approach. Repetitive, monotonous, dissatisfying, or frustrating tasks may require an elevated supportive leadership style. Participative leadership should be provided when the work is moderately ambiguous and subordinates have successfully achieved similar tasks in the past. Subordinates performing tasks in which they have a great deal of experience, or are involved in highly innovative work, may require more of an achievement-oriented leadership style (Higgins, 1994).

The path-goal leadership theory highlights task characteristics so the leader can choose the appropriate leadership style with regard to the individual needs of the subordinates and assists subordinates along the path in the accomplishment of their goals. Rewards are utilized

throughout the process; however, rewards may not just include monetary compensation but also intrinsic incentives. The leader serves more as a coach, helping others identify and understand the tasks, matching task requirements with individual characteristics, and providing the motivation to achieve goals by removing obstacles, stimulating subordinate needs, rewarding achievement, and increasing subordinates' personal satisfaction (Donnelly, Gibson, & Ivancevich, 1992). This type of leadership may be particularly important for midlevel academic leaders because they supervise faculty with different personalities, attitudes, occupational expertise, and performance levels.

Wofford and Liska (1993) examined 120 studies conducted on the path-goal theory from 1967 – 1992. Although a large amount of research has been conducted, deriving overall conclusions about the theory's validity have been difficult mainly due to the fact that more studies have been directed at analyzing individual components of the theory versus the theory as a whole. For example, most testing structures have only examined two leader behaviors rather than the four behaviors described in the theory. Additionally, studies have focused only on the motivational aspects of the theory, excluding the variation of leader behaviors exhibited with different subordinate characteristics and needs (Evans, 1996). Perhaps this is due to the complexity of the theory as referenced in almost all published explanations of the theory (Wofford & Liska).

Robert House refined and reformulated his theory in 1996 based upon the many notable research studies that have occurred since the original theory presentation. These researchers include Mitchell; Baetz; Schriesheim and Kerr; Hunter, Schmidt, and Jackson; Dessler; Miner; Indvik; Fisher and Edwards; Raju, Burke, Normend, and Langlois; and Bass (Wofford & Liska). The reformation of the theory expanded the number of leadership behaviors to eight,

emphasizing not only individual subordinate performance, but also work unit performance. The importance of the leader's social skills and abilities also are more heavily emphasized in the reformation of the theory (House, 1996).

One point that cannot be called into question concerning the path-goal leadership theory is that Robert J. House was his own best critic. He welcomed others to study the theory; he often criticized components of the theory; he even displayed what could be perceived as an invitation to others to study his personality and lifestyle. House believed the mark of a "great" theory was when it was never proven, but continually tested, revised, and rejected. A "good" theorist was one who was open to and welcoming of empirical-based revisions of the theory (Jermier, 1996). At the end of the article in which House (1996) disclosed his reformulated theory, he included a section containing his personal thoughts about his philosophy of science that guided his many years of theoretical and empirical efforts. House (1996) wrote:

> I believe the 1971 path-goal theory of leadership has led to better theories, namely the 1976 theory of charismatic leadership, the reformulated 1996 path-goal theory of work unit leadership, and the value based theory of leadership. Hopefully, the 1996 theory will be subjected to empirical tests and a further improved theory will be formulated at some future time. (p. 353)

Responsibilities of Midlevel Academic Leaders

Midlevel academic leaders are charged with carrying out a vast array of duties and supervising the daily activities of academic departments. However, Gmelch (2004) stated that "…the academic leader is among the least studied and most misunderstood management positions in American" (p. 69). Clark (1978) also noted that for all the literature produced for education entities and their organizational structure, the department chair is hardly mentioned.

Warren (1990), Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993) and Seagren et al. (1994) also support that very few research efforts have been focused on the midlevel academic positions in four-year colleges, universities, or community colleges.

Roles

Although the literature is sparse concerning the responsibilities of midlevel academic leaders, Seagren et al. (1994) documented that midlevel academic leaders' responsibilities are massive and that further research is needed. In reviewing the literature on responsibilities that midlevel academic leaders have, the term "role" often appeared in conjunction with responsibilities. Robbins (2003) defined roles as "a set of expected behavior patterns that are attributed to occupying a given position in a social unit" (p. 85). The research on position roles often cites Jackson and Schuler's work (2000). They supported the work of other role researchers by stating that people serve in multiple roles whether social or work related. When serving in multiple roles, individuals have to be able to shift between roles depending on the situation. And, the concept of role conflict comes into being when one role conflicts with another. Since the responsibilities of midlevel academic leaders are complex, roles are often used in describing responsibilities.

The Seagren et al. (1994) study provided detailed information as to the roles of midlevel academic leaders. Their study revealed that midlevel academic leaders indicated that seven roles were reported as the most important or important roles in their position. These roles included that of planner, motivator, information disseminator, facilitator, advocator, visionary, and delegator. They surmised that the roles midlevel academic leaders serve in could be grouped into three categories: interpersonal, administrator, and leader. The interpersonal roles included "information disseminator, facilitator, mentor, advocate, caretaker" (p. 53). It is not surprising

that these roles typically are ones that support the notion that midlevel academic leaders need communication skills and the ability to get along with others. Tucker (1984), Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, and Beyer (1990), and Murray (1992) support this premise in that supervisory persons who do not place great importance on interpersonal development skills will likely be less effective.

The administrator roles that midlevel academic leaders often serve in are "resource allocator, evaluator, negotiator, and conflict resolver" (Seagren et al., 1994, p. 54). These roles are not always roles that the midlevel academic leader wants, especially if the academic leader does not like to deal with conflict. An interesting point made by Seagren et al. was that midlevel academic leaders did not indicate that the administrator role was as important as the interpersonal and leader roles. Perhaps the lower importance rating was placed on the administrator role because the chair position is generally regarded as a position in the middle. Other administrative levels typically handled these roles.

The leader roles included "visionary, motivator, entrepreneur, delegator, and planner" (Seagren et al., 1994, p. 54). These roles were the second most important set of roles indicated by midlevel academic leaders in the study. Hecht (2004) supported the importance of these roles by stating that department chairs have to work at being knowledgeable about all persons they come in contact with in their work. She discusses how midlevel academic leaders need to know their human universe which includes faculty, staff, administrators, community representatives, students, and those closely associated with students like parents. This same characteristic applies to Georgia's technical college midlevel academic deans.

Responsibilities

When looking at all colleges and universities combined, midlevel academic leaders hold perhaps the key positions (Jennerich, 1981). The tasks that midlevel academic leaders perform are multifaceted and complex, and yet these positions exist as essential "building blocks" on any college (Lucas, 1994). Tucker (1992) summarized a list of tasks and duties for which department chairs are responsible and included budgeting, departmental governance, academic matters, faculty issues, student issues, dealing with external resources, recordkeeping, report production and deciphering report information, and professional development.

Thomas and Schuh (2004) described the responsibilities of department chairs and speculated that chairs are the ones who make sure everything gets done in an educational department. They have to assign instructors for all courses being taught, ensure that all courses needed by students are offered, assign advisors for students, and make certain advisors are available when needed. The college's policies and procedures have to be understood and followed. The budget has to remain balanced. Chairs have to maintain office hours when faculty members are not available. They have to attend almost all institutional events. Building, developing, and maintaining relationships with everyone including other chairs, deans, and administrators are crucial elements. Chairs have to maintain a calendar to ensure that meetings are held with administration, faculty and students. In conclusion, there is very little time for a midlevel academic leader to do his/her job. "Thus, the lack of time that faculty members often feel is magnified for the chair" (Thomas & Schuh, p. 15).

Andrews (2000) reported that community college academic deans have responsibilities such as dealing with faculty and student matters, handling curriculum issues, planning budgets, scheduling courses, and ensuring that course offerings are staffed with competent faculty.

Additional responsibilities as reported by Pettitt (1999) include conducting faculty and program evaluations, managing and coordinating communication efforts between departments and within the college, serving as the administrative representative to the faculty, securing high-tech equipment, and using teams or committees to accomplish college initiatives. But perhaps one of the most difficult responsibilities that the midlevel instructional leader has is to serve as the middle person between administration and faculty, a responsibility that Filan and Seagren (2003) states is "no easy task" (p. 21). Vaughan (as cited in Robillard, 2000) summed up the duties of midlevel instructional leaders when he described the responsibilities that community college deans perform on a regular basis.

> Deans of instruction at community colleges perform most of the duties assigned to the chief academic officer at small, four-year private colleges,…many of the duties performed by provosts or academic vice presidents at major universities,…many of the duties performed by the deans of the various schools or colleges within major universities. (p. 4)

The Seagren et al. study (1994) documented midlevel academic leaders' specific tasks to show what they do in their jobs. The tasks included creating a positive environment, communicating needs to upper level administrators, communicating information from administration to unit faculty, recruiting and selecting faculty, providing feedback to faculty, updating curriculum and courses, designing faculty professional development, developing long-range unit plans, scheduling classes, preparing budgets, evaluating faculty performance, and advising and counseling students. Additional tasks noted as less important in the performance of midlevel academic leaders' jobs included preparing for accreditation, promoting affirmative action, developing relationships with business and community groups, supervising

clerical/technical staff, managing facilities and equipment, recruiting students, creating unit committees, developing clerical/technical staff, helping students register, terminating faculty, preparing enrollment projections, maintaining unit databases, and seeking external funding.

Concerning the wide variety of responsibilities handled by midlevel academic leaders, Robillard (2000) made an interesting observation about the qualifications needed to become a community college dean. While thumbing through a copy of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, he noted that announcements for community college dean positions contained a long list of duties and responsibilities, supporting the proposition that these positions require a high degree of qualifications. However, a short list was published as to the necessary qualifications a candidate for the position should possess. This observation is perhaps not just incidental, but rather strongly related to reality—an inordinate amount of responsibility is expected to be shouldered by these midlevel academic leaders, but the responsibility factor does not correlate with the need for an elite repertoire of qualifications.

A review of the Technical College System of Georgia's job description for Deans for Academic Affairs confirms that the responsibilities of midlevel instructional leaders are comparable to those acknowledged throughout the literature (Technical College System of Georgia, [ca. 2013d]). Community college midlevel academic leaders perform a wide assortment of responsibilities.

Challenges of Midlevel Academic Leaders

The challenges that midlevel academic leaders face are directly related to the responsibilities of midlevel academic leaders. In discussing the importance of community colleges, Seagren et al. (1994) reported that multiple challenges existed for all levels of community college leadership. However, department chairs were singled out to be studied

because "…it is at the department or division level that the responses which affect the lives of students and staff are most directly shaped" (p. 4). But as Gary Filan explicitly stated in the foreword to the Seagren et al. (1994) book, "Although the chair position is widely regarded as key to the effective functioning of a college's major academic and career programs, those filling the positions generally receive little or no formal preparation for the job" (p. vii).

In the Seagren et al. study (1994), midlevel academic leaders were asked to determine their level of agreement with a list of 33 job challenges they believed posed challenges to them in their position. The results were grouped into nine divisions: (a) faculty, (b) student, (c) external relations, (d) technology, (e) program quality, (f) external accountability, (g) financial resources, (h) curriculum, and (i) internal accountability.

Participants in the Seagren et al. study (1994) indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed that the following areas would constitute the greatest challenges to them in fulfilling their responsibilities. The areas included faculty, student, technology, program quality, financial resources, and curriculum. Faculty issues related to incorporating new teaching techniques and providing leadership training primarily related to teaching improvement. Student challenges dealt with accommodating cultural diversity, serving at-risk students, and responding to the needs of a wide range of students. The challenges presented by technology included adapting curriculum in response to new technology and maintaining the latest technology in light of cost factors. Program quality challenges were related to curriculum components and quality of faculty. Financial resource challenges included availability of adequate resources for programs, and maintenance of the physical plant. Curriculum challenges were related to incorporation of general education components and the need for additional human relations training. These

challenges indicate that community college administrators may need to enhance professional development for academic leaders to ensure that these challenges are addressed.

Pettitt (1999) conducted a study of department chairs and faculty in the North Carolina Community College System. Participants were asked to identify challenges faced in handling the responsibilities of their jobs. The chairs identified the following challenges: increasing the use of computer technology with various instructional delivery modes, purchasing high tech equipment, better utilization of computers for administrative tasks, implementing quality management techniques, handling faculty complaints, conducting personnel evaluations, and handling personnel terminations. Additional challenges involved learning techniques to help promote faculty motivation and faculty retention, serving a more diverse student body, and properly advising and counseling students. Faculty expressed that they thought it was important for chairs to know how to communicate faculty needs to administration and how to enhance the department's image. The challenges identified in this study were reflective of the challenges indicated in the Seagren et al. (1994) study.

In conducting the literature review on midlevel academic leaders' challenges, the only documented evidence found concerning identification of perceived challenges was the Seagren et al. (1994) study and the Pettitt (1999) study. Perhaps the lack of research in locating specific information on perceived challenges was due to the fact that most of the research on community college midlevel academic leaders focused on the realm of job responsibilities performed. However, the literature revealed that a critical challenge all community colleges face is maintaining a workforce that is highly trained to meet the demands of the citizens it serves. Therefore, information is presented in this literature review regarding the need for professional development of community college staff, including midlevel academic leaders.

Originally referenced by J. W. Peltason in a forward to Tucker's (1984) *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers*, Peltason made a profound statement on leadership of educational institutions. He stated that educational institutions can operate for a long time with incompetent presidents, but an educational institution will fail quickly with incompetent chairpersons. Therefore, community college midlevel leaders need to be well prepared. Furthermore and in direct relation to this study, TCSG needs to ensure that the professional development needs of its midlevel academic leaders are addressed.

Robillard (2000) supported that community college midlevel leaders need to be experienced in administration, supervision, management, and leadership aspects, well versed in financial matters, adept in personnel hiring, possess knowledge of dismissal and performance evaluation procedures, experienced with conducting program evaluations, and have an understanding of the importance of quality instruction and accountability issues.

Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo (1997) conducted a study focusing on the competencies and attitudes needed by college academic administrators. The study emphasized that professional development may need to be offered in four categories: understanding the community college environment, interpersonal skills, communication skills, and technical competence. The identification of these needs relate directly to professional development needs of academic midlevel leaders in performing a multitude of job responsibilities.

Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, and Haworth (2002) presented information concerning professional development needs of staff members such as midlevel academic leaders and faculty. They discussed that technology challenges certainly are not new issues for community colleges; however, the use of technology should not be the only focal point, but rather faculty and administrator thinking in curriculum design and delivery has to change and assessment matters

have to be addressed. These issues perhaps will require more adaptations than any others because technology usage already has changed and will continue to alter traditional modes of instructional delivery. In addition, Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, and Haworth (2002) supported that midlevel leaders need professional development in relation to building morale and satisfaction and providing enhancements to improve the longevity of midlevel academic leaders.

A national study of community college chairs was launched in 1992 by Filan who reported that chairs needed professional development in conducting faculty evaluations, strategic planning, curriculum planning, managing conflict, and financial management. A curious finding reported in the study was that chairs expressed a need to know how to better manage the dual role of "being in the middle" between administration and faculty. In 1996, Senge reported that leaders of learning organizations in the twenty-first century need to have an imagination, a great deal of perseverance, exhibit a genuine caring for others, and be accepting of change.

Diamond (2002) and Watts and Hammons (2002) support the need for professional development for midlevel academic leaders to ensure that these leaders are equipped with the necessary skills to handle numerous responsibilities, including constant change promoted primarily by technology advancements. Community and technical colleges will continue to be held to greater degrees of accountability by numerous stakeholders. In addition, community and technical colleges will continue to experience staff turnover due to upper- and mid-management retirements requiring a heightened focus on professional development of new staff.

Community college presidents, chief academic officers, and faculty also have contributed their point of view regarding professional development needs of midlevel instructional leaders. Perhaps one of the most comprehensive lists of essential skills needed by midlevel academic leaders was provided by Gillett-Karam (1999) in a discussion with six community college

presidents from North Carolina, New Jersey, Texas, Michigan, Florida, and Ohio. Leaders needed a skill set that included being personable, an excellent communicator, easy to engage with others without offending them, eager to make faculty happy, genuinely care for faculty, able to trust others, a team-oriented leader that can build teams, organized, detailed, multi-tasker, and flexible. Ensuring that midlevel academic leaders have these skills will continue to be a challenge that community college administrators face.

In trying to determine what is actually needed in the preparation of midlevel academic leaders, a study was sponsored by the AACC pertaining to community college leaders' career paths. Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) reported that over half of the chief academic officers surveyed had risen to their current positions from midlevel academic leadership positions such as dean or assistant dean, and only a small percentage had entered their positions directly from the faculty ranks. The study further showed that the career paths of presidents and chief academic officers had changed somewhat over the last 25 years. However, the report substantiated that although some changes may need to be done in the area of personnel recruitment and how professional development is provided, the career paths of future community college leadership positions will probably continue along the same traditional career paths as in the past. Therefore, a more concentrated effort needs to be placed on providing midlevel academic leaders' professional development opportunities.

One of the most important results of Pettitt's (1999) study indicated that "training may need to be designed that is situated in the context and experiences of the chair" (p. 62). Providing training to address midlevel academic leaders' challenges is not as meaningful unless it is situated in the environments that they function in daily. They need to be involved in real tasks, with tasks being relevant and connected. Perhaps some of the most useful training may result

from participation in mentoring experiences, action learning projects, and real-life case problems all situated in a problem solving environment.

One avenue of professional development deals with formal academic preparation such as that provided through educational leadership programs. According to a study conducted by The National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCIA), Katsinas and Kempner (2005) reported the decline in the number of advanced degree awards for community college administrators is no surprise when examined against the backdrop of problems encountered by universities over the last 30 years. Higher education leadership programs usually have existed in the college of education of most universities. The departments within these colleges of education were often independent and self-sufficient. However, the 1990s brought vast change to many of these colleges of education. Individual departments became "super-departments" which in essence combined numerous specialty areas and disciplines for efficiency purposes. Specialized faculty such as community college or higher education faculty were mixed with other education faculty and were expected to focus more on a general educational structure rather than a specialty structure.

To continue to meet the challenge of providing community college academic midlevel leaders professional development, a concerted effort has been made to develop and renew community college graduate programs. Leading these efforts has been the university faculty who are genuinely committed to community college advancement. George Boggs with the AACC (as cited in Katsinas & Kempner, 2005) reported that 140 universities were offering community college graduate courses. Bragg (as cited in Duvall, 2003) noted that many community college graduate programs have had to become innovative and expand the traditional, classroom-bound delivery mode. Online instruction, the use of student cohorts, and the scheduling of classes at

alternative times, including weekends, are some of the most popular instructional modes offered today. Additional efforts also have been directed on bringing community college presidents, chief academic officers, university faculty, university graduates, and current students together to assist in the design of curriculum and identification of the skills needed by community college leaders (Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002).

But even with the development of these unconventional and unique modes of delivery and the collaboration between community college and university personnel, "…formal graduate programs alone may not be enough to develop community college leaders with the specific skills needed to develop, safeguard, and deliver the new mission of these unique organizations" (Anderson, 1997, Conclusions section, para. 2). One of the recommendations that surfaced out of Anderson's literature synthesis was that community college leaders should participate in specially designed, short-term leadership development programs in combination with pursuing graduate coursework.

Another professional development opportunity for community college midlevel academic leaders is to participate in mentoring or "grow your own" programs. Examples of some of these types of programs can be found at "Parkland College in Champaign, Illinois, Guilford Technical College in Greensboro, North Carolina, and Daytona Beach Community College in Florida" (Boggs, 2003, p. 22). Establishing mentoring programs where an experienced leader mentors a potential leader also are being set up in community colleges across the country. And, equally as important, many community college state systems are also encouraging and sponsoring leadership development programs.

Community colleges that choose to not be involved in leadership development may face multiple consequences. With the continual decline in faculty who desire to move into leadership

positions, the decline in available candidates for middle and senior administrative positions, and poor preparation of available candidates, leadership development in community colleges is seriously needed. Community colleges need to develop policies and programs to prepare future leaders, establish leadership development committees made up of cross-sectional college representation, and put into effect mentoring experiences. Leaders must also partner with universities and professional organizations to assist in the development of community college leadership programs (Piland & Wolf, 2003). Existing community college leaders must assist in identifying and cultivating future leaders, develop programs at the local, state, and/or regional level, and commit to implementation of these programs.

As revealed in the literature, obvious gaps exist in the identified challenges of midlevel academic leaders. Among these challenges, professional development is a critical topic for the success of community college midlevel academic leaders and the future of Georgia's technical college system in relation to midlevel academic leadership. For the most part, few efforts have been devoted to providing adequate training to Georgia's midlevel academic leaders.

Profile of Midlevel Academic Leaders

Midlevel academic leaders vary in personal characteristics such as age, ethnicity, gender, highest academic degree earned, number of years of educational experience, and previous work experience. A review of the literature was conducted to examine the demographic profiles of midlevel academic leaders. Few studies exist that provide detailed evidence of the personal characteristics of midlevel academic leaders, deans, assistant deans, directors, department heads, department chairs, division chairs, and program coordinators.

Carroll's (1991) research showed that on average, department chairs were 46 years old with 90% of the positions dominated by males. In 1992, Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and

VanHorn-Grassmeyer reported on the profile of approximately 3000 department chairs surveyed in a community college national study. The study revealed that 47% of the chairs were 45-54 years old, 59% were male, and 89% were white. Women were slightly younger than men occupying chair positions. A few years later, Smith and Stewart (1998) reported that of the 193 chairs surveyed, 44% were between 50-59 years of age, 61% were males, and 71% were white. They concluded that mostly males served in the chair role but women were beginning to enter the positions at higher percentages, especially at non-research based institutions. Palmer and Miller (2001) reported in a study of the Alabama Community Colleges that 80% were over the age of 45 and 60% were male. Reddick (2007) conducted a study of thirteen technical colleges in Georgia and found that of the 39 participants in the study, 49% were male and 51% were female.

Information on the highest academic degrees earned was less available in the literature. In the national study conducted by Seagren et al. in 1992, the majority of midlevel academic leaders had a degree higher than a baccalaureate, 59% held master's degrees and 24% held doctoral degrees. Smith and Stewart (1998) reported that 20% held doctoral degrees. McKenney and Cejda (2000) reported that chief academic officers generally held degrees at or above the master's level: 76% with a doctoral degree and 23% a master's degree.

Data on previous work experience of the academic midlevel leader was examined. The Seagren et al. (1994) study showed that 97% of midlevel academic leaders had been faculty prior to chairing a department, with the average number of years' experience as a faculty member being 11-15 years. Forty-five percent of the chairs had one to five years as a chair or head of a department, and 26% had six to ten years' experience. Overall, 72% had less than ten years as a community college chair or head. To further substantiate academic midlevel leader's lack of administrative experience, 91% had less than five years' experience in other community college

administrative positions. Seagren et al. (1994) also reported that 65% had previous business and industry experience, and 44% had experience in K-12 school systems. Palmer and Miller (2001) reported that 50% had at least 20 years of experience as a faculty member, 50% had K-12 administrative experience, and 59% had business and industry experience.

Community College Size

As gaps were revealed in the identified challenges of midlevel academic leaders and in the profile of these leaders, community college size is another area where limited research has been conducted in relation to academic midlevel leaders. This section contains information about community college size in regard to the number of faculty, number of midlevel academic leaders, and total student enrollment for the college. Additional information will be provided concerning college size in relation to midlevel academic leaders.

Faculty, Academic Leaders, and Student Enrollment

In discussing size of community colleges, the number of full-time faculty members, the number of adjunct faculty members, the number of midlevel academic leaders, and the college's total student enrollment may influence responsibilities and challenges faced by midlevel academic leaders. Seagren et al. (1994) gathered data on community college midlevel academic leaders. The colleges represented in the study reported a mean of 101-150 full-time faculty members and the same mean was reported for adjunct faculty members. The study determined full-time and part-time student headcounts separately; data was not provided for a combined total student headcount. Sixty percent of the campuses represented in the study reported that full-time student headcount had less than 4000 full-time students. Part-time student headcount also indicated that 60% of the colleges had less than 4000 part-time students. The number of academic midlevel leaders reported that 30% of the responding colleges had 6-10 midlevel

leaders, 25% had 11-20 midlevel leaders, and 21% had 5 or less midlevel leaders. The remaining 24% had at least 21 chairpersons. The program areas identified as having the largest student enrollment were liberal arts and sciences, nursing/allied health, and business administration/accounting.

This study seeks to determine similar data for the Technical College System of Georgia including the number of full-time faculty members, the number of adjunct faculty members, and the college's total student headcount enrollment. The only research studies found relating to midlevel academic leaders in the TCSG were Reddick (2007) and Daniel (2009). Neither of these studies revealed data concerning the total number of full-time or adjunct faculty members or the college's total student headcount enrollment. Once the data is compiled, the perceived challenges identified by the midlevel academic leaders will be compared to the size of the colleges to determine if a difference exists between the responses of the Deans from larger and smaller colleges.

Data on the size of the colleges based on total student enrollment will be documented for this study. College size will be based on total headcount enrollment of students enrolled in credit programs for the academic year 2013 (August 1, 2012 – July 31, 2013). Total headcount credit enrollment figures were attained from TCSG's Knowledge Management System (KMS) portal, the internet home for the TCSG Data Center operations.

College Size in Relation to Midlevel Academic Leadership

Size of a college is generally determined by total student enrollment. In reviewing the literature, the size of a college may influence the complexity of the organizational structure, including escalating the layers or levels of management.

The size of divisions and departments may influence the efficiency of midlevel academic leaders. Tucker (1992) discussed extensively the development of academic departments. He classified departments as either pure or mixed. Pure departments have single, common disciplines or faculty have similar education and professional backgrounds. For example, a pure department would be one in which a single discipline area such as English groups instructors who teach English together. However, it is rare for community colleges to have single discipline or pure departments. Rather, community colleges usually have mixed departments primarily for managerial and financial purposes. Mixed departments usually have too few faculty members to be supported by an individual leader. In terms of financial support, mixed departments are necessary to support what generally equates to lower number of students served by the department. Community colleges generally are organized by divisions rather than departments and are supported by an academic leader, most commonly referred to as a dean. However, it is not uncommon for community college divisions to have departments established within a division representing similar disciplines or programs of study.

Tucker (1992) furthered his study of academic department sizes by categorizing departments according to the size and maturity of departments. Small departments generally have nine or less full-time faculty members, medium departments have between 10 and 19 full-time faculty members, and large departments' support 20 or more full-time faculty members. The maturity of a department is often defined by "one in which the faculty members have the experience and capacity as a group to work together, set high but attainable goals, reach group decisions, and readily accept responsibility for their decisions and assignments" (p. 16). On the other hand, immature departments generally have greater difficulty in reaching agreement. The members of an immature department generally do not work together successfully, and are

perhaps reluctant in working together effectively. Although midlevel academic leaders are not mentioned in these definitions, one might speculate if a relationship exists between department size and midlevel academic leaders' efficiency and effectiveness.

When discussing size of an institution and the departmental structure for which midlevel academic leaders oversee, certain departmental characteristics such as pure, mixed, small, medium, large, mature or immature departments may affect the midlevel's ability to perform his/her responsibilities. Certainly an academic environment is managed and led differently than a manufacturing organization. However, the size and maturity of academic organizations, as well as departmental size and maturity may be an area that affects productivity.

While the focus of this study is on midlevel academic leaders' responsibilities and challenges, college size in relation to the midlevel academic leader is also being explored. The Technical College System of Georgia is a relatively young organization. As the agency continues to grow, additional factors may need to be analyzed in respect to college size. Cohen and Brawer (1996) offer some thought provoking reasons as to why college size may be relevant information for community college administrators.

> Why are some colleges consistently more successful than others in effecting student learning, sustaining staff morale, presenting a positive public image, managing growth, raising funds, and answering every challenge promptly and efficiently? According to many commentators, leadership is the answer. The successful colleges are blessed with the proper leaders: people who know how to guide their colleagues, stimulating each to put forth maximum effort toward attaining the program goals. (pp. 131-132)

Summary

This study sought to describe the responsibilities and challenges of midlevel academic leaders in the Technical College System of Georgia. The study also provided a documented profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs. The size of colleges was compared to the identified job challenges of the Deans to determine if the challenges differ based on the size of the technical colleges. Determining the perceived job challenges related to the performance of responsibilities of the deans may provide information as to possible leadership development opportunities needed by TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs.

The literature review has discussed the development of two-year colleges, reviewed two-year colleges in today's society, and presented an overview of the Technical College System of Georgia. The path-goal theory of leadership has been presented, responsibilities of midlevel academic leaders discussed, challenges of midlevel academic leaders revealed, community college size factors presented, and a profile of academic leaders offered.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter explains the methods used in conducting this descriptive, quantitative study. The data was collected through the use of a self-reporting, web-based survey instrument administered to midlevel instructional leaders, Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG). The following sections include purpose of the study, research questions, study design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, data analysis, and chapter summary.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study was to develop a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) to include identified perceived job challenges related to their responsibilities. Job challenges were analyzed to see if the challenges differed based on the size of the technical colleges. Demographic information was gathered from the Deans, including specifics regarding the division supervised and the college represented. Determining the perceived job challenges related to the daily work of the deans provided awareness of where leadership development opportunities are needed.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What perceived job challenges were identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG?

2. Do the perceived job challenges identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG differ based on the size of the technical college they represent?

Study Design

This study was modeled after the Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer (1994) national study of chairpersons in community colleges. The Seagren et al. study's purpose was to develop a profile of the characteristics of persons in chair positions, instructional units, and institutions; to identify implications for leadership development including policy and structural aspects for community colleges; and to recommend areas for future study. The study examined chair perceptions concerning their educational beliefs and values, roles, tasks, skills, job challenges, and strategies in response to job challenges.

The design for this study was exploratory and descriptive in nature and focused only on the identification of perceived job challenges of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG. In addition, certain demographic information was also obtained concerning the Dean and specifics regarding the division supervised and the college represented.

In conducting this study, information was needed that would describe perceptions, attitudes, and specific practices used in an educational environment (Gay & Airasian, 2000). According to Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (1959), the primary purpose of using survey research is to obtain information about the characteristics, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and perceptions of people. Data gathered through surveys often are used to study relationships; compare, analyze, and interpret opinions and feelings; determine wants, needs, and desires; find out sequences of events; or establish conditions of environments (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Creswell, 2003; Dillman, 1978; Merriam & Simpson, 2000).

The rationale for using survey research for this study was for participants to reveal certain personal characteristics and disclose their perceptions in a straightforward and sincere manner. Howard (1985) supports the use of survey research in that participants usually are honest in disclosing information primarily because they are exceedingly familiar with their own attitudes and behaviors. Furthermore, Hill (2001) suggests that participants often will respond to surveys because they can reveal truthful information about subjects that may be sensitive and yet remain anonymous.

The use of self-reporting instruments for conducting research has advantages and disadvantages. One of the most common noted advantages of survey research includes the fairly low cost of administration to gather data (Creswell, 2003; Hill, 2001; Schaefer & Dillman, 1998), relatively simple management of data collection procedures (Hill), and the ability of obtaining information from a reasonably small sample and generalizing to a larger population (Babbie, 1990; Creswell, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The information gathered during a survey may be needed immediately and may not be readily available from any other source; therefore, surveys are a means of obtaining this information in an expeditious and low-cost manner, enabling the researcher to obtain a "snapshot" of a certain situation. Additionally, well-constructed surveys can be replicated easily by other researchers desirous of obtaining similar information (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Merriam & Simpson, 2000; Rea & Parker, 1997).

Although the advantages of conducting research using surveys are numerous, there are also disadvantages of survey research. Merriam and Simpson reported that information obtained through surveys is limited in comparison to the information revealed through qualitative designs. Somewhat related to Merriam and Simpson's view is the fact that people often are skeptical about the reliability of information gathered from a small sample. Some people actually believe

that participants are not as honest in responding to surveys because they do not know or they are not sure of why they behave the way they do in response to certain situations (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Rea & Parker, 1997). Hill (2001) noted that participants may have pessimistic feelings about surveys. These feelings could hinder a participant from answering the survey honestly or sincerely. In addressing and overcoming the disadvantages encountered when conducting survey research, it was anticipated that the study participants would be open and honest in disclosing the information requested primarily because the study's purpose was relevant to the population in the performance of their jobs and because the population has had limited visibility with an associated peer group in the TCSG.

Prior to the twenty-first century, surveys were normally conducted through mail-outs, telephone discussions, personal interviews, and paper/pencil formats. However, one of the most popular formats used today is electronic, web-based surveys (Dillman, Reips, & Matzal, 2010; Nardi, 2003). The costs of administering surveys electronically are considerably less in that there are not any mailing costs associated with sending the survey to participants. In addition, the overall turnaround time for data to be collected via electronic surveys can be less than mailed surveys. The process of following up on non-responders is greatly reduced because emails are less time consuming than additional mail-outs being sent to potential participants (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). And, when using web-designed survey software, a variety of reports are available to allow the researcher to access the survey results. Data usually can be exported into other commonly used statistically software like SPSS or Excel for further data analysis.

However, a disadvantage in using electronic surveys relates to response rates. According to Manfreda, Bosniak, Berzelak, Haas, and Vehovar (2008), response rates for electronic surveys are on average 11% lower than mail or telephone surveys. Rea and Parker (2005) propose that

web-based surveys may have low response rates because the survey population may have limited access to computer and/or email resources. Furthermore, the survey population also has to possess at least a minimal level of computer knowledge. Ritter and Sue (2007) support these premises by stating that web-based surveys are best for "limited populations and research objectives" (p. 6). Consideration should be given to the survey population's accessibility and knowledge of computer operation.

If a group being surveyed uses email extensively such as in a company or an organization, the survey response rate is generally higher (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). If individuals are to be contacted via email to conduct a survey, an established relationship should be in existence between the surveyor and the participant (Council of American Survey Research Organizations, 2007).

Babbie (1998) suggests that survey response rates of 50-60% are adequate for analysis of data. Mangione (1995) proposes that acceptable survey response rates range from 60-70%. For this study, an electronic, web-based survey delivery format was used with a 60% anticipated response rate.

Participants

Gay and Airasian (2000) describe the first step in determining participants for a study as defining the population. In defining the population, Hurlbert (2003) describes a population as "all the members of the group under consideration" (p. 8). For this study, the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG technical colleges were the defined, single population. Deans for Academic Affairs, now a uniform position in the TCSG, are defined as administrators who are responsible for overseeing the academic responsibilities in Georgia's technical colleges. All TCSG colleges have multiple Deans for Academic Affairs; and these administrators are referred

to as midlevel leaders in that their job responsibilities are ranked below those of the highest ranking academic official, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, but above those of faculty. Some of the TCSG colleges have two academic deans, and some colleges may have as many as ten deans. The exact number is determined by each technical college generally based on the size of the college, the number and variety of technical programs operated, and in some cases, the number of campuses. Several TCSG colleges, generally larger colleges, have Assistant Deans for Academic Affairs and/or Associate Deans for Academic Affairs whose duties may be delineated to oversee certain program areas or departments within a division. Assistant and Associate Deans for Academic Affairs were included in the population with the stipulating factor that the individuals supervised credit academic programs and faculty.

Instrumentation

The survey for this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, was developed based on the International Community College Chair Survey conducted in 1992 by Seagren et al. The survey was developed by the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education (CSHPE) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in conjunction with the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA) (Seagren et al., 1994).

Original Survey

Permission to modify and adapt the International Community College Chair Survey was granted by the lead researcher, Dr. Alan Seagren, Professor Emeritus, University of Nebraska. A copy of this email may be found in Appendix A. The Seagren et al. survey was designed to develop a profile of the characteristics of midlevel academic management in community colleges and included nine sections. The nine sections were: (a) Instructional Unit Characteristics, (b)

Campus Characteristics, (c) Personal Information, (d) Educational Beliefs and Values, (e) Roles, (f) Tasks, (g) Skills, (h) Job Challenges, and (i) Strategies (Seagren, et al., 1994).

The study conducted using the original survey was the first documented study of community college chairpersons (Seagren et al., 1994) seeking to determine the importance of the community college chair position as an instructional leader and administrator. The survey was administered to 9,000 community and technical college department chairs in the United States and Canada. Approximately 3,000 community college chairs completed the survey (Seagren et al.).

The survey for this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, was modified by using five of the nine sections of the 1994 survey. Table 1 shows the nine sections of the original survey. Sections one, two, three, six, and eight of the original survey were modified for use in this study. Table 1 shows the sections and number of questions in the original survey.

Table 1

International Community College Chair Survey Sections

International Community College Chair Survey		
Section	Title	Number of Questions
1	Characteristics of Instructional Units	8
2	Characteristics of Your Campus	12
3	Personal Information	25
4	Educational Beliefs and Values	24
5	Roles	14
6	Tasks	32
7	Skills	12
8	Job Challenges	36
9	Strategies	24

The original survey gathered information concerning the characteristics of instructional units (section one), characteristics of the campus (section two), and personal information of department chairs (section three). Questions concerning the instructional unit included identification of (a) division supervised, (b) student headcount of the division, (c) number of full- and part-time faculty, (d) years the unit has been operating as an instructional unit, (e) types of degrees awarded from the instructional unit, and (f) program areas in the unit.

Questions concerning the characteristics of the campus included (a) number of full- and part-time students on the campus, (b) number of full- and part-time faculty on the campus, (c) campus accreditation region, (d) instructional focus of the campus, (e) source of funding for the campus, and (f) how department/division chairs are appointed.

Personal information questions included (a) age, (b) gender, (c) race, (d) number of years working in a community college as a faculty member, (e) number of years working in a community college as a chair, (f) number of years working in a community college in other administrative positions, (g) number of years prior work experience in business/industry, (h) number of years prior work experience in K-12 schools, (i) number of years prior work experience in public agencies, (j) number of years prior work experience in university, (k) number of years prior work experience in vocational/technical college, (l) length of term of appointment, (m) release time for being a chair, (n) amount of stipend for being a chair, (o) annual salary, (p) average number of hours worked in a week as a chair, (q) highest degree achieved, and (r) professional plans for the next five years (Seagren et al., 1994).

In the Seagren et al. study, job challenge and task questions were determined by a comprehensive review of community college chair literature at the time of the study. The literature areas reviewed included tasks and duties of the chair, skills, administrative chair duties,

responsibilities, and higher education management practices. Using this information and through applied research with local community colleges and input from the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA), the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education (CSHPE) developed the job challenge questions (Seagren, et al., 1994).

Section six of the original survey gathered information concerning the tasks of department chairs. Community college chairs were asked to indicate the degree of importance of 32 tasks covering questions concerning (a) professional development and communication, (b) faculty selection and performance, (c) budgets, managing facilities and equipment, (d) recruiting students, (e) developing relationships with business and community groups, (f) curriculum, (g) advising students, (h) scheduling classes, and (i) division planning.

Section eight of the original survey asked chairs to indicate the extent to which they would they face the 36 identified challenges. The challenges section of the survey included questions concerning (a) faculty, (b) students, (c) external relations, (d) technology, (e) program quality, (f) accountability, (g) financial resources, and (h) curriculum (Seagren et al., 1994).

Modified Survey

Five sections of the original survey were chosen to be used in this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, because of the relevance of information related to this study's purpose. A copy of the modified survey used for this study is contained in Appendix B. Questions from five sections of the original survey were modified and/or distributed into three sections for the modified survey, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs. The three sections included: (a) Personal Demographics, (b) Demographic Information of Campus, (c) Challenges. Table 2 shows the modified survey sections on the left side with the right side of the table indicating the corresponding section of the original survey, including the number of questions

that were modified from each section. New questions were added to the modified survey and are indicated in the table.

Table 2

Modified Survey Sections

Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs Survey			International Community College Chair Survey		
Section	Title	Number of Questions	Section	Title	Number of Questions
1	Personal Demographics	22 (total)	2	Characteristics of Instructional Unit	6
	New Questions	6	3	Personal Information	10
2	Demographic Information of Campus	1 (total)	1	Demographic Information of Campus	1
3	Challenges • Instructional Processes • Supervision of Faculty/Staff • Curriculum • Students • Fiscal Responsibilities • Use of Technology • Facilities/ Inventory • Planning • Accreditation • Campus Communication • External Activities	72 (total)	6	Tasks	27
			8	Challenges	21
	New Questions	24			

The first section of the survey used in this study, Personal Demographics, gathered demographic information specific to the respondent and to the respondent's college. Responses for the personal demographic section included direct response questions and categorical response questions requiring the respondent to select a response from a list of options. The Personal Demographics section of the survey contained 22 questions.

The demographic information requested in the study's survey included: (a) previous work experience in a technical college including the number of years of service, (b) academic programs supervised, (c) number of instructional programs supervised that are degree programs, (d) number of instructional programs supervised that are diploma programs, (e) number of instructional programs supervised that are technical certificate of credit programs, (f) number of full-time faculty supervised, (g) number of adjunct faculty supervised, (h) age, (i) gender, (j) ethnicity, (k) highest academic degree achieved, (l) number of years in a technical college as a full-time faculty member, (m) number of years in a technical college as a director or dean for academic affairs, (n) previous work experience in business/industry including the number of years of service, (o) previous work experience in a 4-year college or university including the number of years of service, (p) previous work experience in K-12 schools including the number of years of service, and (q) previous work experience in a two-year college not including a technical college, including the number of years of service.

The second section of the survey, Demographic Information of Campus, asked one question specific to the respondent's college in relation to total credit enrollment for an academic year. Responses for the demographic information of campus section included one categorical response question. Respondents were directed to use the 2013 academic year total enrollment figure provided to each dean in the survey participation email invitation. By using the enrollment

figure provided, each dean chose whether his/her college's total academic year 2013 enrollment information was 6,000 or less students or 6,001 or greater.

For this study, college size in the Technical College System of Georgia was based on total full-time and part-time student enrollment in credit programs for the academic year 2013 (August 1, 2012 – July 31, 2013). Total enrollment figures were attained from TCSG's Knowledge Management System (KMS) portal, the internet home for the TCSG Data Center operations (Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013a]). The Data Center collects and reports agency data with the technical colleges and other outside agencies. When analyzing the data, eleven colleges had total enrollment of 6,000 or less; and thirteen colleges had annual enrollment of 6,001 or more. Therefore, college size in question two is defined by student enrollment 6,000 or less and student enrollment 6,001 or greater. Table 3 shows the colleges by ranked order of size, location of the college, and total enrollment for academic year 2013 (Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013a]).

Table 3

Colleges Ranked by Size

Ranked Order	College	Location	Total Enrollment
1	Chattahoochee	Marietta	17,238
2	Gwinnett	Lawrenceville	10,013
3	West Georgia	Waco	9,748
4	Georgia Northwestern	Rome	8,565
5	Southern Crescent	Griffin	7,871
6	Atlanta	Atlanta	7,546
7	Savannah	Savannah	7,380
8	Central Georgia	Macon	7,010
9	Athens	Athens	6,756
10	Georgia Piedmont	Clarkston	6,663
11	Augusta	Augusta	6,312

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Colleges Ranked by Size

Ranked Order	College	Location	Total Enrollment
12	Columbus	Columbus	6,295
13	Wiregrass Georgia	Valdosta	6,148
14	Albany	Albany	5,931
15	Lanier	Oakwood	4,909
16	North Georgia	Clarkesville	3,397
17	Ogeechee	Statesboro	3,223
18	Moultrie	Moultrie	2,783
19	Oconee Fall Line	Sandersville	2,766
20	South Georgia	Americus	2,721
21	Southeastern	Vidalia	2,458
22	Southwest Georgia	Thomasville	2,338
23	Altamaha	Jesup	2,180
24	Okefenokee	Waycross	1,990

For this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, information was not being sought concerning specific tasks performed by deans; however, the tasks section in the original survey was reviewed with some questions modified to include in the challenge section for this study's survey. The challenge questions were modified to extrapolate information that was relevant to TCSG technical colleges. In the Seagren et al. (1994) survey, some terminology was dated. The terminology was updated to reflect commonly used terms and phrases utilized by TCSG and Georgia's technical colleges. Some challenge questions were added and/or deleted because they were or were not relevant to TCSG Deans and their position responsibilities.

The third section of the survey, Challenges, provided a list of challenges that the respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with the challenges listed in relation to the challenges they encounter in the performance of their responsibilities. The challenges section was divided into 11 subsections: (a) Instructional Processes, (b) Supervision

of Faculty/Staff , (c) Curriculum, (d) Students, (e) Fiscal Responsibilities, (f) Use of Technology, (g) Facilities/Inventory, (h) Planning, (i) Accreditation, (j) Campus Communication, and (k) External Activities.

Another modification in developing the survey for this study was at the end of each subsection, an open-ended question was included that asked the respondents if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges faced in their position regarding that particular subsection. The last modification included the addition of an open-ended question at the end of the survey asking if there were any specific strategies that would help the responder overcome the challenges faced in the Dean's position. The Challenges section of the survey contained 72 questions, eleven subsection open-ended questions, and one overall open-ended question concerning specific strategies that would help overcome the challenges identified.

In organizing the survey instrument, the Personal Demographics and the Demographic Information of Campus sections included check boxes that allowed the responder to choose the answer(s). For questions requiring a typed response, text boxes were included so that the responder could simply click in the box and complete the information requested.

For the questions in the third section, Challenges, a four-point Likert scale was used for respondent answers with the scale consisting of the following categories: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The four-point Likert scale was chosen so that participants will be required to respond with a definite answer and not be allowed to express any uncertainty as to their agreement or disagreement with the question (Hill, 2001). Check boxes were used on the scaled items, allowing the responder to choose the answer(s). Text boxes were used for questions requiring a typed response.

When modifying the survey, the researcher had two deans for academic affairs and an institutional effectiveness assistant who works in designing web-based surveys assist with the wording and organization of the questions. These individuals assisted in determining subsection headings in order to organize the challenge questions of the survey. In making changes to the wording, these individuals also provided assistance helping to ensure appropriate and current terminology was used.

Pilot Test

Creswell (2003) states that a pilot or field test of the survey should be conducted prior to full survey administration to assist in establishing validity and to improve the survey format, scales, and questions. A pilot test of the survey was conducted prior to the full administration of the survey. Four Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs were asked to take the electronic survey and provide feedback pertaining to the (a) clarity of questions, (b) relationship of questions to the scope of duties performed by Deans, (c) suggestions for rewording or additions/deletions of questions, (d) survey length, and (e) general comments and suggestions. Also, the pilot test participants were asked to comment on whether the directions were clear and if the software was easy to use in completing the survey.

Three weeks prior to the full administration of the survey, an email was sent to the pilot study participants asking them to complete the survey and provide feedback. Several suggestions were made concerning word changes, and these suggestions were incorporated in the final survey. Two suggestions were made concerning the realignment of a question into a more appropriate subsection, and this suggestion was incorporated into the final version of the survey. Positive comments were received concerning the appropriateness of the questions to the actual responsibilities of Deans, survey length, and thorough coverage of the challenges that Deans may

encounter in the performance of their jobs. No problems were reported concerning the clarity of the survey directions or the use of the survey software.

Validity and Reliability

The validity of a survey refers to whether the instrument being used measures what the instrument was designed to measure (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Content validity can be established based on an extensive review of the literature and by having others familiar with the subject matter review the survey (Muijs, 2004). Creswell (2003) supports that construct validity is established if the survey results can "serve a useful purpose and have positive consequences when used" (p. 158).

The Seagren et al. (1994) survey was developed by researchers extensively reviewing literature and studies related to department chairs in two-year institutions. A four dimensional model of department chairs was developed "utilizing existing studies and empirical feedback through interviews and discussion groups with community college practitioners and scholars" (p. 7). The four components of the model were (1) characteristics of the chair, (2) responsibilities in the position, (3) challenges of the position, (4) and response strategies used by chairs.

Based on the literature concerning department chairs in two-year institutions, the Seagren et al. survey questions were developed using previously validated surveys, assistance from local community colleges, and nationally recognized groups such as the National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Department of Education, the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education (CSHPE) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA).

Since this research study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG, was designed only to collect data on the demographics of deans, instructional units, campuses, and

challenges, only those corresponding sections of the Seagren et al. survey are described in relation to how validity was established for these sections.

Sections one, two, and three of the Seagren et al. survey (1994) were designed to gather data on the characteristics of instructional units and participants (community college chairs), and participant demographics. Section eight of the survey was designed to collect data concerning the job challenges of chairs. Table 4 shows the source of development for each section's questions.

Table 4

Survey Question Sources

Survey Question Sources		
Section Number	Section Title	Source of Question Design
1	Characteristics of Instructional Units	Adelman study (1992) The way we are: The community college as American thermometer Demographic data generally collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Department of Education
2	Characteristics of Community College Chairs	Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education (CSHPE) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln staff National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA) staff
3	Personal Demographics of Chairs	CSHPE staff
8	Job Challenges	CSHPE staff through applied research with local community colleges with additional input from the NCCCA

After the Seagren et al. survey (1994) was developed, "feedback was sought as to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the instrument" (p. 9). A pilot test was conducted with Nebraska Community College leaders, students enrolled in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Educational Leadership and Higher Education doctoral program, and participants in the 1992

NCCCA Institute for Academic Leadership Development. After reviewing the results of the pilot test, the survey was revised primarily for clarification and comprehensiveness purposes. The extensive literature review and the pilot test served in determining the original survey's validity (Seagren et al., 1994).

To determine validity for the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG survey, an updated review of the literature was performed and used as a platform for ensuring that the questions asked in the Tasks and Challenges sections of the Seagren et al. (1994) study were valid in relation to technical college deans and their responsibilities. A pilot study also was conducted as previously discussed in order to assist in determining the validity of the instrument.

The Seagren et al. (1994) survey performed a factor analysis on 142 survey items to determine reliability. This test allowed "the researcher to identify (exploratory) or create (confirmatory) clusters of items to use in further analysis" (p. 164). Using SPSS software, categories were generated based on participant responses. A multitude of potential factors were identified, and 28 factors showed statistical significance. The factors that had alpha levels greater than .5500 were further analyzed. Most of the factors could be clustered in a related way; however, a few cases showed theoretical positions in which the researchers moved items into other clusters only when the movement did not significantly change the reliability of either factor. For the Challenges section of the Seagren et.al survey, the factor analysis grouped the Challenge questions into nine clusters based on the similarity of responses: (a) faculty, (b) students), (c) external relations, (d) technology, (e) program quality, (f) external accountability, (g) financial resources, (h) curriculum, and (i) internal accountability (Seagren et.al, 1994). Seagren et al. noted that by examining the reliability data based on factor analysis data for the challenge questions, the results showed "far-ranging implications for the future of community

colleges" (p. 86), including using the results "as a model for personal and professional development, or as a framework for chair development" (p. 110).

For the Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs survey, the cluster headings noted in the Seagren et al. survey were slightly modified and used to organize similar questions for this study. After the modifications, the 11 subsections included: (a) Instructional Processes, (b) Supervision of Faculty/Staff , (c) Curriculum, (d) Students, (e) Fiscal Responsibilities, (f) Use of Technology, (g) Facilities/Inventory, (h) Planning, (i) Accreditation, (j) Campus Communication, and (k) External Activities.

In order to determine instrument reliability for this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, Cronbach's alpha test was used. Cronbach's alpha is an internal consistency index designed for use with tests containing items that do not have a right or wrong answer and also only requires one administration of the survey. The Cronbach's alpha test was chosen as the test for instrument reliability because Cronbach's alpha seems to be the most widely chosen method of determining inter-item reliability (Gloeckner, Gliner, Tochterman, & Morgan, 2001). Generally when using this test, participants in a study are being asked to rate the degree to which they agree or disagree with certain statements given particular scales. The Cronbach's alpha was used to establish a reliability coefficient and determine how much measurement error was present (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Measurement errors are caused when scores differ for reasons unrelated to individual respondents (Gloeckner et al.). An instrument is considered more reliable if fewer errors are revealed. In using Cronbach's alpha the measurement of values will be between .00 and 1.00, with .00 indicating no reliability and 1.00 indicating perfect reliability (Gall et al.).

Procedures

Prior to implementation of this study, permission to conduct this research study was obtained by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board (IRB). A copy of the approved IRB and approval notification is contained in Appendix C. Approval of the study was also obtained by the Technical College System of Georgia Institutional Effectiveness Department; a copy of this approval is contained in Appendix D.

In order to determine the exact names and number of participants, a two-step process was conducted. First, the names of the Deans for Academic Affairs were determined by using the TCSG listserv to identify only the Deans for Academic Affairs who oversaw matters pertaining to the delivery of credit instruction. Careful consideration was given in extracting the names from the listserv because other individuals participate in the listserv such as Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Deans for Library Services, Deans for Curriculum, and others who have an interest in the topics discussed via the listserv. Second, in order to verify the names extracted from the listserv were actually Deans for Academic Affairs (or Associate or Assistant Deans) who oversee credit academic programs, the names were verified by the Vice President for Academic Affairs at each college. An email was sent to each college's Vice President for Academic Affairs explaining the study's purpose, explaining the use of a survey to obtain the information, and asking for verification of the accuracy of the list of Deans for Academic Affairs provided. As of March 9, 2014, the number of midlevel academic leaders in TCSG colleges was determined to be 109.

Since the survey was electronically disseminated, a personal email was sent to each participant's work email account. The email outlined an invitation to participate in the study which explained the purpose of the survey, format of the survey, estimated time required for

survey completion, directions for how to access the survey, survey availability dates, and survey results dissemination information. The researcher's email address and telephone number were also included in the email. The email contained a statement of confidentiality so participants knew their responses would remain confidential. A statement in the email was also included letting participants know that their participation in the study was voluntary. A link to the survey and a unique participant password was included, as well as an enrollment figure for his/her college showing total enrollment for the academic year 2013 to be used to answer a specific question. See Appendix E for a copy of the email sent to participants. The consent to participate in the survey was expressed by the participants completing and submitting the web-based survey as approved by the IRB board.

The survey was conducted using a web-based survey software package, Class Climate. This software is a Scantron product used by many of Georgia's technical colleges in conducting colleague and student satisfaction surveys and student evaluations of instruction.

Three weeks were allowed for completion of the surveys. After one week, a group email was sent to each college's Deans for Academic Affairs reminding them of the importance of the survey and asking for their participation. Another email reminder was sent two weeks after the original invitation to participate. At the end of three weeks, 67 surveys had been completed, yielding a 61% return rate, surpassing the anticipated rate of 60%.

Data Analysis

The data gathered from this study for the research questions presents the demographic information and the job challenges using descriptive statistics. Reports were generated from the survey software and downloaded to SPSS 22 for data analysis for this study.

Hurlbert (2003) stated that descriptive statistics are used to show how information concerning a population is distributed. The analysis of the data provides the number of respondents and the percentage of the total for each question. Since the survey collected demographic data concerning the participants and their campuses, demographic data is presented in charts showing the number of responses and percentage of total responses/non-responses. For this study, the dependent variables were the challenges perceived by academic deans; and the independent variable was the size of the college. Data for research question one, the perceived job challenges, is reported using tables showing ranked order lists for each question. The number of responses per question and the percentage of each category of responses are displayed in tables.

For research question two, determining if the job challenges identified by participants differed based on the size of the technical college each represented, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to compare the means and determine if significant differences existed between the variables. The ANOVA is a simple test used to study possible mean differences (Lomax, 2001). The analysis of an independent variable that has two or more levels can be accomplished by using a one-way ANOVA (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988). The independent variable, college size, had two levels, (1) colleges with enrollment 6,000 or less, (2) and colleges with enrollment 6,001 or greater. The dependent variables were the 72 Challenge questions.

Using SPSS, an ANOVA was performed to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups with a significance level set at .05, meaning that one can be 95% confident that the results are due to the independent variable and that 5% of the time this result could happen by chance (Hurlburt, 2003). A comparison of the difference of means scores was conducted to determine if there were values less than the .05 significance level. Values less than

the .05 significant difference levels showed a significant difference existed between the responses from participants based on college size. Statistical tables were produced showing observed significance level results.

To determine if the significant differences in the challenges were from smaller or larger colleges, an independent T-test was conducted. The mean response values were analyzed to determine the differences.

Summary

This chapter described the research methodology used in conducting this descriptive, quantitative study. The chapter included sections pertaining to the purpose of the study, research questions, study design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, data analysis, and chapter summary. Chapter four will present the findings of the study as related to the research questions.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

In the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG), the Deans for Academic Affairs are essential in the day-to-day operations of the technical colleges. The Deans serve a major role in the administration of Georgia's technical colleges by working directly with the faculty who teach in the academic programs. Much is known about the roles, responsibilities, tasks, and characteristics of community college Deans; however, little is known specifically about TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs, the jobs they perform, and the challenges they encounter related to their position.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study was to develop a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) to include identified perceived job challenges related to their responsibilities. Job challenges were analyzed to see if the challenges differed based on the size of the technical colleges. Demographic information was gathered from the Deans, including specifics regarding the division supervised and the college represented. Determining the perceived job challenges related to the daily work of the deans provided awareness of where leadership development opportunities are needed.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What perceived job challenges were identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG?
2. Do the perceived job challenges identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG differ based on the size of the technical college they represent?

This study used a modified instrument developed for a study conducted by Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer in 1992, the International Community College Survey (Seagren, et al., 1994). The overall benefit of this study is that TCSG representatives and college personnel will be able to review the challenges the Deans face in their positions and provide professional development opportunities for Deans.

This chapter presents the results of the study and includes the analysis of the data as related to the research questions. Descriptive statistics provide demographic information related to the study's participants and their perceived challenges. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data related to whether the identified challenges differ based on the size of the college the participants represented.

Results

One-hundred and nine Deans for Academic Affairs including Associate and Assistant Deans employed by technical colleges in the TCSG were asked to participate in the study. Over a three-week period, 67 individuals completed the web-based survey for a response rate of 61%. The data was collected using the survey software Class Climate. Survey data was analyzed using Class Climate, Excel, and SPSS version 22.0.

In order to provide additional instrument reliability standards for this study, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs, a Cronbach's alpha test was conducted. An instrument is considered more reliable if fewer errors are revealed. The measurement of values is between .00

and 1.00, with .00 indicating no reliability and 1.00 indicating perfect reliability (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). The Cronbach alpha test conducted on the survey used in this study revealed the instrument was reliable with a .948 score.

To create a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG, section one of the survey collected demographic information about the deans and the division and college they represented. Demographic information was gathered from the Deans concerning (a) previous work experience, including number of years of previous experience; (b) number and types of programs supervised; (c) number of faculty supervised; (d) age; (e) gender; (f) ethnicity; (g) highest academic degree earned by the Deans; and (h) total number of years served in a technical college as a faculty member and administrator. The data was organized into tables showing the number of respondents for each question and the percentage of the total responses for each question according to the question categories. Narrative information concerning each demographic question is provided to indicate the most prevalent data for each question.

Previous Work Experience

Participants were asked to indicate if they had previous work experience in a (a) technical college, (b) business/industry, (c) four-year college or university, (d) K-12 schools, and in (e) two-year colleges not including technical colleges. In addition, participants were asked to indicate the number of years of previous experience in each environment.

The data showed that 82.09% of the respondents had previous work experience in a technical college. Table 5 shows results reported for previous work experience in a technical college.

Table 5

Previous Work Experience in a Technical College

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Yes	55	82.09%
No	12	17.91%

In reporting the number of years of previous work experience in a technical college, the highest percentage of responses (31.34%) indicated 11-15 years previous work experience. Table 6 shows all participant results for the number of years of work experience in a technical college.

Table 6

Number of Years' Experience in a Technical College

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
1-5 years	5	7.46%
6-10 years	16	23.88%
11-15 years	21	31.34%
16-20 years	17	25.37%
21-25 years	2	2.99%
26-30 years	4	5.97%
31 + years	2	2.99%

In response to whether participants had previous work experience in business/industry, 73.13% of the participants reported they did have previous work experience in business/industry. Table 7 shows the participant results for having previous work experience in business/industry.

Table 7

Previous Work Experience in Business/Industry

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Yes	49	73.13%
No	16	23.88%
No Response	2	2.99%

Of the participants reporting previous work experience in business/industry, most participants reported having 1-10 years of previous work experience in business/industry (44.77%). Table 8 shows all participant results reported for the number of years previous work experience in business/industry.

Table 8

Number of Years' Experience in Business/Industry

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	6	8.96%
1-5 years	13	19.40%
6-10 years	17	25.37%
11-15 years	6	8.96%
16-20 years	8	11.94%
21-25 years	1	1.49%
31-35 years	1	1.49%
36-40 years	1	1.49%
Not Applicable	1	1.49%
No Response	11	16.42%

Participants reported that 58.21% did not have previous work experience in a four-year college or university. Table 9 shows all participant results for the number of years of previous work experience in a four-year college or university.

Table 9

Previous Work Experience in a Four-Year College or University

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Yes	22	32.84%
No	39	58.21%
No Response	6	8.96%

Most participants reported zero years of previous work experience in a four-year college or university (40.30%). The largest segment indicating previous work experience in a four-year college or university (25.37%) reported having 1-5 years' experience in this setting. Table 10 shows all participant results reported for the number of years of previous work experience in a four-year college or university.

Table 10

Number of Years' Work Experience in a Four-Year College or University

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	27	40.30%
1-5 years	17	25.37%
6-10 years	3	4.48%
11-15 years	2	2.99%
16-20 years	2	2.99%
NA	3	4.48%
No Response	13	19.40%

Participants reported that 61.19% did not have previous work experience in K-12 schools. Table 11 show all participant results reported for the number of years of previous work experience in a four-year college or university.

Table 11

Previous Work Experience in K-12 Schools

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Yes	25	37.31%
No	41	61.19%
No Response	1	1.49%

Most participants reported zero years of previous work experience in K-12 schools (37.31%). Of those participants reporting previous work experience in K-12 schools, 19.40% indicated the number of years' experience as 1-5 years. Table 12 illustrates all participant results reported for the number of years of previous work experience in K-12 schools.

Table 12

Number of Years' Work Experience in K-12 Schools

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	25	37.31%
1-5 years	13	19.40%
6-10 years	6	8.96%
11-15 years	4	5.97%
16-20 years	0	0.00%
21-25 years	0	0.00%
26-30 years	2	2.99%
NA	2	2.99%
No Response	15	22.39%

A majority of participants, 77.63%, indicated having no previous work experience in a two-year college. Table 13 shows all participant results for those having previous work experience in a two-year college.

Table 13

Previous Work Experience in a Two-Year College

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Yes	15	22.39%
No	50	77.63%
No Response	2	2.99%

Of those participants reporting previous work experience in two-year colleges, 16.42% indicated the number of years' experience as 1-5 years. Table 14 shows all participant results reporting the number of years of previous work experience in a two-year college.

Table 14

Number of Years' Work Experience in a Two-Year College

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	32	47.76%
1-5 years	11	16.42%
6-10 years	3	4.48%
11-15 years	1	1.49%
16-20 years	1	1.49%
NA	3	4.48%
No Response	16	23.88%

Programs Supervised

Participants were asked to indicate the academic programs for which they are responsible given the most common program categories used in the TCSG technical colleges. Participants were encouraged to indicate all academic program categories in which they supervised programs; therefore, the percentages reported are greater than 100.00%. With the exception of Natural Resources (8.96%) and Learning Support (17.91%), the results showed the data was fairly evenly distributed among the program groups. Table 15 shows all participant responses for academic program areas.

Table 15

Programs Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Business	22	32.84%
Industrial Technologies	18	26.87%
Health Science	17	25.37%
Personal or Public Service	24	35.82%
Natural Resources	6	8.96%
General Education	22	32.84%
Learning Support	12	17.91%
Others	15	22.39%

Types of Instructional Programs Supervised

Participants were asked to indicate the number of degree, diploma, and technical certificate of credit (TCC) instructional programs supervised. In reviewing the degree programs data, 65.68% of the participants supervise 1-10 degree programs. Some participants (17.91%) responded that they did not supervise any degree programs. This information is probably

indicative that some participants supervise general education and/or learning support areas that are not distinguished as program areas leading to a degree credential. Table 16 shows all participant results reported for the number of degree instructional programs supervised by the participants.

Table 16

Number of Degree Programs Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 programs	12	17.91%
1-5 programs	22	32.84%
6-10 programs	22	32.84%
11-15 programs	5	7.46%
16-20 programs	2	2.99%
21-25 programs	1	1.49%
Not Applicable	1	1.49%
No Response	2	2.99%

The number of diploma instructional programs supervised by participants showed 25.37% oversee 11-15 diploma programs. Participants indicating they supervised zero diploma programs, (22.39%), most likely represent deans supervising general education and/or learning support areas not awarding a formal credential. Table 17 shows all participant results for supervision of instructional programs.

Table 17

Number of Diploma Programs Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 programs	15	22.39%
1-5 programs	14	20.90%
6-10 programs	13	19.40%
11-15 programs	17	25.37%
16-20 programs	3	4.48%
21-25 programs	0	0.00%
26-30 programs	2	2.99%
Not Applicable	1	1.49%
No Response	2	2.99%

The question concerning the number of instructional programs supervised that are technical certificates of credit (TCCs), most participants indicated they supervised 1-5 TCC programs (32.84%). The results showing zero TCC instructional programs supervised (11.94%) may indicate that TCC program awards are not taught in the division, or that general education and/or learning support areas are within the division supervised, with these areas generally not offering a TCC award. Table 18 shows all participant responses concerning the number of TCC instructional programs supervised.

Table 18

Number of TCC Programs Supervised

Response	# of Responses (n = 63)	% of total participants
0 programs	8	11.94%
1-5 programs	22	32.84%

(continued)

Table 18 (continued)

Number of TCC Programs Supervised

Response	# of Responses (n = 63)	% of total participants
6-10 programs	10	14.93%
11-15 programs	7	10.45%
16-20 programs	5	7.46%
21-25 programs	3	4.48%
26-30 programs	1	1.49%
31-35 programs	1	1.49%
36-40 programs	4	5.97%
41-45 programs	1	1.49%
67 programs	1	1.49%[a]
No Response	4	5.97%

[a] Results did not indicate number of programs supervised over 45 programs, except for one participant who reported supervising 67 programs.

Faculty

Participants were asked to indicate the number of full-time and adjunct faculty supervised. For full-time faculty, most reported supervising 11-15 faculty members (26.87%). Table 19 shows all participant results for the number of full-time faculty supervised.

Table 19

Full-Time Faculty Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 faculty	1	1.49%
1-5 faculty	5	7.46%

(continued)

Table 19 (continued)

Full-Time Faculty Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
6-10 faculty	5	7.46%
11-15 faculty	18	26.87%
16-20 faculty	15	22.39%
21-25 faculty	9	13.43%
26-30 faculty	5	7.46%
31-35 faculty	5	7.46%
36-40 faculty	1	1.49%
41-45 faculty	0	0.00%
46-50 faculty	1	1.49%
73 faculty	1	1.49%[b]
No Response	1	1.49%

[b] Results did not indicate number of full-time faculty supervised over 50 faculty, except for one participant who reported supervising 73 full-time faculty.

The number of adjunct faculty supervised by participants showed most participants (13.43%) supervised 6-10 adjunct faculty members. Table 20 shows all participant results for the number of adjunct faculty supervised.

Table 20

Number of Adjunct Faculty Supervised

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 faculty	3	4.48%
1-5 faculty	3	4.48%
6-10 faculty	9	13.43%
11-15 faculty	6	8.96%
16-20 faculty	8	11.94%
21-25 faculty	7	10.45%
26-30 faculty	5	7.46%
31-35 faculty	8	11.94%
36-40 faculty	5	7.46%
41-45 faculty	2	2.99%
46-50 faculty	1	1.49%
51-55 faculty	1	1.49%
56-60 faculty	2	2.99%
61-65 faculty	2	2.99%
66-70 faculty	0	0.00%
71-75 faculty	1	1.49%
76-80 faculty	1	1.49%
80-100 faculty	2	2.99%
120-150 faculty	1	1.49%

Age, Gender, Ethnicity

TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs were asked to disclose age, gender, and ethnicity information. The results showed that the majority of participants (58.21%) are between 36-55 years of age, with most participants representing indicating the 46-55 age category. Table 21 shows all participant responses for age categories.

Table 21

Age

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
25 or under	0	0.00%
26-35	4	5.97%
36-45	19	28.36%
46-55	20	29.85%
56-65	18	26.87%
66 or over	6	8.96%

Participants reported that 55.22% were female. Table 22 shows all participant results for gender categories.

Table 22

Gender

Response	# of Responses (n = 65)	% of total participants
Male	28	41.79%
Female	37	55.22%
No Response	2	2.99%

The ethnicity question revealed that 80.60% of the participants indicated they were white. Table 23 shows all participant results for the ethnicity categories.

Table 23

Ethnicity

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
White	54	80.60%
Black	10	14.93%
Hispanic	0	0.00%
Asian	1	1.49%
Native American	0	0.00%
Other	1	1.49%
No Response	1	1.49%

Academic Degrees

A majority of the participants responded that their highest academic degree achieved was a Master's degree (70.15%). Table 24 shows all results for the highest academic degree held by the participants.

Table 24

Highest Academic Degree

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
Doctoral	12	17.91%
Specialist	5	7.46%
Master's	47	70.15%
Bachelors	2	2.99%
No Response	1	1.49%

Number of Years as Full-Time Faculty and Administrator

Participants were asked to indicate the total number of years in a technical college (including TCSG) as a full-time faculty member. The majority of the participants have served as

a full-time faculty member in a technical college with 1-5 years of service (29.85%) and 26.87% reporting 11-15 years of service. Table 25 shows all results for participants disclosing the number of years in a technical college as a full-time faculty member.

Table 25

Number of Years as a Technical College Full-Time Faculty Member

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	7	10.45%
1-5 years	20	29.85%
6-10 years	10	14.93%
11-15 years	18	26.87%
16-20 years	7	10.45%
21-25 years	2	2.99%
26-30 years	1	1.49%
NA	1	1.49%
No Response	1	1.49%

For the total number of years served as a Dean or Director in academic affairs (including TCSG), 55.22% have served 1-5 years. Table 26 shows all participant results for the number of years served in a technical college as a dean or director in academic affairs, including TCSG.

Table 26

Number of Years as a Technical College Academic Affairs Dean or Director

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
0 years	1	1.49%
1-5 years	37	55.22%
6-10 years	20	29.85%
11-15 years	7	10.45%

(continued)

Table 26 (continued)

Number of Years as a Technical College Academic Affairs Dean or Director

Response	Participants (n = 67)	% of total participants
16-20 years	1	1.49%
21-25 years	0	0.00%
26-30 years	0	0.00%
31-35 years	1	1.49%

Section two of the survey collected information from the participants about the college size as defined by total annual full-time and part-time students for the academic year 2013. In the email inviting the participants to participate in the study, each participant was provided the enrollment figure for their college for the academic year 2013. Using the figure, the participants responded as to whether their college enrollment was 6,000 or less or 6,001 or greater. The data showed that 56.72% of the participants reported enrollment for their college as 6,001 or greater.

Question 1, Perceived Job Challenges

The third section of the revised Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer (1994) survey, (questions 3-13) collected information from participants concerning job challenges. Participants were presented eleven sections of challenges with questions concerning tasks and responsibilities performed by Deans for Academic Affairs. The sections included (a) Instructional Processes, (b) Supervision of Faculty and Staff, (c) Curriculum, (d) Students, (e) Fiscal Responsibilities, (f) Use of Technology, (g) Facilities/Inventory, (h) Planning, (i) Accreditation, (j) Campus Communications, and (k) External Activities. The participants were asked what they perceived as challenges in their position as Dean for Academic Affairs based on a scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Each subsection also had an open-ended question asking the participants if there was anything they would like to

add or comment on concerning the challenges faced in their position in reference to the subsection title.

The data was compiled into tables showing the percentage of participants who strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, and strongly disagreed, including the percentage of participants who did not provide a response to the question. Items were determined to be challenges identified by the percentages listed in the strongly agree and agree columns. If the percentage totals for the strongly agree and agree column for each question were greater than 50.00%, the participants perceived this responsibility as a challenge. The responses to each section's open-ended question were organized and compiled into themes, and these themes will be presented at the end of each challenge section.

Challenges Concerning Instructional Processes

Of the 16 challenge questions presented in the survey concerning instructional processes, 11 challenges were identified. Five instructional processes challenge question responses showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating the items were not challenges. The three highest-ranked challenge responses included improving (a) graduation rates (89.55%), (b) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple instructor programs (86.57%), (c) and increasing growth in programs (85.07%). Other instructional processes challenges included (a) monitoring program quality (77.61%), (b) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations (74.63%), (c) coordinating dual enrollment schedules (71.64%), (d) scheduling classes (70.15%), (e) developing student retention plans (68.66%), (f) monitoring programs at multiple-campus locations (65.67%), (g) monitoring classroom/lab instruction (65.67%), and (h) increasing growth in transfer programs (64.18%). Table 27 displays

the results of all participant response ratings for challenges concerning instructional processes in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 27

Instructional Process Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Improving graduation rates	89.55%	50.75%	38.81%	7.46%	0.00%	2.99%
Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple instructor programs	86.57%	38.81%	47.76%	10.45%	0.00%	2.99%
Increasing growth in programs	85.07%	37.31%	47.76%	8.96%	2.99%	2.99%
Monitoring program quality	77.61%	26.87%	50.75%	19.40%	0.00%	2.99%
Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations	74.63%	37.31%	37.31%	14.93%	4.48%	5.97%
Coordinating dual enrollment schedules	71.64%	32.84%	38.81%	19.40%	4.48%	4.48%
Scheduling classes	70.15%	28.36%	41.79%	25.37%	1.49%	2.99%
Developing student retention plans	68.66%	22.39%	46.27%	26.87%	1.49%	2.99%
Monitoring programs at multiple-campus locations	65.67%	44.78%	20.90%	25.37%	5.97%	2.99%

(continued)

Table 27 (continued)

Instructional Process Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Monitoring classroom/lab instruction	65.67%	13.43%	52.24%	31.34%	0.00%	2.99%
Increasing growth in transfer programs	64.18%	17.91%	46.27%	28.36%	2.99%	4.48%
Increasing course or program offerings through distance education	49.25%	11.94%	37.31%	37.31%	8.96%	4.48%
Increasing the use of advisory committees	35.82%	13.43%	22.39%	56.72%	2.99%	4.48%
Increasing program offerings sponsored by specific companies	34.33%	5.97%	28.36%	46.27%	13.43%	5.97%
Increasing the use of computers in the classroom	34.33%	10.45%	23.88%	56.72%	5.97%	2.99%
Designing promotional materials/activities for academic programs	25.37%	1.49%	23.88%	58.21%	10.45%	5.97%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to instructional processes. Twenty-three participants (34.33%) provided responses. When analyzing the instructional processes responses, two themes were discovered. Deans' responses indicated concerns with

maintaining and monitoring instructional quality. This theme also involved the heavy workloads of deans that often involved other tasks besides monitoring and improving instructional quality. The second theme focused on the concerns of budget and having enough money to adequately pay quality faculty. Table 28 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning instructional processes. Other than spelling corrections, all instructional process challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 28

Responses to Instructional Process Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Maintaining accreditation for multiple programs and managing resentment toward Gen Ed instructors who do not have to register as many students, do program self-studies, or teach as many hours as my health and services faculty.
2. It is difficult to monitor the consistency of educational quality among several campuses because of time constraints. Additionally, the large number of full and part time faculty increases the difficulty of maintaining consistency in instruction, especially in health core subjects.
3. In defining challenges, I responded as if they were a large amount of my work time. These are all challenges we face daily, some more than others.
4. Lack of state funding to hire additional faculty and being to attract and keep quality faculty members.
5. Time associated with administration of mandates from governing bodies (such as ACA, program accrediting bodies, SACSCOC).
6. Ensuring equity between online and face-to-face instruction is also a challenge.

(continued)

Table 28 (continued)

Responses to Instructional Process Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
7. My position in academic affairs does not involve the instructional process.
8. Getting access to additional funds to expand program opportunities (travel abroad, internship, etc...). (Budgeting). Providing more professional development activities via out of state travel to conferences. Hiring more full-time faculty given budget constraints and paying competitive salaries to those we do hire. Getting students more involved with campus activities given our commuter style culture.
9. We are currently undergoing the SACS COC accreditation process. At this point we are severely limited as to type and scope of changes we are allowed to make thus hampering the above mentioned activities.
10. Changing adjunct positions to full-time positions being heavy in adjunct positions to save on expenses keeping quality adjuncts with the reduction in hours worked because of the Affordable Care Act Adapting technical trade programs that use stacked classes to an academic model. Having responsibility without the power to make decisions; too many steps to complete before an initiative can be approved Lack of marketing of programs Lack of administrative assistant help Low pay for adjuncts and full-time faculty when competing with board of regent's colleges and private colleges. Supervisor not backing up decisions that have been made by a Dean and an instructor.
11. Keeping quality and consistency high is quite a challenge due to the number of adjunct faculty we employ.
12. Helping instructors to find the time and importance of all of the other things they are asked to do or to participate in that are not directly linked to teaching in the classroom and lab.

(continued)

Table 28 (continued)

Responses to Instructional Process Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
13. At current workplace there are 44 programs, we have 6 Deans and 1 Associate Dean. Programs are assigned as follows: I Dean (survey participant) 20 programs, 1 Associate Dean over Child Care Development, 1 Dean over General Education (not included in the '44' count above), 1 Dean over 14 programs, 1 Dean over 9 programs, 1 Dean of Technology, 1 Dean of Library services. As you can see the programs are not distributed evenly among the Deans causing some Deans to have an extremely heavy workload. I am not able to work individually with my programs; the majority of my time is spent on student issues. My division alone, with 20 programs, carries half of the student population.
14. The lack of discipline and good study habits among students who increasingly don't come to class, don't complete assignments, and don't purchase course materials. When their grades drop, they come to the dean complaining about the instructor. Teachers are increasingly badgered and verbally attacked by students at every turn. A great deal of time is spent addressing these issues in an effort to bring student and instructor together.
15. Changing the way we teach nursing with faculty that are comfortable with the instructor control classroom. Would like to see more concept base learning.
16. The greatest challenge is being able to pay faculty their worth.
17. Personnel management.
18. Other challenges include: finding credentialed faculty, maintaining high morale through budget cuts and furloughs, and providing effective academic support for underprepared students.

(continued)

Table 28 (continued)

Responses to Instructional Process Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
19. As a school we just recently split the division I am over into its own division so it is small now and I do not face the challenges as much. Before this position I was over another division (largest in the college in terms of programs offered) and I found almost all the above to be very challenging.
20. Administrative work level is so high that there is limited to no time to monitor quality of programs.
21. Being on a satellite campus, I am sometimes over any problem someone wants to throw at me, GED to Continuing Education, or different departments like financial aid.
22. Producing reports and justification documents.
23. Note: the items above marked disagree do not fall under my duties. The Arts & Sciences have no programs directly related to them here.

Challenges Concerning Supervising of Faculty and Staff

Of the 16 challenge questions presented in the survey concerning faculty and staff, 11 challenges were identified. Six faculty and staff challenge question responses showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the items were challenges. The three highest-ranked faculty and staff challenges included recruiting faculty (89.55%), evaluating faculty performance in distance education classes (74.63%), and supervising faculty and staff at multiple campus locations (67.16%). Other faculty and staff challenges identified included (a) recommending termination of faculty (62.69%), (b) providing orientation to new faculty (61.19%), (c) mentoring faculty and staff (61.19%), (d) evaluating faculty performance in

traditional classroom settings (59.70%), (e) conducting faculty performance evaluations (58.21%), (f) devising faculty-disciplinary plans (56.72%), (g) designing professional development opportunities for faculty (55.22%), and (h) training faculty in distance education delivery (52.24%) Table 29 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning supervision of faculty and staff in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 29

Supervision of Faculty and Staff Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant responses (n = 67)					
Challenges	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Recruiting faculty	89.55%	50.75%	38.81%	8.96%	0.00%	1.49%
Evaluating faculty performance in distance education classes	74.63%	25.37%	49.25%	20.90%	0.00%	4.48%
Supervising faculty and staff at multiple campus locations	67.16%	32.84%	34.33%	26.87%	2.99%	2.99%
Recommending termination of faculty	62.69%	31.34%	31.34%	29.85%	4.48%	2.99%
Providing orientation to new faculty	61.19%	25.37%	35.82%	34.33%	1.49%	2.99%
Mentoring faculty and staff	61.19%	14.93%	46.27%	32.84%	2.99%	2.99%

(continued)

Table 29 (continued)

Supervision of Faculty and Staff Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant responses (n = 67)					
Challenges	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Evaluating faculty performance in traditional classroom settings	59.70%	13.43%	46.27%	34.33%	2.99%	2.99%
Conducting faculty performance evaluations	58.21%	7.46%	50.75%	37.31%	0.00%	4.48%
Devising faculty disciplinary plans	56.72%	10.45%	46.27%	34.33%	5.97%	2.99%
Designing professional development opportunities for faculty	55.22%	13.43%	41.79%	35.82%	5.97%	2.99%
Training faculty in distance education delivery	52.24%	20.90%	31.34%	40.30%	2.99%	4.48%
Establishing faculty credentialing guidelines	46.27%	19.40%	26.87%	44.78%	5.97%	2.99%
Determining teaching assignments	38.81%	7.46%	31.34%	52.24%	5.97%	2.99%
Promoting diversity equity	31.34%	4.48%	26.87%	52.24%	11.94%	4.48%
Supervising clerical staff	25.37%	0.00%	25.37%	56.72%	13.43%	4.48%
Preparing job descriptions	22.39%	2.99%	19.40%	62.69%	13.43%	1.49%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to faculty and staff. Eleven participants (16.42%) provided responses. When analyzing the responses, one primary theme was discovered. Deans' responses indicated concerns with recruiting, hiring, and retaining qualified faculty during a time of budget reductions, no salary increases, and low pay scales compared to other colleges. Table 30 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the faculty and staff challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all faculty and staff challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 30

Responses to Faculty and Staff Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. One of the greatest challenges is hiring and retaining qualified instructors because of competition with health care facilities. Because of the decrease in student numbers, the compensation for instructors has remained at the same level for a number of years and faculty is, in fact, losing money because of increases in the cost of living. Supervising faculty at multiple-campus locations is difficulty [*sic*] without a good departmental organizational structure, especially in the aftermath of a merger.
2. 4.16 - We are accredited by SACSCOC so, establishing those guidelines are not a challenge. We stick strictly to the guidelines presented to us by SACSCOC. Everyone is credentialed and we only hire credentialed faculty.
3. Lack of time to mentor and coach faculty.
4. Most of my faculty is Theory Y type people so this is not a big issue for me. Recruiting faculty based on our pay scale is a major challenge!

(continued)

Table 30 (continued)

Responses to Faculty and Staff Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
5. One thing I have learned in a number of years in supervisory roles it [*sic*] that you must treat every employee fairly, but you cannot treat them all the same.
6. Recruiting new faculty (adjunct and full time) has become one of the biggest challenges. This also contributes to program growth, retention and graduation rates.
7. My position in academic affairs does not involve the supervision of faculty.
8. Recruiting faculty in 4.2 is only an issue when it comes to dual enrollment. It is difficult to find a credentialed person who is willing to teach an hour or two at odd times during the day (to suit the needs of various high school schedules).
9. Faculty that are not motivated and do just enough to get by.
10. TCSG is not competitive enough, in the area of compensation, to draw qualified industry leaders into our faculty positions. We offer low salaries, and have not had a salary increase (raise) in 7 years.
11. Note: the unmarked items above are not part of my duties as a Dean but fall under the direct supervision of others on campus.

Challenges Concerning Curriculum

Of the seven challenge questions presented in the survey concerning curriculum, four challenges were identified. Three curriculum challenge question responses showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating the participants did not perceive these items as challenges. The curriculum challenges included (a) preparing new program requests (55.22%), (b) developing new program curricula (55.22%), (c) conducting assessments to determine need for new programs (55.22%); and (d) globalizing the curriculum (53.73%). Table

31 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning curriculum in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 31

Curriculum Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Preparing new program requests	55.22%	13.43%	41.79%	32.84%	5.97%	5.97%
Developing new program curricula	55.22%	14.93%	40.30%	32.84%	5.97%	5.97%
Conducting assessments to determine need for new programs	55.22%	11.94%	43.28%	29.85%	4.48%	10.45%
Globalizing the curriculum	53.73%	13.43%	40.30%	37.31%	5.97%	2.99%
Suggesting modifications to curriculum	47.76%	10.45%	37.31%	46.27%	2.99%	2.99%
Offering distance education programs	41.79%	20.90%	20.90%	49.25%	2.99%	5.97%
Increasing general education requirements	35.82%	8.96%	26.87%	56.72%	4.48%	2.99%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to curriculum. Nine participants (13%) provided responses. When analyzing the responses, one theme was discovered. Deans' responses indicated concerns with curriculum restructuring that is currently

being done, including the evaluation of general education components associated with programs. Table 32 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the curriculum challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all curriculum challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 32

Responses to Curriculum Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. The greatest challenge right now with curriculum is the restructuring of large health programs. Since switching to the semester system, it seems there is already less time with the students, and now program size has been cut drastically. Instructors are having a difficult time adjusting to this change.
2. Challenges in general education requirements are all set by state standards for each Degree, Diploma, and Certificate. We don't want to increase these requirements, but want to increase course offerings in this area for degree electives and new degrees.
3. Just the bureaucracy behind getting things through committees, the board and TCSG are usually my issues.
4. Starting new programs without additional funding continues to be a challenge.
5. The opposite hold [*sic*] true for general education requirements as program look to streamline GE to courses which are applicable to job readiness to meet business and industry needs. Less fluff and more concentration on job skills and quicker completion times.
6. Most of these items are not applicable to General Education.
7. Curriculum also presents scheduling challenges, especially with regards to faculty qualifications. It is very difficult to find qualified adjunct faculty for some required courses (physics, chemistry for example).

Challenges Concerning Students

Of the eight challenge questions presented in the survey concerning students, five challenges were identified. Three students challenge question responses showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating the participants did not perceive these items as challenges. The challenges included (a) responding to students' complaints/grievances (74.63%), (b) recruiting students (70.15%), (c) serving at-risk students (65.67%, (d) advising students (59.70%), and (e) counseling students (56.72%). Table 33 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning students in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 33

Student Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenges	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Responding to students complaints/grievances	74.63%	34.33%	40.30%	20.90%	1.49%	2.99%
Recruiting students	70.15%	16.42%	53.73%	20.90%	4.48%	4.48%
Serving at-risk students	65.67%	19.40%	46.27%	28.36%	2.99%	2.99%
Advising students	59.70%	19.40%	40.30%	31.34%	2.99%	5.97%
Counseling students	56.72%	5.97%	50.75%	32.84%	2.99%	7.46%

(continued)

Table 33 (continued)

Student Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenges	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Responding to the needs of diverse students	43.28%	10.45%	32.84%	47.76%	4.48%	4.48%
Addressing student transfer issues	35.82%	10.45%	25.37%	50.75%	7.46%	5.97%
Establishing selective admission criteria	28.36%	5.97%	22.39%	52.24%	11.94%	7.46%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges faced in their position with regard to students. Ten participants (14.93%) provided responses. When analyzing the responses, two themes emerged. Deans were concerned with student problems such as appeals and complaints often centered on students not being successful in classes. The other theme involved student advisement and advisement processes. Table 34 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the student challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all students challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 34

Responses to Student Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. A majority of student complaints could be handled at the faculty level if students would follow the chain of command.
2. We spend much time advising and responding to student needs in the TCSG. We are now the only college system to offer remedial education/learning support classes, as the BOR has pushed this back to the 2 yr college. As an open door, open access college, we see diverse of [*sic*] students of which many are underprepared for college level work.
3. Advising is currently being re-evaluated at my college as students currently don't have to be advised even after their freshmen orientation; but this causes major issues when they need to graduate and they haven't followed the course curriculum provided by the catalog. Moreover, having high admission criteria can hinder getting students in the door, especially if they are in learning support classes. Many times we lose them before they are program ready. Transferring courses between us and the USG is a big deal. One that I believe we need to spend more time leveraging on behalf of our students and in support of the Complete College Georgia Initiative.
4. Recruiting academically prepared students is challenging. We are still working to prove that technical colleges aren't just for those who aren't successful at four-year colleges universities.
5. My position does not involve the students & issues surrounding them. These issues are handled by division chairs, program deans and/or student affairs.
6. We have updated advising technology tools on campus, but it isn't shared between departments.
7. Strong college policies are vital in the process of student complaints/grievances.

(continued)

Table 34 (continued)

Responses to Student Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
8. Dealing with student behavior issues.
9. Consistency in the effort put into advisement is a concern. Some advisors do an excellent job of advising & counseling students, while others do not take the time that is needed to adequately prepare the student for what is expected regarding coursework/course load, how long it will take to complete the program, etc. Staff development on advisement is provided, yet this area continues to need improvement in some programs.
10. One of the greatest challenges with regard to students is dealing with appeals and student complaints. I rarely see students in my office unless they have a grievance, so student issues are always challenging.

Challenges Concerning Fiscal Responsibilities

Of the five challenge questions presented in the survey concerning fiscal responsibilities, four challenges were identified. One fiscal responsibility challenge question response showed participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating participants did not perceive this item as a challenge. The fiscal responsibilities challenges included (a) maintaining budgetary resources to support all programs (80.60%), (b) seeking external funding for academic resources (76.12%), (c) developing division budgets (68.66%), and (d) purchasing classroom/lab equipment (65.67%). Table 35 displays results of all participant responses for challenges concerning fiscal responsibilities in ranked order according to the total responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 35

Fiscal Responsibility Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Maintaining budgetary resources to support all programs	80.60%	43.28%	37.31%	14.93%	1.49%	2.99%
Seeking external funding for academic resources	76.12%	40.30%	35.82%	17.91%	1.49%	4.48%
Developing division budgets	68.66%	19.40%	49.25%	28.36%	0.00%	2.99%
Purchasing classroom/lab equipment	65.67%	23.88%	41.79%	31.34%	1.49%	1.49%
Monitoring grant expenditures	38.81%	19.40%	19.40%	52.24%	2.99%	5.97%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to fiscal responsibilities. Nine participants (13.43%) provided responses. When analyzing the fiscal responsibilities challenge responses, the primary theme focused on the lack of budget resources and the need for additional external funding. Table 36 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the fiscal responsibilities challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all fiscal responsibilities challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 36

Responses to Fiscal Responsibility Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. The main fiscal challenge is the decrease in funds for programs, and deciding which program needs are the most critical. So far, we have not had any difficulty obtaining equipment and supplies that are needed. The travel budget is still pretty tight.
2. I do not manage any grants at this time. I did in the past, but not now.
3. Our budgeting process is quite simple and developing them is simple too. We just want to ensure we don't lose budgetary items from fiscal year to fiscal year while also being aware of the competitive nature each division has in obtaining budgetary dollars.
4. I supervise Trades Industry and Transportation. All expensive programs to operate. Funding is a daily focus.
5. The need for external funding has dramatically increased due to the budget restraints in state and federal funding yet technology continues to progress.
6. The State purchasing system requires too much time and training and is so slow that it makes planning and efficiency difficult.
7. Need grant finders and writers at all technical colleges.
8. For the past two years the budget has been set above us by the VPAA and has been cut.
9. Budget matters are always an issue – the main issue is not enough funds allocated to do what is necessary.

Challenges Concerning Use of Technology

Of the three challenge questions presented in the survey concerning technology, two challenges were identified. One technology challenge question response showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating the participants did not perceive this item as a

challenge. The challenges included analyzing statistical data (67.19%) and compiling statistical data (62.29%). Table 37 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning use of technology in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 37

Use of Technology Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Analyzing statistical data	67.16%	17.91%	49.25%	25.37%	5.97%	1.49%
Compiling statistical data	62.69%	25.37%	37.31%	29.85%	5.97%	1.49%
Using computer technology	32.84%	2.99%	29.85%	53.73%	13.43%	0.00%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to use of technology. Five participants (7.46%) provided responses. When analyzing the use of technology responses, several themes were discovered. Deans' responses indicated concerns with needing more experience and training concerning statistical data and ability to customize reports from Banner and KMS. Banner is TCSG's Student Information System and KMS (Knowledge Management System) is TCSG's data and reporting division. Other responses indicated satisfaction with the support and training available on his/her campus. Another comment focused on analyzing student learning outcomes, but specifically on the challenge of making sure everyone in the division compiled the data. Table 38 provides all use of technology responses to the open-ended

question concerning the use of technology challenges. Other than spelling corrections, technology challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 38

Responses to Use of Technology Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. I probably need more experience and training with statistical data.
2. We compile and analyze student learning outcomes every semester. It is a challenge to make sure everyone complies.
3. I'm currently completing my doctoral degree at VSU and I quite frequently have to explain statistical data to my faculty. I actually enjoy and they utilize it in their analysis of grades (E.G. Z-Scores) instead of raw scores!
4. The ability to customize reports from Banner and KMS would be helpful.
5. There seems to be sufficient support and/or technology training for colleague needing such.

Challenges Concerning Facilities/Inventory

Of the four challenge questions presented in the survey concerning facilities/inventory, participant responses did not indicate any challenges when combining the strongly agree and agree categories. The results for these four challenges showed results lower than 50.00%. Table 39 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning facilities/inventory in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 39

Facilities/Inventory Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Planning for new facilities	49.25%	13.43%	35.82%	38.81%	7.46%	4.48%
Evaluating facilities for program use	44.78%	5.97%	38.81%	44.78%	7.46%	2.99%
Supervising off-campus facilities	43.28%	13.43%	29.85%	41.79%	10.45%	4.48%
Monitoring program equipment inventory	40.30%	8.96%	31.34%	52.24%	4.48%	2.99%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to facilities/inventory. Four participants (5.97%) provided responses. When analyzing the facilities/inventory responses, a theme did not really emerge. Comments were made about the challenge of planning for new facilities and the need for new facilities. Two comments stated that responsibility for this area was not relevant to his/her position. Table 40 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the facilities/inventory challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all facilities/inventory comments are listed verbatim.

Table 40

Responses to Facilities/Inventory Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Planning for a new facility is challenging, but certainly rewarding as well.
2. This is not part of my job as a Dean of General Education.
3. We have plans for facilities we just don't have funding yet. At my school we only have one campus as of right now. 2016 will change that.
4. No responsibility in this area.

Challenges Concerning Planning

Of the three challenge questions concerning planning, all three items were identified as challenges. Table 41 displays the results identified by the participants concerning planning.

Table 41

Planning Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses		Participant response (n = 67)				
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Evaluating policies, procedures, and processes	73.13%	20.90%	52.24%	25.37%	1.49%	0.00%
Developing annual division plans	67.16%	17.91%	49.25%	26.87%	5.97%	0.00%
Preparing enrollment projections	64.18%	16.42%	47.76%	28.36%	2.99%	4.48%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to planning. Six participants (9%) provided responses. When analyzing the responses, the theme identified was the amount of

time required for planning, including the time needed for documentation of institutional effectiveness processes. Table 42 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the planning challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all planning challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 42

Responses to Planning Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. We service our students but I do not spend much time on enrollment projections. We plan for increases in the fall and slightly lower in the spring, and then even lower in the summer semesters. We add classes as needed. I am on several committees that evaluate policies, procedures, and processes. Academic Affairs also deals with many academic policies that are in our catalog.
2. I personally thrive in this area and it's not challenging for me. If anything we spend a lot of time planning in my divisions.
3. The IE process, while very necessary, takes a large amount of time to keep in compliance with all of the various requirements or COE and COC.
4. The timing of our current annual planning process doesn't allow for current data as we develop plans for the upcoming year. Plans are developed in May...data isn't ready until January.
5. So much has changed in this college that it is difficult to put a handle on any plan, procedure, and process.
6. The only challenge as previously stated, due to student and personnel issues, I have little time to spend on planning.

Challenges Concerning Accreditation

Of the three challenge questions presented in the survey concerning accreditation, all three items were identified by participants as challenges. Table 43 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning accreditation in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 43

Accreditation Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Preparing for institutional accreditation/reviews	86.57%	43.28%	43.28%	10.45%	0.00%	2.99%
Preparing for program accreditation/reviews	71.64%	34.33%	37.31%	22.39%	1.49%	4.48%
Addressing accountability issues	68.66%	22.39%	46.27%	28.36%	0.00%	2.99%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to accreditation. Eight participants (11.94%) provided responses. When analyzing the accreditation responses, one theme was discovered. Deans' responses indicated that accreditation activities, including program accreditation, demanded a great deal of time especially for faculty. Table 44 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the accreditation challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all accreditation challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 44

Responses to Accreditation Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Maintaining accreditation at any level is always a challenge, but having a lot of experience with programmatic accreditation makes that process easier. Fortunately, we have a great Institutional Effectiveness department that gives us a tremendous amount of support.
2. We just got reaccredited a year ago and we do not have to address accountability issues unless some units or departments have not completed their annual work on student learning outcomes. Everyone in my division complies regularly in these areas.
3. SACSCOC and other program accreditations are simply time consuming. The preparation is time consuming, but they are not daunting task [*sic*] after going through a few.
4. We have several programs that have their own accreditation. I must assure that these criteria are met along with all other accreditation needs.
5. A more stream-lined IE process would improve faculty understanding and buy-in.
6. In the previous years, I had a great responsibility in the area of accreditation. Now I do not have responsibility in this area.
7. There are not any program accreditations in my area of Business Technologies and Human Services.
8. Lack of time of faculty to gather additional information for our accreditation.

Challenges Concerning Campus Communication

Of the three challenge questions presented in the survey concerning campus communication, two items were identified as challenges. One campus communication challenge

question response showed the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed, indicating the participants did not perceive this item as a challenge. The challenges included communication information from administration to faculty (65.67%) and communicating needs and concerns of divisions to administration (62.69%). Table 45 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning campus communication in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 45

Campus Communication Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Communicating information from administration to faculty	65.67%	20.90%	44.78%	26.87%	4.48%	2.99%
Communicating needs and concerns of division to administration	62.69%	25.37%	37.31%	29.85%	5.97%	1.49%
Networking with other deans on campus	37.31%	11.94%	25.37%	46.27%	13.43%	2.99%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges faced in their position with regard to campus communication. Seven participants (10%) provided responses. When analyzing the campus communication responses, two themes were discovered. Deans' responses indicated communication was an important

component in their jobs, especially across multiple campuses. Another theme showed that a communication challenge exists in administration understanding the needs of the division and faculty. Table 46 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the external activities challenges. Responses concerning campus communication are listed verbatim with the exception that spelling was corrected and a name of an individual was redacted.

Table 46

Responses to Campus Communication Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Faculty members are always concerned about communication with administration. My concern is trying to get administration to understand the needs of the division. Health programs are somewhat unique in that there are programmatic accreditation issues and clinical site issues that other divisions don't have.
2. I am constantly communicating to other Deans, Faculty, and Staff. We are five campuses spread across several counties. Communication is a key part of our daily success.
3. Communication to other areas of academia is the biggest challenge: E.G. Student Affairs.
4. There are three Deans at our college and we all have a very cohesive working relationship. We are in constant communication to assure we are all meeting our responsibilities and everyone is willing to help as needed. This is a big positive on our campus. Our VP is extremely supportive and understanding and our president is approachable and willing to listen to any thoughts or concerns.
5. Communication is bad!
6. Our VP of academic affairs is always available and supportive of the deans. I have support. I need more funds.
7. Many times decisions are made by administration; however, the deans are responsible for sharing those decisions with faculty and defending those decisions. This can create more challenges for deans.

Challenges Concerning External Activities

Of the four challenge questions presented in the survey concerning external activities, all four items were identified by the participants as challenges. The external activities challenges included networking (a) with deans from other colleges (65.67%); (b) participating in state, regional, and/or national meetings/conferences (53.73%); (c) participating in community activities and events (52.24%); and (d) developing relationships with business and industry (50.75%). Table 47 displays the results of all participant responses for challenges concerning external activities in ranked order according to the total participant responses that strongly agreed and agreed.

Table 47

External Activity Challenges

Ranked order of challenges based on total % of strongly agree and agree responses	Participant response (n = 67)					
Challenge	Perceived challenges	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Networking with deans from other colleges	65.67%	16.42%	49.25%	26.87%	5.97%	1.49%
Participating in state, regional and/or national meetings/conferences	53.73%	16.42%	37.31%	35.82%	8.96%	1.49%
Participating in community activities and events	52.24%	14.93%	37.31%	35.82%	10.45%	1.49%
Developing relationships with business and industry	50.75%	13.43%	37.31%	37.31%	8.96%	2.99%

Participants were asked if there was anything they would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges they faced in their position with regard to external activities. Fifteen participants (22.39%) provided responses. When analyzing the external activities responses, several themes were discovered. Deans' responses indicated concerns with not having enough time to participate in external activities. Other Deans' responses indicated that meetings with other Deans through a recently established TCSG Dean's Council would help in the development of stronger relationships with other Deans in technical colleges throughout the state. Some responses indicated that budgetary constraints result in limited participation in national and regional conferences. One response noted that several initiatives were in place at the college to promote community involvement including coordination with high schools and business/industry. Another response was that networking with accreditation boards was a priority. Table 48 provides all responses to the open-ended question concerning the external activities challenges. Other than spelling corrections, all external activities challenge responses are listed verbatim.

Table 48

Responses to External Activity Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Time is the biggest constraint for participating in all activities, but they are important. I have to decide which activities are most important and budget my time.
2. We have several initiatives at our college that reach into the community. Project Success allows us to work with high schools, our college, and industry. We have a First Year Matters initiative. We go to conferences and IFCC faculty consortium meetings. We constantly network among other Deans and colleges in our system. We are all on ListServes to stay connected.

(continued)

Table 48 (continued)

Responses to External Activity Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
3. Can be a bit much at times.
4. I believe last year November 2013 they just started an executive dean's council for TCSG to get Deans around the state involved in conversations. I think this is ideal given that we all have similar experiences.
5. Attending national and regional conferences has been difficult due to budget constraints. In 2013 TCSG implemented a Deans Peer Group which has helped greatly with networking within the system.
6. Competition between sister colleges often inhibits collaboration. If we truly worked as a team we could accomplish more.
7. Much of the Dean's time is taken up with putting out fires. Maintaining consistency throughout college is a major challenge.
8. Networking with deans should start becoming easier with the establishment of a Deans Council, which will be promoting regular meetings of campus deans.
9. Time management and juggling competing and seemingly equally important tasks are the most difficult issue in serving as dean.
10. 13.3 Lack of funds makes this one a challenge.
11. External commitments can be very time consuming, and those commitments are expected to be met in addition to regular job duties.
12. Due to my current workload it is nearly impossible to participate in external activities.
13. Time is what creates the challenge here....
14. Networking with our accreditation bodies is a priority but networking with the community is a challenge due to time. I work on average 60 hours a week which leaves little time for the community but I am on several hospital community boards.

Participants were asked a final open-ended question to determine if there were specific strategies that would help the Deans in overcoming the challenges faced in their positions. Nineteen participants (29.69%) provided responses. When analyzing the responses, several themes were discovered. Deans' responses indicated that peer group meetings would assist in learning about issues affecting their jobs and state staff providing guidance on upcoming issues. Staffing concerns were noted as to not enough Academic Affairs administrative staff and/or reallocation of Deans to more equitable handle the job responsibilities. Another suggestion was to clarify the roles of deans including reviewing the types of decisions Deans can make without approvals. The final theme concerning strategies focused on improving communication. Table 49 provides all responses to the open-ended strategy question. Other than spelling corrections, all challenges are listed verbatim.

Table 49

Strategies Concerning Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
1. Try to hire good people and trust the people you hire to do their jobs.
2. Constant Communication is the only strategy that allows me to be successful at my job. Learning as much information that I can and attending all the state meetings for Deans and faculty in my area help me to be on top of the hottest issues we are facing at any given time.
3. As we are constantly needing to plan ahead....timely anticipation from state office of how to address upcoming external changes/challenges.
4. Clearer delineation of roles within the college, better communication from VPs.
5. Methods of maintaining consistency throughout the college.

(continued)

Table 49 (continued)

Strategies Concerning Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
6. Improve Communication; stop the micro-managing!
7. Personally, I'm working to improve in the area of institutional advancement. We have to become more visible to business/industry folks to provide additional dollars to progress our programs. Our college budgets aren't big enough to serve the people we need to serve efficiently.
8. One initiative of the Deans Peer Group is to hold scheduled meetings focusing on the different areas supervised. I believe that as a result of these meetings some type of training may be developed for new Deans.
9. Increases in support staff, addition of program chairs, and addition of division chairs would be helpful.
10. Programs need to be distributed more evenly between Deans.
11. If the leaders at the state level (TCSG) would provide training in regards to what are the responsibilities of each dean. Provide a 'check list' of items that should be completed each month, each term, each year. When I was placed in the position I received no training or guide lines. When I have had to hire new faculty I receive very little support from HR. I had to provide interview questions, check previous work history and check references. I am not a HR expert but I know there are certain questions that can and cannot be asked during an interview or when checking references.
12. Honestly, the biggest problem is not enough time. We are responsible for all of the activities noted in the survey. I love my job and am dedicated to everyone one of the responsibilities but am stretched to the limit in time to be good at all of it and to have the time to reflect and review strategies for improvement.

(continued)

Table 49 (continued)

Strategies Concerning Challenges

Open-Ended Responses
13. Not to teach a class. I would guest lecture in any class. My time would be better spent in the community advocating for our programs to increase enrollment and more time with student learning outcomes and archiving the dream tasks just to mention a few.
14. We have instituted a Dean's outreach that should help with the transition of new deans.
15. For upper administration to allow us to make more middle management decisions. Upper level management is to [*sic*] involved in middle management decision making.
16. Bottom up decision making, IE data collection, analysis and distribution, instructional designs, clear organization structure with multiple levels of leadership.
17. Hiring strategies for adjuncts.
18. Better communication on all fronts.
19. No.

Research Question 2, Challenge Differences Based on College Size

Research question two sought to determine if the perceived job challenges identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in TCSG differed based on the size of the college as defined by unduplicated student enrollment of the technical college. In the invitation sent to Deans for Academic Affairs to participate in the study, each Dean's email contained an enrollment figure specific to their college for 2013 annual enrollment. The Deans were asked to answer a specific question as to whether their college's enrollment was 6,000 or less or 6,001 or greater.

To extract the data for this question, the challenge questions were downloaded into SPSS and an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on the questions in each challenge

subsection to determine if any of the perceived challenges differed based on college size. Based on 72 challenge questions, four questions showed significant differences. The significant differences included the following: (a) increasing growth in programs, (b) increasing growth in transfer programs, (c) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and (d) training faculty in distance education delivery modes. Table 50 summarizes the ANOVA results for the four challenges determined to be significant different.

Table 50

Challenges Identified as Significantly Different Based on College Size

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Increasing growth in programs	Between Groups	3.565	1	3.565	7.025	.010
	Within Groups	31.973	63	.508		
	Total	35.538	64			
Increasing growth in transfer programs	Between Groups	4.477	1	4.477	8.506	.005
	Within Groups	32.633	62	.526		
	Total	37.109	63			
Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations	Between Groups	4.001	1	4.001	5.851	.019
	Within Groups	41.713	61	.684		
	Total	45.714	62			
Training faculty in distance education delivery methods	Between Groups	2.734	1	2.734	4.061	.048
	Within Groups	41.750	62	.673		
	Total	44.484	63			

To determine if significant differences in the challenges were from smaller or larger colleges, an independent T-test was conducted. The mean response values were analyzed to determine the differences. The first significantly different challenge identified by the Deans, increasing growth in programs, the challenge emerged from the deans of larger colleges, those with enrollment of 6,001 and more. Deans from the smaller colleges, those with enrollment of 6,000 or less, perceived the other three challenges as significantly different: (a) increasing growth in transfer programs, (b) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and (c) training faculty in distance education delivery modes.

Summary

The data for this study has been statistically analyzed to determine a profile for the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia. Demographic information has been determined in relation to factors concerning previous work experience, including number of years of previous experience; number and types of programs supervised; number of faculty supervised; age; gender; ethnicity; highest academic degree achieved by the Deans; and number of years served as a faculty member and administrator. The study identified 49 perceived job challenges related to the Deans' responsibilities. The challenges were analyzed to determine if any significant difference existed between the perceived challenges identified by the Deans and the analysis showed that four challenges were significantly different based on the size of the college. Qualitative data was analyzed for themes identified concerning comments the Deans provided regarding the challenges and strategies suggested for overcoming the challenges.

Demographic information related to the Deans and data concerning perceived job challenges were gathered in this study concerning the Deans for Academic Affairs in the

Technical College System of Georgia. Chapter five will present a summary of the findings, discussion, implications, and make recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Higher education environments such as community and technical colleges need leadership that is attentive to the needs of the environment. Change is constantly occurring and causing leaders to change in much the same way that Bass (1990) described when he stated that "leaders are agents of change—persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them" (pp. 19-20).

Wallin (2010) stated that leadership development is needed more today than ever so that community and technical colleges can continue to meet the needs of students. Specifically, technical colleges need to establish leadership programs that emphasize "…the importance of vision and foresight; the relevance of partnerships; and best practices in a rapidly changing economic, social, political, and cultural environment" (p. 1). This is true for the TCSG and the technical colleges in the system. Specifically, Deans for Academic Affairs constantly are being called on to assist in the pursuit of the mission and vision of the TCSG, develop partnerships with others, and implement best practices, especially in processes pertaining to learning. This study was conducted to identify challenges Deans for Academic Affairs encounter in performing their jobs so that professional development opportunities may be provided to assist Deans in continuing their daily work and developing leadership skills to address the ever changing environment of Georgia's technical colleges.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study was to develop a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) to include identified perceived job challenges related to their responsibilities. The job challenges identified were analyzed to see if the challenges differed based on the size of the technical colleges. Determining the demographic information regarding the TSCG Deans, the division they supervised and their colleges allowed for the development of an understanding of midlevel academic leadership in TCSG colleges. By reviewing the challenges the TCSG Deans identified, others can ascertain what may be needed in developing and supporting existing and future midlevel academic leaders. The information revealed in this study is relevant to community college leaders as they continually strive to discover and implement strategies to attract and retain new midlevel academic leaders.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What perceived job challenges were identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG?
2. Do the perceived job challenges identified by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG differ based on unduplicated student enrollment of the technical college they represent?

Method

Through the administration of an electronic survey, data was requested from 109 Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG. Sixty-seven Deans completed the survey for a response rate of 61%. The survey instrument, Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia was modified using the Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller,

VanHorn-Grassmeyer survey, International Community College Chair Survey, conducted in 1992. The modified survey had three sections: Personal Demographics, Demographic Information of the Campus, and Challenges.

The first section collected data concerning demographic information concerning the Deans. The information included 28 questions which gathered data concerning: (a) previous work experience in a technical college, business/industry, four-year college or university, K-12 schools, and two-year colleges, including the number of years of service in each sector; (b) academic programs supervised, including the number of instructional programs supervised that are degree, diploma, and technical certificate of credit (TCC) programs, (c) number of full-time faculty and number of adjunct faculty supervised; (d) age; (e) gender; (f) ethnicity; (g) highest academic degree achieved; and (h) number of years in a technical college as a full-time faculty member and as a director or dean for academic affairs.

The second section of the survey had one question which asked the size of the technical college the Dean represented. Size determination was based on total annual credit enrollment. Participants were provided their 2013 academic year credit enrollment and answered a question as to whether his/her college enrollment information was 6,000 or less or 6,001 and greater. When data was collected, the participants represented 24 technical colleges with 11 colleges reporting total annual enrollment of 6,000 or less, and 13 colleges reporting annual enrollment of 6,001 or more.

The third section of the data provided a list of challenges the participants were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with the challenges listed in relation to performance of their job responsibilities. After each subsection, participants were provided the opportunity to add or

comment on the challenges listed. The survey concluded with a question concerning specific strategies that would help the participant overcome the challenges faced in the Dean's position.

After a three-week period, the survey data was tabulated and analyzed using Class Climate, Excel, and SPSS software. Data for the demographics and the challenges were reported using descriptive statistics. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical tests were conducted to determine if a significant difference existed in the perceptions identified by Deans in smaller colleges (6,000 or less enrollment) versus those in larger colleges (6,001 or higher enrollment).

Findings

The findings of this study resulted in three distinct outcomes: (a) the development of a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG, (b) the identification of challenges encountered by the Deans in performing their job responsibilities, and (c) documentation of challenges that differed based on the size of the technical college.

The profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG is illustrated in Table 51 showing the most prevalent results for each question.

Table 51

Profile of Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG

The majority of Deans have previous work experience in a technical college with the largest number of years reported as 11-15 years.
The majority of Deans have previous work experience in business/industry, with the largest number of years reported as 6-10 years.
The majority of Deans do not have previous work experience in a four-year college or university. For deans having previous work experience in a four-year college or university, the largest number of years reported was 1-5 years.

Table 51

Profile of Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG

The majority of Deans do not have previous work experience in K-12 schools. For Deans having previous work experience in K-12 schools, the largest number of years reported was 1-5 years.
The majority of Deans do not have previous work experience in two-year colleges, excluding technical colleges. For Deans having previous work experience in two-year colleges, the largest number of years reported was 1-5 years.
The majority of Deans supervise Personal/Public Services programs, General Education, and Business programs.
The majority of Deans supervise 1-10 degree programs in their division.
The majority of Deans supervise 1-15 diploma programs in their division.
The majority of Deans supervise 1-15 technical certificates of credit (TCC) programs in their division.
The majority of Deans supervise 11-25 full-time faculty members.
The majority of Deans supervise 6-30 adjunct faculty.
The majority of Deans are 36-55 years old.
The majority of Deans are females.
The majority of Deans are white.
The majority of Deans have a Master's degree.
The majority of Deans have spent 1-15 years as a full-time, technical college faculty member.
The majority of deans have spent 1-5 years in a technical college as a dean or director for academic affairs.

In relation to the size of the college represented based on total credit enrollment for the 2013 academic year, the majority (56.72%) of Deans indicated their colleges have 6,001 students or more.

In response to question one, identification of challenges perceived by the TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs, a list of 72 challenges were presented to the Deans organized by areas of

major responsibility and included 11 sections: (a) instructional processes, (b) supervision of faculty and staff, (c) curriculum, (d) students, (e) fiscal responsibilities, (f) use of technology, (g) facilities/inventory, (h) planning, (i) accreditation, (j) campus communication, and (k) external activities. The 72 challenges were identified by using the Seagren et al. (1994) survey's section on challenges and tasks. Modifications were made in the survey to reflect updated terminology, including adding challenge questions to more accurately reflect the scope of TCSG Deans' responsibilities. The data was analyzed by reviewing the responses provided by the Deans for Academic Affairs. If the percentage totals for the strongly agree and agree column for each question was greater than 50.00%, the participants perceived this responsibility as a challenge. Table 52 identifies the 49 challenges organized by areas of major responsibilities perceived by the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG.

Table 52

Identified Challenges

Instructional Processes	
Improving graduation rates	Scheduling Classes
Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple instructor programs	Developing student retention plans
Increasing growth in programs	Monitoring programs at multiple-campus locations
Monitoring program quality	Monitoring classroom/lab instruction
Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations	Increasing growth in transfer programs
Coordinating dual enrollment schedules	

(continued)

Table 52 (continued)

Challenges Identified

Faculty and Staff	
Recruiting faculty	Evaluating faculty performance in traditional classroom settings
Evaluating faculty performance in distance education classes	Conducting faculty performance evaluations
Supervising faculty and staff at multiple campus locations	Devising faculty disciplinary plans
Recommending termination of faculty	Designing professional development opportunities for faculty
Providing orientation to new faculty	Training faculty in distance education delivery
Mentoring faculty and staff	
Curriculum	
Preparing new program requests	Conducting assessments to determine need for new programs
Developing new program curricula	Globalizing the curriculum
Students	
Responding to students complaints/grievances	Advising students
Recruiting students	Counseling students
Serving at-risk students	

(continued)

Table 52 (continued)

Challenges Identified

Fiscal Responsibilities	
Maintaining budgetary resources to support all programs	Developing division budgets
Seeking external funding for academic resources	Purchasing classroom/lab equipment
Use of Technology	
Analyzing statistical data	Compiling statistical data
Planning	
Evaluating policies, procedures, and processes	Preparing enrollment projections
Developing annual division plans	
Accreditation	
Preparing for institutional accreditation/reviews	Addressing accountability issues
Preparing for program accreditation issues	
Campus Communications	
Communicating information from administration to faculty	Communicating needs and concerns of division to administration
External Activities	
Networking with dean from other colleges	Participating in community activities and events
Participating in state, regional, and/or national meetings/conferences	Developing relationships with business and industry

Based on 72 questions concerning perceived challenges of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG, four challenges showed significant differences based on the size of the technical college. The four challenges included: (a) increasing growth in programs, (b) increasing growth in transfer programs, (c) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and (d) training faculty in distance education delivery modes.

The first significantly different challenge identified by the Deans, increasing growth in programs, emerged from the deans of larger colleges, those with enrollment of 6,001 and more. Deans from the smaller colleges, those with enrollment of 6,000 or less, perceived the other three challenges as significantly different: (a) increasing growth in transfer programs, (b) ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and (c) training faculty in distance education delivery modes.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of the Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG), identify challenges the Deans have in performing their job responsibilities, and determine if the challenges were different based on the size of the technical college. The focus of the study was to collect information specific to the leaders who exist in the middle, those who most often serve as the information source from administration to faculty and from faculty to administration. For the 24 colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG), these midlevel leaders are Deans for Academic Affairs. To substantiate the need for the study, few studies have been conducted concerning Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG, and no studies have been conducted to identify a prolife of TCSG Deans or to determine the challenges they face in conducting their jobs.

As reflected by Gillett-Karam (1999) in an interview with six community college presidents, the responsibilities of mid-level deans and chairs is complex ranging from curriculum matters, hiring and evaluation of faculty, budgeting, class scheduling, dealing with students, ensuring quality of instruction, daily problem solving, monitoring program enrollment, and many other responsibilities. The presidents who were interviewed discussed in length the significant role that deans play in helping to make a college successful. One president stated,

> The effective chair cultivates excellent working relations with instructors, students, student service and maintenance staff, administrative services, and senior administration. Chairs are in position to see all sides of most issues related to the primary responsibility of the college, that is, instruction. No other position with the college has the same level and frequency of contact with the entire college staff. As colleges move toward a more learning centered environment, the role of the chair becomes even more critical as he or she provides leadership, encouragement, and assistance in this paradigm shift. (pp. 44-45)

The Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG serve the same purpose as those described by presidents in the Gillett-Karam interview.

In comparing previous work experience held by Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG to the Seagren et al. (1994) and Colvin studies (2012), the data is similar. TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs indicate having comparable levels of experience in business and industry, four-college or university, and K-12 schools as the participants surveyed in the Seagren et al and Colvin studies.

In comparing the number of years served in a faculty position, TCSG Deans (14.93%) have served 16 years or more as a faculty member as compared to 48.3% of the participants in the Seagren et al. study and 44.8% of the participants in the Colvin study. Most TCSG Deans

(71.65%) have 1-15 years' experience as compared to 48.6% in the Seagren et al. study and 48.3% in the Colvin study. Overall, TCSG Deans have spent less time serving as faculty when compared to national community college data.

In comparing the number of years' experience served in a Dean's position, 2.98% of TCSG Deans reported having served 16 years or more as a Dean with 95.52% indicating 1-15 years of experience. The Seagren et al. study showed 12.9% of the participants had over 16 years' experience as a Dean with 85.8% having 1-15 years' experience. The Colvin study showed 14.3% had over 16 years' experience as a Dean with 85.7% having more than 16 years of experience. The conclusion can be drawn that when comparing TCSG Deans to national community college Deans, TCSG Deans have less years' experience in their positions.

In relation to the number of faculty supervised, the data showed that TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs supervise more faculty than participants in the Seagren et al. study. While the majority of TCSG Deans (62.69%) supervise 11-25 full-time faculty, the Seagren et al. study showed that the majority of study participants (56.3%) supervised 10 or less full-time faculty. When comparing data concerning the number of adjunct faculty supervised, the majority of TCSG Deans supervise 1-30 adjunct faculty compared to the Seagren et al. study that showed 70.7% participants supervised 1-20 adjunct faculty, with most (49.9%) supervising 10 or fewer adjunct faculty.

The majority of TCSG Deans (58.21%) are between 36-55 years of age, comparable to the Seagren et al. study indicating 73.9% of the participants were 30-54 years of age. Colvin's study (2011) showed the majority of Deans (76.00%) were slightly older, 45-64 years of age. In reference to gender, the majority of TCSG Deans are female as compared to the Seagren et al. and the Colvin studies in which the majority of deans were male. Ethnicity data was also

comparable with 80.60% of the TCSG Deans being white, compared with 89.3% in the Seagren et al. study and 75.1% in the Colvin study. TCSG Deans were more diverse with 14.93% of deans indicating they were black as compared to the Seagren et al. study reporting 3.6% and Colvin reporting 5.9%. However, Hispanic and Asian ethnicity was equitable with less than three percent total reported for these ethnicity groups.

In examining the challenges related to Deans overseeing the instructional processes of the division, the most common topic related to monitoring the extent of quality in the teaching and learning process. Wheeler, Seagren, Becker, Kinley, Mlinek, and Robson (2008) support the concept that the focus on quality instruction is fundamental to any educational organization. However, quality instruction is one of the most difficult and overwhelming tasks a Dean faces. The Deans for Academic Affairs in TCSG indicated the challenges they face centered on monitoring classroom/lab instruction and ensuring quality of education was consistent among multiple instructor programs and multiple campus locations. Perhaps the concern of monitoring educational quality relates to being responsible for the task but not having a clear picture of how to be certain that quality exists. Seymour (1993) reinforced how the intersection of three concepts has to be examined in order to maintain the quality factor in education to stay on the forefront of meeting student needs. These three concepts involve faculty, the design of programs, and being committed to strengthening and adjusting the curriculum. TSCG Deans may need assistance in how to recognize quality instruction, including techniques to use with faculty to improve the learning process.

Scheduling classes including coordinating dual enrollment schedules was identified as a challenge. Georgia's technical colleges often promote everything for everyone everywhere anytime. While this customer-centered strategy supports TCSG students, it often creates havoc

for a Dean to ensure all classes at all locations are staffed with qualified faculty. Providing dual enrollment opportunities for secondary students is a fundamental practice for TCSG colleges. However, it is often difficult to find the right instructor to teach secondary students especially during the times needed according to high school schedules and with the physical location of instruction being at the high school. TCSG Deans may need assistance in understanding scheduling parameters, the use of tools to assist with designing schedules, and assessing and documenting the need for additional faculty.

Other instructional process challenges concentrated on improving graduation rates and developing student retention plans. Higher education institutions including TCSG are being called on to shift from an enrollment focus to one of a completion agenda. TCSG's formula funding for determining technical college budgets incorporates the completion agenda by funding colleges based on the number of awards and completions rather than total enrollment (Diamond, 2012). Therefore, it is not surprising that TCSG Deans identified improving graduation rates and developing student retention plans as challenges.

In the identification of faculty and staff challenges, TCSG Deans' primarily rated faculty performance matters as the key challenge. Faculty performance matters included evaluating faculty performance in both traditional and distance education techniques, discipline and termination of faculty, providing orientation to new faculty, mentoring faculty, and designing faculty professional development. For the most part, these challenges deal with human resource issues, primarily in the use of appropriate instruments and maintenance of documentation. For educators, faculty performance evaluations are often not easy to quantify. In relation to personnel management, what should be measured, how often performance should be monitored, and planning for improvement are many times not well defined and mastered skill sets for

educational managers. Professional development opportunities concerning faculty performance may assist the TCSG Deans in understanding their role in evaluating faculty performance, techniques to use, and how to properly document in order to help alleviate the stress associated with evaluating the performance of faculty. However, as Wheeler et al. (2008) noted, for those who are involved in evaluating performance and designing improvement plans, a multitude of approaches should be available and used according to the individual and according to the situation.

The curriculum strategies centered on the development of new programs and globalizing the curriculum. Community and technical colleges thrive on developing curricula that support the business and industry needs of the communities served. One fundamental principle of TCSG is that technical colleges will change educational program offerings to meet the needs of the workforce. Cohen and March (1986) stated that colleges can be seen as "changing continuously in response to various internal and external pressures and opportunities" (xvi). However, Deans often feel the pressure to determine if a new program is needed, assist in writing the curriculum, and ensuring the resources are made available to support the curriculum. In further compounding this stress felt by Deans, TCSG has implemented a global initiative to expand its programs and services abroad and according to Commissioner Ron Jackson, the global initiative was established "…to forge international partnerships that will enable the TCSG to solidify its goal of becoming a global leader in technical education" (Technical College System of Georgia, 2014, para. 6). Continual professional development is needed by TCSG Deans to keep them abreast of how to assess the need for new programs in order to meet the needs of local communities and global initiatives.

In relation to student challenges, the TCSG Deans identified responding to student complaints/grievances, advising issues, counseling, and serving at-risk students as challenges. Underprepared and at-risk students often require more intense and lengthy advisement and counseling sessions. These sessions often involve more than just mapping out a class schedule, but also may include addressing personal problems, transportation issues, family obligations, and work schedules. While student support services are available on TCSG colleges, the Deans often encounter direct contact with these students by way of referral from faculty.

In an interview with six community college presidents concerning the duties and roles of community college chairs, Gillett-Karam (1999) noted a list of 27 items. Within that list, some items are stated in multiple cases; however, only one reference is made to handling student grievances. This responsibility has been recognized by TCSG Deans as a time-consuming component of their daily responsibilities. Certainly society demands accountability, but the sheer volume of student complaints and grievances make it difficult for Deans to manage. As noted by one study participant in this study, it is important for colleges to have clear policies and procedures concerning the handling of student complaints and grievances. Perhaps this is an area where TCSG Deans need assistance in order to learn how to strengthen college policies/procedures concerning student complaints and grievances.

In matters concerning fiscal responsibilities, Deans continually struggle in how to equitably appropriate resources among programs. With decreasing state allocations, Deans have been forced to seek external funding and find alternative solutions to garner necessary resources. As Cohen and Brawer (1996) supported the challenge of sustaining and allocating resources for community colleges, TCSG Deans also have had to encounter morale issues with faculty and staff in response to leaner budgets (Wheeler et. al, 2008). Often Deans are willing to devote the

necessary time to seek additional funding sources but are not as well equipped regarding where and how to secure these funds. TCSG Deans need support in learning where to seek external funding and how to obtain the funding to provide needed resources.

Somewhat related to the fiscal challenges faced by TCSG Deans is the ability to provide data to substantiate the need for additional resources. On the quest for seeing additional funding, TCSG Deans may need to compile statistical data and analyze that data to make a case for funding. Wheeler et al. stated "…the largest and probably most important impact of technology on the internal workings of the department and the chair is the speed with which information is transmitted and received" (p. 176). With limited time as a factor, TCSG Deans need additional support to locate, compile, and analyze data in order to make timely and appropriate decisions.

Two additional sets of challenges identified by TCSG Deans concentrated on planning and accreditation issues. While these two challenges exist independently of each other, a similarity can be drawn. The planning challenges addressed evaluating policies, procedures, and processes and developing annual division plans, while the accreditation challenges outlined preparing for accreditation reviews and addressing accountability issues. An array of accountability issues surround education environments today and have "forced most organizations to reexamine their priorities and to place more emphasis on providing value to stakeholders in an environment in which change is the only constant" (Alfred, Shults, & Seybert, 2007, p. v). Accountability is demanded by students, parents, employers, accreditation organizations, states, and federal government. Embedded in these accountability requirements is the need for accreditation agencies to monitor the effectiveness of colleges.

As TCSG colleges transitioned to regional accreditation under the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) during the last fifteen years,

colleges have placed a greater focus on institutional effectiveness to document college planning, assessment, and improvement strategies. While these systems are in place and functioning, college employees continually learn how to more effectively plan, assess, and document improvements for division goals and outcomes. While these processes are now standard practices, the amount of time required to perform these processes is great. TCSG Deans need support to assist in monitoring accountability measures, thus making it less time consuming and overpowering so the institutional effectiveness processes are more manageable. By incorporating planning, assessment, and continuous improvement as a priority in the Deans' division, the challenges of planning and accreditation matters may become more easily manageable.

Campus communication is important to any educational organization especially the flow of information downwardly, laterally, and upwardly. Campus communication is vital to a Dean's division; and while communication efforts have been improved by technology such as email, share points, and web-based delivery services, the savings of time is not the only concern involving communication. Interpreting and relaying appropriate messages is still of utmost concern in the area of communications. Deans need to be able to obtain from faculty information needed by administrators, and administrators need to convey certain messages to the faculty via the Dean. This responsibility lies in the Deans' hands, and takes considerable effort to obtain, discern, and relay information appropriately.

With the many responsibilities that Deans have, involvement in external activities outside the college is crucial in maintaining and building relationships with community leaders and business and industry representatives. However, time is often the factor that creates the stress that Deans express in being more involved in external activities. Professional development opportunities might assist Deans in recognizing and cultivating the relationships outside of the

technical college that would be most beneficial. Additionally, Deans need to be given opportunities to network with deans from other colleges to share best practices. Participation in broader professional development activities such as regional and/or national conferences may also assist the TCSG Deans in learning how to meet the demands of being involved in external activities.

In regard to the significant differences that emerged due to the differences in the size of technical colleges, the Deans had differing responses to increasing growth in programs, increasing growth in transfer programs, ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and training faculty in distance education delivery methods. Although this study did not seek to determine why significant differences existed among Deans from smaller and larger colleges, further study may need to be conducted to determine the underlying reasons why the Deans from larger and smaller colleges perceived these challenges differently. In determining these reasons, techniques may be developed and implemented to address these challenges.

Deans revealed some thought-provoking strategies for TCSG and technical college administrators to consider in addressing challenges identified by the TCSG Academic Dean. A recurring strategy suggested the continuation and support of a Deans' peer group. The support group would provide opportunities for professional development on some of the specific challenge topics. The importance of communication was mentioned several times as well as clarifying the roles of Deans and defining the purpose they serve.

Implications

This study has provided some significant information that may assist in understanding the challenges Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG encounter in the performance of their job

responsibilities. The study has documented that the Deans' perceived challenges are real and support is needed to ensure that these leaders are equipped with the necessary leadership skills to lead TCSG faculty in providing quality learning opportunities for students. Professional development opportunities are needed to assist Deans in the specific challenges identified in this study, but professional development also may be needed to address leadership theories to assist Deans in developing a leadership style that helps them manage the multiplicity of their job responsibilities.

The path-goal leadership theory is a potential theory that may lend support to Deans for Academic Affairs. The theory is based on the expectancy theory and simply proposes that individuals are fulfilled in their jobs if they believe it leads to things that are highly valued, and they work hard if they believe that effort leads to things that are highly valued (Nevarez, Wood, & Penrose, 2013).

Technical colleges serve as teaching/learning environments, and Deans are considered the leaders of faculty. Deans assist faculty in incorporating teaching techniques best suited for a non-homogeneous student population, and adjust curriculum as needed for today's workforce. And, Deans work tirelessly to keep faculty motivated and rewarded for the jobs they do even if during extreme financial times.

The path-goal leadership theory offers potential for Deans who juggle numerous tasks, responsibilities, and challenges. The theory outlines the need for leaders to direct, support, participate, and establish levels of expectations for his/her subordinates. Deans provide direction to faculty and students, support and show concern for others, participate in decision-making for the college, and assist in outlining expectations for performance and improvement.

In working with faculty and students, Deans encounter many different types of personalities whose needs often vary greatly. Deans may alter their approach of dealing with a situation depending on the individual and sometimes the issue at hand. Deans have a responsibility to convey to faculty the path that needs to be taken in relation to the goals of the system, the college, and/or the division or program. As progression is made toward achieving the goal, Deans generally are observant and responsive in removing obstacles that hinder goal attainment.

Deans for Academic Affairs in the TCSG are "wearing many hats," requiring the Dean to use different approaches, techniques, and creativity. From the incorporation of new technology to the changing environment of technical colleges, from faculty performance to boosting morale due to financial cuts, Deans are constantly faced with an array of challenges.

Additionally, Deans have responsibilities to advise students, obtain input from advisory committees, handle inordinate amounts of paperwork, and provide input on college improvement processes such as increasing student retention and graduation rates, scheduling high-school dual enrollment programs, and reviewing program improvement plans. Rarely is there a guidebook that outlines specifically how to accomplish these tasks. Deans continually have to be flexible in working with the faculty, providing direction for ambiguous tasks, offering words of encouragement during peak times, and carefully listening and allowing participative input from faculty. The path-goal leadership theory can be applied to TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs and their jobs.

The path-goal theory context is intriguing because the intent of the theory calls for the leader to make adjustments based on the needs of subordinates. People are unique individuals; however, the early studies of Maslow (1954) showed that all people have varying degrees of

needs. Furthermore, some needs may be quickly satisfied, whereas other needs are not as easily fulfilled. McGregor (2006) suggested that a satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior and believed that in relation to organizational behavior, managers have to focus on the social and psychological needs of their people. Failing to do so may eventually result in the crushing of human spirit and potential (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1976).

The findings in this study support the fact that Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia have overwhelming responsibilities in the performance of their jobs. The demands placed on them may be perceived as daunting. From a list of 72 job responsibilities, 49 were identified as challenges. Yet, the single most important responsibility of Deans in carrying out TCSG's mission and simultaneously their college's mission is the charge of serving as the leader of faculty.

Most of the challenges perceived by the TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs are not responsibilities in which a defined set of absolutes can be proposed to reduce the challenges. But rather, most challenges are focused on the topics of dealing with people (faculty, students, and colleagues), the availability of time to properly address all of the issues, and monitoring and ensuring high productivity and quality. Many of these challenges may be addressed through the design of professional development activities allowing the Deans to acquire techniques to help them learn how to better manage these diverse responsibilities. However, the sheer number of perceived challenges identified may reflect that leadership development is needed.

Deans' responsibilities include both management and leadership responsibilities. While management and leadership have similarities, each exists independently of each other. Management theories often support a manager's role as performing tasks such as planning, organizing, staffing, motivating, and controlling people and processes (Montana & Charnov,

2000). Leadership, as proposed by DuBrin (2004), generally involves dealing with change; inspiring, motiving, and influencing others; and eliciting cooperation and teamwork.

Today's community and technical colleges are facing tremendous challenges. It is up to college leaders as to how they choose to lead their colleges through the rapidly changing environment. Boggs (2012) reported that community college leaders have to be armed with leadership competencies to address economic matters, lack of resources, student success measures, accountability standards, the effects of globalization, and the skills gap of community college students. The challenges identified by TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs centered primarily on these topics and lends support that the development of certain leadership competencies may be needed to ensure that TCSG Deans lead faculty in a manner that addresses the ever changing landscape of technical education.

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) began work in 2003 to develop a set of leadership competencies critical for community college leadership. According to the AACC (2005), the competencies include:

1. Organizational strategy—strategically improves quality, protects long term health, promotes success of students, and sustains the community, college mission.
2. Resource management—equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, information, and physical and financial assets.
3. Communication—uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and community.
4. Collaboration—develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, ethical, and mutually beneficial internal and external relationships.

5. Community college advocacy—understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.
6. Professionalism—works ethically to set high standards for self and others.

A focus on the development of these competencies would be beneficial in addressing the challenges identified by TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs.

Coupled with the AACC leadership competencies, the path-goal leadership theory could be a useful theory for TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs. The theory focuses on leadership effectiveness outlining various techniques to use with subordinates in order to attain high productivity and increasing morale. The theory is based on understanding the characteristics of the situation including the characteristics of the group members (subordinates) and the demands of the task. By the leader using various approaches of leadership such as a directive, supportive, participative, or achievement-oriented approach, the outcomes of productivity and morale are affected.

TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs serve as the primary leaders for faculty. In applying the path-goal theory, Deans should understand the work environment, faculty responsibilities, and the individual characteristics of the faculty they supervise. Individual faculty members possess different personalities and work characteristics, their experience in an educational environment varies, and their understanding of additional administrative responsibilities outside of the classroom often differs. Faculty are hired based on their occupational expertise and their understanding of the work environments of their profession. Faculty serve as the catalyst for students obtaining the skills needed in today's workforce.

TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs are responsible for leading faculty along a path that will enable them to accomplish their mission. Along that path, Deans often have to direct faculty

in the performance of tasks including planning, organizing, and controlling factors to ensure the accomplishment of the tasks. They sometimes have to provide support to faculty by displaying concern and providing emotional support when their daily responsibilities are stressful or frustrating. Faculty often have solutions to problems, however, it requires a Dean to be open to input and suggestions. Deans also have to set high expectations and strive for work improvement through the establishment of goals.

In analyzing the challenges identified by the Deans, the proposition emerged that both management and leadership skills are needed by Deans. The challenges identified in the areas of curriculum, fiscal responsibilities, use of technology, planning, and accreditation indicates areas related more to managerial responsibilities. Therefore, professional development opportunities are needed to assist Deans in learning how to better manage these challenges.

The challenges identified in relation to instructional processes, faculty and staff, students, campus communications, and external activities primarily involve relationships with people, thus involve more leadership skills. Leadership development focused on the AACC leadership competencies would assist Deans in being better equipped to deal with the areas Boggs (2012) noted were major challenges such as the changing economic conditions, diminished resources, student success measures, accountability requirements, global trends, and the skills gap of community college students.

The path-goal theory may assist Deans in meeting the challenges related to relationships with faculty, students, colleagues, and business/industry community leaders. As Kouzes and Posner (2003) support, “the heart of leadership is caring” (p. xi). By Deans using various approaches of the path-goal theory of leadership—directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented—the Deans are displaying the heart of leadership. However, as can be

seen in the identified challenges of this study, the balance of performing both the managerial and leadership responsibilities of Deans' positions can be viewed as the underlying concern. The balance is difficult to achieve.

In conclusion, John Maxwell (1999), one of today's most well-known authors on leadership, described some common elements of people and emphasized the ways that leaders can enhance leader/subordinate relationships:

They like to feel special, so sincerely compliment them.

They want a better tomorrow, so show them hope.

They desire direction, so navigate for them.

They are selfish, so speak to their needs first.

They get low emotionally, so encourage them.

They want success, so help them win. (p. 107)

Maxwell's thoughts relate to the points emphasized in the path-goal theory. Most of the challenges identified by TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs dealt with issues involving instructional processes, faculty and staff, students, campus communication, and external activities. These challenges generally revolve around dealing with people. Providing additional leadership development opportunities to Deans for Academic Affairs in learning and applying practical, sensible, and useful leadership theories such as the path-goal theory, the challenges of Deans may be reduced. In doing this, Maxwell's quote becomes even more relative to Deans and their relationships with faculty, staff, and students.

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations for practice are offered based upon the findings of this study.

1. A continued focus should be placed on Deans having previous work experience as a faculty member. TCSG Deans have spent less time as faculty when compared to other national community college data. However, Deans need to have a continual understanding and appreciation of faculty responsibilities.
2. TCSG and/or individual colleges may need to implement Deans' mentoring programs to assist Deans in learning how to better handle managerial and leadership challenges.
3. A professional development program designed for new Deans may help newly hired or promoted Deans understand the complexity of their positions, the magnitude of responsibilities, and how to accomplish required tasks.
4. TCSG and colleges should explore opportunities to promote greater ethnic diversity among Deans for Academic Affairs.
5. TCSG and colleges may find it beneficial to provide professional development opportunities for Deans in relation to assessing instructional quality, including techniques to use with faculty to improve the learning process.
6. Seek partnerships with secondary schools to provide assistance in helping Deans to better understand secondary educational systems.
7. Provide professional development opportunities for Deans to learn more about student success models and the development of techniques to promote student success.
8. Design professional development activities focused on understanding global initiatives and incorporating globalization in the curriculum.
9. Provide professional development opportunities in learning how to handle student complaints and grievances.

10. Provide professional development opportunities concerning managing fiscal responsibilities, grant development, and the use of data and data management information.
11. Design professional development opportunities that support accreditation related matters including establishing accountability measures that may be used in conjunction with measuring student success.
12. Deans for Academic Affairs would benefit from mentoring and participating with other TCSG Deans in peer group meetings.
13. Provide professional development opportunities to determine TCSG Deans leadership styles.
14. Design leadership academies for TCSG Deans.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research are made based upon the findings and conclusion of this study:

1. Follow-up research, possibly in a qualitative study, conducted on the challenges identified by TCSG Deans for Academic Affairs.
2. Further study may need to be conducted to determine to why Deans from different sized colleges viewed differently the challenges related to increasing growth in programs, increasing growth in transfer programs, ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations, and training faculty in distance education delivery methods.
3. Examine performance issues of deans as revealed by faculty and/or direct supervisor.

4. Explore the job satisfaction level of TSCG Deans for Academic Affairs in regard to turnover rates.
5. The effect that college mergers have had on academic deans and the management of multiple locations and multi-faculty programs.
6. Conducting a regional study exploring the challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs to compare with other community/technical colleges.
7. Explore strategies to combat specific challenges identified by Dean for Academic Affairs.

REFERENCES

Adelman, C. (1992). *The way we are: The American community college as thermometer* (Report No. 92-511). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED338269

Alfred, R., Shults, C., & Seybert, J. (2007). *Core indicators of effectiveness for community colleges* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The survey research handbook* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Irwin.

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

America Association of Community Colleges. (2012). *Reclaiming the American dream: A report from the century commission on the future of community colleges* (Report No. ED535906). Retrieved from ERIC *American Association Of Community Colleges*http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535906

American Association of Community Colleges (2014). Fast facts from our fact sheet. Retrieved from American Association of Community Colleges website: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx

American Council on Education (ACE). (2009). The CAO census: A national profile of chief academic officers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *Career paths for community college leaders* (Research Brief, AACC-RB-02-02). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Anderson, J. A. (1997). Leadership training initiatives for community college administrators: A focused synthesis of the literature. *Community College Review*, *24*, 27-54. doi:10.1177/009155219702400403

Anderson, P., Murray, J. P., & Olivarez, A., Jr. (2002). The managerial roles of public community college chief academic officers. *Community College Review*, *30*(2), 1-26. doi:10.1177/009155210203000201

Andrews, H. A. (2000). The dean and the president. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *109*, 19-26). doi:10.1002/cc.10903

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Babbie, E. R. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Babbie, E. R. (1998). *The practice of social research* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How Colleges Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Board of Regents (2014). USG institutions by name. Retrieved from http://www.usg.edu/inst/

Boggs, G. R. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 123,* 15-25. doi:10.1002/cc.118

Boggs, G. R. (2012). Next steps-looking to the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (159), 97-107. doi:10.1002/cc.20030

Bogue, J. P. (1950). *The community college.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Breeden, K. H. (n.d.). *Foundations and defining principles of Georgia's technical college system: Quality and innovations for the future*. Atlanta: Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review, 30*(1), 45-74. doi:10.1177/009155210203000103

Carroll, J.B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective". *Research in Higher Education, 32*(6), 669-688.

Cejda, B. D., & Jolley, M. R. (2013). Developing leadership competencies in the heartland. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 37*, 160-167. doi:10.1080/10668926.2013.739506

Clark, T. D. (1978). The academic hierarchy and the department head. In D. B. Robertson (Ed.), *Power and empowerment in higher education: Studies in honor of Louis Smith* (pp. 41-57). Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity* (2nd ed.). Boson: Harvard Business School Press.

Colvin, D. J. (2012). The role of the dean in the public comprehensive community college (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A, Humanities and Social Sciences, 72*, 3991.

Council of American Survey Research Organizations. (2007). *CASRO code of standards and ethics for survey research.* Retrieved from http://www.casro.org/?page=TheCASROCode

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J., Wheeler, D., Seagren, A., Egly, N., & Beyer, K. (1990). *The academic chairperson's handbook.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Daft, R. L. (1991). *Management.* Ft. Worth, TX: The Dryden Press.

Daniel, T. E. (2009). *Factors influencing performance of academic middle managers in the technical college system of Georgia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from daniel_tiffany_e_200912_edd.pdf

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: Options and choices. In K. H. Gillespie, L. R. Hilsen, & E. C. Wadsworth (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources* (pp. 2-8). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Diamond, L. (2012, December 12). Georgia college funding to focus on graduation, not enrollment. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution.* Retrieved from http://www.ajc.com/news/news/local/georgia-college-funding-to-focus-on-graduation-not/nTTYY/

Dillman, D. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dillman, D. A., Reips, U., & Matzat, U. (2010). Advice in surveying the general public over the internet. *International Journal of Internet Science*, *5*(1), 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.ijis.net/ijis5_1/ijis5_1_editorial_pre.html

Donnelly, J. H., Jr., Gibson, J. L., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1992). *Fundamentals of management*. Homewood, IL: Richard B. Irwin.

Drucker, P. F. (2004). *The daily Drucker.* New York: HarperCollins.

DuBrin, A.J. (2004). *Leadership research findings, practice, and skills* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Duree, C. (2008). Iowa State study of community college presidents finds national shortage on horizon. Retrieved from http://www.public.iastate.edu/~nscentral/news/08/jul/ccleadership.shtml

Duree, C. & Ebbers, L. (Fall 2012). The AACC competencies in action. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 159*, 41-52. doi:10.1002/cc.20025

Duvall, B. (2003). Role of universities in leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 123, 63-71. doi:10.1002/cc.122

Ebbers, L., Conover, K. S., & Samuels, A. (Spring 2010). Leading from the middle: Preparing leaders for new roles. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149,* 59-64. doi:10.1002/cc.396

Eddy, P. L. (2009). Wanted: Community-college leaders to serve in the hinterlands. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(29), B24-B25.

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

Evans, M. G. (1996). R. J. House's 'A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness' *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 305-309. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90021-1

Farmer, E. I., & Rojewski, J. W. (Eds). (2001). *Research pathways: Writing professional papers, theses, and dissertations in workforce education.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Filan, G. L. (1992, January). The trick to being a community college chair. *Leadership Abstracts, 5*(1). Retrieved December 13, 2004, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED358885.pdf

Filan, G. L., & Seagren, A. T. (2003). Six critical issues for midlevel leadership in postsecondary settings. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 124.* 21-31. doi:10.1002/he.127

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gibson-Harman, K., Rodriguez, S., & Haworth, J. G. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: The human resource challenge. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117,* 77-90). doi:10.1002/cc.55

Gillett-Karam, R. (1999). College presidents examine midlevel management in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105, 37-46. doi: 10.1002/cc.10505

Gillett-Karam, R., Cameron, D. W., Messina, R. C., Jr., Mitelstet, S. K., Mulder, A. E., Sykes, A. B., & Thornton, J. S. (1999). College presidents examine midlevel management in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105*, 37-46. doi:10.1002/cc.10505

Gillett-Karam, R., Smith, K. B., & Simpson, J. (1997). *Administrators in North Carolina community colleges: A comparative study by gender*. Retrieved from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED409073 website: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED409073

Gloeckner, G. W., Gliner, J. A., Tochterman, S. M., & Morgan, G. A. (2001). Validity and reliability concerns of data collection. In E. I. Farmer & J. W. Rojewski (Eds.), *Research pathways: Writing professional papers, theses, and dissertations in workforce education* (pp. 223-245). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Gmelch, W. H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education, 126*, 69-84. doi:10.1002/he.149

Gmelch, W. H. & Miskin, V. D. (1995). *Chairing an academic department.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goldberg, M. (1990). Common and uncommon concerns: The complex role of the community college department chair. In J.B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson. New York: America Council on Education/Macmillan.

Hecht, I. D. (2004). The professional development of department chairs. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (126), 27-44. doi:10.1002/he.146

Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hill, R. B. (2001). Survey research. In E. I. Farmer & J. W. Rojewski (Eds.), *Research pathways: Writing professional papers, theses, and dissertations in workforce education* (pp. 201-222). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1988). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(3), 321-339.

House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory *The Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 323-352. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90024-7

Howard, G. S. (1985). *Basic research methods in the social sciences.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, & Company.

Hurlburt, R. T. (2003). *Comprehending behavioral statistics* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (2000). Revisited: A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. Journal of Management, 26(1), 155-169. doi:10.1177/014920630002600103

Jennerich, E. (1981). Competencies for department chairpersons: Myths and realities. *Liberal Education, 67*(1), 46-65.

Jermier, J. M. (1996). The path-goal theory of leadership: A subtextual analysis *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 311-317.

Katsinas, S. G, & Kempner, K. (2005, March 1). *Strengthening the capacity to lead in the community college: The role of university-based leadership programs.* Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED486369.pdf

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1976). *Educational administration: An introduction.* New York: Macmillan.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical research* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Levin, J. (1998). Organizational change in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, (102),*1-4. doi:10.1002/cc.10201

Lomax, R. G. (2001). *Statistical concepts: A second course for education and the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lucas, A. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

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

Manfreda, K., Bosniak, M., Berzelak, J., Haas, I., & Vehovar, V. (2008). Web surveys versus other survey modes - A meta-analysis comparing response rates. *International Journal of Market Research, 50*(1), 79-104.

Mangione, T. W. (1995). *Mail surveys: Improving the quality*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Maxwell, J. C. (2001). *The right to lead: A study in character and courage*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

McGregor, D. (2006). *The human side of enterprise/Douglas McGregor, updated and with new commentary by Joel Cutcher-Gershenfeld*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McKenney, C. B., & Cejda, B. D. (2000). Profiling chief academic officers in public community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24,* 745-759. doi: 10.1080/106689200750034504

Merriam, S. B., & Simpson, E. L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults* (2nd ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Montana, P. J., & Charnov, B. H. (2000). *Management* (3rd ed.). New York: Barron's Educational Series.

Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1995). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murray, J. P. (1992). *The department chairperson: The confessions of a researcher turned practitioner*. Paper presented at the meeting of National Conference on Successful College Teaching and Administration, Orlando, FL. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED342456.pdf

Nardi, P.M. (2003). *Doing survey research. A guide to quantitative methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Palmer, A. D., & Miller, M. T. (2001). Academic leaders in Alabama community colleges: Roles and tasks of department chairs. Research report. (ED 453 856). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED453856.pdf

Pettitt, J. M. (1999). Situating midlevel managers' training: Learning and doing in context. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105,* 57-67. doi:10.1002/cc.10507

Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 123*, 93-99. doi:10.1002/cc.125

Quigley, M. S., & Bailey, T. W. (2003). *Community college movement in perspective.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1997). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reddick, M. G. (2007). *Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness of Georgia's technical college department chairs*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from reddick_mark_g_200712_edd.pdf

Ritter, L. A., & Sue, V. M. (2007). Introduction to using online surveys. *New Directions for Evaluation,* 115, 5-14. doi: 10.1002/ev.230

Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robillard, D., Jr. (2000). Toward a definition of deaning. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 109,* 3-8. doi:10.1002/cc.10901

Robison, G., Sugar, W., & Miller, B. (2010). Fostering community college leaders: An examination of leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 34*, 605-623. doi:10.1080/106689207018316

Schaefer, D. R., & Dillman, D. A. (1998). Development of a standard e-mail methodology. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62*(3), 378-397. doi:10.1086/297851

Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles, responsibilities and challenges* (Report ED 363 164). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED363165.pdf

Seagren, A. T., Wheeler, D. W., Creswell, J. W., Miller, M. T., & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, K. (1994). *Academic leadership in community colleges.* Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. (1959). *Research methods in social relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Senge, P. M. (1996). Leading learning organizations. *Training and Development, 50*(12), 36-37.

Seymour, D. T. (1993). *On Q: Causing quality in higher education*. Phoenix: Onyx.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership* (Research Brief, Leadership Series, No. 1). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED451833

Smith, A.B., & Stewart, G. (1998, April). *The process of role transitioning of new community college department chairs in Texas.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council of Universities & Colleges, Miami, FL. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED418735

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 1999a]. *End of quarter/semester and end of year reports* (Annual FY 1999 Enrollment, Report No. 661). Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia, Knowledge Management System website: https://kms.tcsg.edu/DPR/ReportsResearch/SystemSum.aspx

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 1999b]. *End of quarter/semester and end of year reports* (Annual FY 1999 Graduates and Placement, Report No. CR164). Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia, Knowledge Management System website: https://kms.tcsg.edu/DPR/ReportsResearch/SystemSum.aspx

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013a]. *End of quarter/semester and end of year reports* (Annual AY 2013 Enrollment, Report No. ER21). Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia, Knowledge Management System website: https://kms.tcsg.edu/DPR/ReportsResearch/SystemSum.aspx

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013b]. *End of quarter/semester and end of year reports* (Annual AY 2013 Graduates and Placement, Report No. ER21). Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia, Knowledge Management System website: https://kms.tcsg.edu/DPR/ReportsResearch/SystemSum.aspx

Technical College System of Georgia [ca. 2013c]. Vice President for Academic Affairs. Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia website: http://intranet.tcsg.edu/JobDescriptions/current/Vice_President_for_Academic_Affairs.pdf

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013d]. Dean for Academic Affairs. Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia website: http://intranet.tcsg.edu/JobDescriptions/current/Dean_Academic_Affairs.pdf

Technical College System of Georgia. [ca. 2013e]. College Campuses. Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia website: https://tcsg.edu/college_campuses.php

Technical College System of Georgia. (2014). Deans Executive Council Members. Retrieved from Technical College System of Georgia website: http://www.dtae.org/teched/deans_exec_council.html

Technical College System of Georgia. (2014). Global initiatives. Retrieved from https://tcsg.edu/global_landing.php

Thomas, J. R., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). Socializing new chairs. *New Directions for Higher Education,* 126, 11-25. doi:10.1002/he.145

Townsend, B. K., & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1997). The effective community college academic administrator: Necessary competencies and attitudes. *Community College Review, 25*(2), 41-57. doi:10.1177/009155219702500204

Townsend, B. K., & Twombly, S. B. (2001). *Community colleges: Policy in the future context.* Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. (2nd ed.). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Tucker, A. (1992). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (3rd ed.). New York : Maxwell Macmillan International.

Wallin, D. (2004). The leadership promise. *Community College Journal, 74,* 22-23.

Wallin, D. L. (2010). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149,* 1-3. doi: 10.1002/cc.389

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

Warren, C. O. (1990). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson.* (New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Professional development: Setting the context. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120,* 5-10). doi:10.1002/cc.83

Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Becker, L. W., Kinley, E. R., Mlinek, D. D., & Robson, K. J. (2008). *The academic chair's handbook* (2nd edition). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Wild, L. L., Ebbers, L. H., Shelley, M. C., & Gmelch, W. H. (2003). Stress factors and community college deans: The stresses of their role identified. *Community College Review*, 31(3), 1-22. doi:10.1177/009155210303100301

Wofford, J. & Liska, L. (1993). Path-goal theories of leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management 19*(4), 857-876. doi:10.1177/014920639301900407

APPENDIX A

PERMISSION TO MODIFY AND ADAPT SURVEY

From: aseagren1@unl.edu

Sent: Tue 9/30/2008 9:34 PM

To: tallen@ogeecheetech.edu

Subject: RE: 1994 Publication: Academic Leadership in Community Colleges

The survey is in the 1994 publication, Chapter one gives an overview of the book and conceptual framework for the study, a brief description of how each of the sections of the survey was developed and how the survey was administered. You have permission to use or to modify the survey to meet your needs, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your survey and the results of your study. If after reviewing these materials if you have questions give me a call and I will try to respond to your specific questions. Wish you luck with your study.

From: tallen@ogeecheetech.edu

Sent: Fri 9/19/2008 8:33 AM

To: aseagren1@unl.edu

Subject: Re: 1994 Publication: Academic Leadership in Community Colleges

Dr. Seagren, I am a doctoral student at The University of Georgia. My dissertation is focusing on the academic responsibilities and challenges of Academic Deans in the Technical College System of Georgia.

I am interested in using parts of the survey conducted in the early 90s in conjunction with the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This survey resulted in the book--Academic Leadership in Community Colleges/ by Alan Seagren, Daniel Wheeler, John Creswell, Michael Miller, & Kimberly VanHorn-Grassmeyer. As reported in the Preface of the book, this was the first study of community college chairpersons.

I would appreciate your help with the following:

1. I would like to gain approval for adaption of the survey for my research.
2. I need some additional background information as to the development of the survey (question design, category development, validity/reliability, etc.).

I would appreciate any help you could offer. If I need to forward this information to any of the other authors that worked on the study, please let me know.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

DRAFT

Class Climate	The Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia	SCANTRON

The Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia

Mark as shown: ☐☒☐☐☐ Please use a ball-point pen or a thin felt tip. This form will be processed automatically.

Correction: ☐■☐☒☐ Please follow the examples shown on the left hand side to help optimize the reading results.

1. Please provide an answer to the following questions. Question types include drop box selections and short answer. You may elect to skip any question and proceed to the next.

Personal Demographics

1.1 Do you have previous work experience in a technical college? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.2 # of years work experience in a technical college?

1.3 Academic programs for which you are responsible. (check all that apply)

☐ Business ☐ Industrial Technologies ☐ Health Science
☐ Personal or Public Service ☐ Natural Resources ☐ General Education
☐ Learning Support ☐ Others

1.4 What are the number of instructional programs that you supervise that are degree programs? (please provide the number)

1.5 What are the number of instructional programs that you supervise that are diploma programs? (please provide the number)

1.6 What are the number of instructional programs that you supervise that are technical certificate of credit programs? (please provide the number)

1.7 What are the numbers of full-time faculty that you supervise? (please provide the number)

1.8 What are the numbers of adjunct faculty that you supervise? (please provide the number)

1.9 Age ☐ 25 or Under ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-65 ☐ 66 or over

1.10 Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female

1.11 Ethnicity ☐ White ☐ Black ☐ Hispanic ☐ Asian ☐ Native American ☐ Other

1.12 Highest academic degree achieved ☐ Doctorate ☐ 6-year ☐ Masters ☐ Bachelors

For the following questions, include the total years in and outside of TCSG.

1.13 # of years in a technical college as a full-time faculty member. (please provide the number)

1. Please provide an answer to the following questions. Question types include drop box selections and short answer. You may elect to skip any question and proceed to the next.

Personal Demographics [Continue]

1.14 # of years in a technical college as a director or dean in academic affairs. (please provide the number)

1.15 Do you have previous work experience in business/industry? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.16 # of years previous work experience in business/industry? (please provide the number)

1.17 Do you have previous work experience in a 4-year college or university? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.18 # of years previous work experience in 4-year college or university? (please provide the number)

1.19 Do you have previous work experience in K-12 schools? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.20 # of years of previous work experience in K-12 schools? (please provide the number)

1.21 Do you have previous work experience in a two-year college (not including a technical college)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1.22 # of years of previous work experience in a two-year college (not including a technical college).

2. Demographic Information of Campus

2.1 What is the total annual credit enrollment at your college (please use the data sheet attached to the introductory email)? ☐ 6,000 or less ☐ 6,001 or greater

3. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Instructional Processes

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3.1	Scheduling Classes	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.2	Monitoring classroom/lab instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.3	Coordinating dual enrollment schedules	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.4	Designing promotional materials/activities for academic programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.5	Developing student retention plans	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.6	Monitoring program quality	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.7	Increasing the use of advisory committees	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.8	Increasing program offerings sponsored by specific companies	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.9	Increasing course or program offerings through distance education	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.10	Increasing growth in programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.11	Increasing growth in transfer programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.12	Improving graduation rates	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.13	Monitoring programs at multiple-campus locations	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.14	Increasing the use of computers in the classroom	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.15	Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple instructor programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.16	Ensuring the quality of education is consistent among multiple campus locations	☐	☐	☐	☐

3.17 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position regarding the instructional process?

4. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Supervision of Faculty and Staff

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4.1	Determining teaching assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.2	Recruiting Faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3	Evaluating faculty performance in traditional classroom settings	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.4	Evaluating faculty performance in distance education classes.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.5	Devising faculty disciplinary plans	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.6	Conducting faculty performance evaluations	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.7	Recommending termination of faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.8	Training faculty in distance education delivery methods	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.9	Designing professional development opportunities for faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.10	Providing orientation to new faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.11	Supervising clerical staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.12	Supervising faculty and staff at multiple-campus locations	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.13	Promoting diversity equity	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.14	Preparing job descriptions	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.15	Mentoring faculty and staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.16	Establishing faculty credentialing guidelines	☐	☐	☐	☐

4.17 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to the supervision of faculty and staff?

5. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Curriculum

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5.1	Suggesting modifications to curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.2	Preparing new program requests	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.3	Developing new program curricula	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.4	Globalizing the curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.5	Increasing general education requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.6	Offering distance education programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.7	Conducting assessments to determine need for new programs	☐	☐	☐	☐

5.8 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to curriculum?

6. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Students

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6.1	Establishing selective admission criteria	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.2	Recruiting students	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.3	Advising students	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.4	Counseling students	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5	Responding to students complaints/grievances	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.6	Responding to the needs of diverse students	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.7	Serving at-risk students	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.8	Addressing student transfer issues	☐	☐	☐	☐

6.9 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to students?

7. **CHALLENGES:**

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Fiscal Responsibilities

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7.1	Developing division budgets	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.2	Maintaining budgetary resources to support all programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.3	Purchasing classroom/lab equipment	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.4	Seeking external funding for academic resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.5	Monitoring grant expenditures	☐	☐	☐	☐

7.6 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to fiscal responsibilities?

8. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Use of Technology

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8.1	Using computer technology	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.2	Compiling statistical data	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.3	Analyzing statistical data	☐	☐	☐	☐

8.4 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to use of technology?

9. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Facilities/Inventory

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9.1	Monitoring program equipment inventory	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.2	Evaluating facilities for program use	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.3	Supervising off-campus facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4	Planning for new facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐

9.5 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to facilities/inventory?

10. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Planning

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10.1 Developing annual division plans	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.2 Evaluating policies, procedures, and processes	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.3 Preparing enrollment projections	☐	☐	☐	☐

10.4 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to planning?

11. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Accreditation

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
11.1 Preparing for institutional accreditation/reviews	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.2 Preparing for program accreditation/reviews	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.3 Addressing accountability issues	☐	☐	☐	☐

11.4 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to accreditation?

12. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

Campus Communication

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
12.1 Communicating needs and concerns of division to administration	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.2 Communicating information from administration to faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.3 Networking with other deans on campus	☐	☐	☐	☐

12.4 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to campus communication?

13. CHALLENGES:

What do you perceive as challenges in your position as Dean for Academic Affairs?

External Activities

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13.1 Participating in community activities and events	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.2 Developing relationships with business and industry	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.3 Participating in state, regional and/or national meetings/ conferences	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.4 Networking with deans from other colleges	☐	☐	☐	☐

13.5 Is there anything you would like to add or comment on concerning the challenges you face in your position with regards to external activities?

13.6 Are there specific strategies that would help you overcome the challenges you face in your position as a dean? Please describe.

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL TO CONDUCT STUDY

The University of Georgia

Phone 706-542-3199

Fax 706-542-3660

Office of the Vice President for Research
Institutional Review Board

APPROVAL OF PROTOCOL

January 17, 2014

Dear Wanda Stitt-gohdes:

On 1/17/2014,the IRB reviewed the following submission:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	The Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia
Investigator:	Wanda Stitt-gohdes
IRB ID:	STUDY00000487
Funding:	None
Grant ID:	None

The IRB approved the protocol from 1/17/2014.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

Larry Nackerud, Ph.D.
University of Georgia
Institutional Review Board Chairperson

APPENDIX D

TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM OF GEORGIA APPROVAL

TECHNICAL COLLEGE
TCSG
SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

Ronald W. Jackson
Commissioner

Dr. Josephine Reed-Taylor
Deputy Commissioner

February 17, 2014

Ms. Teresa Allen
Okefenokee Technical College
1701 Carswell Avenue
Waycross, GA 31503

Dear Ms. Allen:

The Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness Department of the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) has received the forms and documentation related to your intended dissertation research (involving a survey of Deans within the Technical College System of Georgia). We have reviewed the summary of your research, as well as the IRB approval issued to you by the University of Georgia.

In accordance with the IRB approval, as well as the documents you submitted to TCSG with regard to the parameters and intent of your study, we authorize you to continue with the research project.

Please note, if you utilize the Deans of Instruction mailing list (or other communication portal owned by TCSG), you must make clear to the recipients that the study is independent of TCSG, a personal venture associated with your doctoral studies, and that **participation in the study is strictly voluntary.**

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I may be reached at (404) 679-1663 or swalker@tcsg.edu.

Sincerely,

SCWalker

Serena C. Walker, Ph.D.
Institutional Effectiveness Specialist

cc: Dr. Marjorie Kuezi-Nke
Dr. Kathryn R. Hornsby
Mr. Andy Parsons
Ms. Steffanie Morrison
Mr. Richard Young
Mr. Donyell Francis

APPENDIX E

EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE WITH PARTICIPANTS

Teresa Allen

From: Teresa Allen
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 6:15 PM
To: jwhi rl@gwinnetttech.edu'
Subject: Request to Participate in Doctoral Study

Good evening Mr. Whirl,

I am a doctoral student under the direction of Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes in the Department of Career and Information Studies at The University of Georgia. Iinvite you to participate in a doctoral research study entitled The Challenges of Deans for Academic Affairs in the Technical College System of Georgia. The purpose of this study is to identify the perceived job challenges that TCSG Deans and Assistant Deans have in relation to their overall job responsibilities, determine basic demographical information,and analyze if the challenges identified differ based on the size of the college. The size of the college will be determined by answering one question using your college's AY2013 Enrollment as published on the TCSG Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) website, Report ER#21. I have provided your college's enrollment information below.

Your participation will involve completing an electronic, web-based survey and take about 15-20 minutes. Your involvement in the study is voluntary and confidential without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may choose not to participate or to stop at any time. The information gathered through the survey will be retained and analyzed by the end of April 2014. If you decide to not complete the survey, any information answered will be discarded and not included in the data analysis. While this study has been approved by TCSG, it is a personal venture associated with my doctoral program.

The survey data will be collected using Class Climate software and is contained on a secure HTIPS. Personal information or internet protocol addresses will not be captured. However, internet communications may be insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to technology itself. Once the results are received by the researcher,standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. The results of the study may be published,but your name or any identifying information will not be used. The results will be presented in summary form only and presented to you, the TSCG Academic Affairs Division, and the colleges' Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs.

The overall benefit to you is that TCSG representatives and college personnel will be able to review the challenges that the Deans face in their positions as disclosed by you and your peers. Professional development opportunities may be identified in this study. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. Participation in this study does not provide any financial compensation or incentives.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at 912-690-2923 or by email at tallen@okefenokeetech .edu. My major professor, Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes may be contacted at 706-542-4078, or at WLSG@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga .edu

Prior to beginningthe survey, make a note of you college's enrollment as listed below. You will use this number to answer question 2.1. To access the survey, 1) hold your control key down, 2) click on the link, and 3) provide the password provided:

AY2013 Enrollment	
Gwinnett	10,013

http://ie-server.okefenokeetech .edu/classclimate/index.php?mca=online/index/index

Password: dean2014

By completing and submitting this web-based survey, you are agreeing to participate in the above described research project.

Thank you for your assistance.