

A STUDY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES: A  
COMPARISON OF THE 1992 INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHAIR  
SURVEY TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS IN THE NORTH TEXAS COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

Judith Gallagher, B.S., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2003

APPROVED:

Ronald W. Newsom, Major Professor and Program  
Coordinator for Higher Education

John L. Baier, Minor Professor

Jesse Jones, Committee Member

Michael Altekruise, Chair of the Department of  
Counseling, Development and Higher  
Education

M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education

C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse  
School of Graduate Studies

Gallagher, Judith. *A Study of Department Chairs in Two-Year Colleges: A Comparison of the 1992 International Community College Chair Survey to Department Chairs in the North Texas Community College Consortium*. Doctor of Education (Higher Education), August 2003, 215 pp., 64 tables, references, 129 titles.

A study was conducted to gather information from department chairs serving in the 26 two-year colleges that are members of the North Texas Community College Consortium using the International Community College Chair Survey (ICCCS). The ICCCS is designed to gather insights into four aspects of the chairs' professional lives: personal characteristics, responsibilities challenges, and strategies. The study compared the demographic data and the respondents' perceptions of the challenges their units will face in the next 5 years to the original survey conducted in 1992. The regional sample included 616 first-line administrators, and a 30.5% response rate was achieved.

The demographic distribution of the regional respondents shows significant shifts in gender, age, education, experience and release time but constancy in race and stability of the population. Similarities between the two samples exist regarding the challenges of maintaining program quality, providing technology, and managing financial issues. The regional sample expresses greater concern about the challenges of distance education, external accountability, and student matters.

Copyright 2003

by

Judith Gallagher

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
Background of the Study .....	11
The Problem.....	15
Purpose of the Study.....	15
Research Questions .....	16
Significance of the Study.....	17
Definition of Terms .....	20
Limitations .....	21
Delimitations.....	22
Assumptions.....	22
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	23
Lack of Research.....	23
Roles of Department Chairs.....	25
Lack of Training and Development .....	30
The Need for Training .....	35
National Survey of Department Chairs in Higher Education .....	38
Research by Dr. Alan Seagren on Chairs .....	57
Other Books Written for Department Chairs.....	71
The Chairperson.....	82
Historical Perspectives on Department Chairs .....	83
Gender Study .....	84
Evaluation .....	85
Professional Development .....	90
Role Conflict.....	91
By Discipline .....	91
Demographics .....	95
Workloads.....	97
Communication Skills .....	98
Legal Issues.....	99
Enrollment Management .....	100
Hiring.....	100
Conflict Management .....	101
Change .....	102
Budget.....	103
Deans .....	104
Faculty Development .....	104

Promoting Effective Teaching .....	105
Surviving as Chair .....	107
3. RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY .....	111
Research Design.....	111
Procedure for Collection of Data .....	111
Instrument .....	111
Population .....	113
Sample .....	113
Procedure for Data Analysis .....	113
4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS .....	115
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample.....	116
Career Characteristics of the Sample .....	120
Perceived Challenges Faced by Chairs or Heads.....	135
Challenge Scales .....	184
5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	191
Summary.....	191
Discussion.....	192
Recommendations .....	198
APPENDIX .....	201
REFERENCES .....	211

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	
QI0021 Respondent's Age .....	116
Table 2a	
QI0022 Respondent's Gender .....	117
Table 2b	
QI0022 Mean Age Distribution by Gender .....	118
Table 3	
QI0023 Respondent's Race/Ethnicity.....	118
Table 4	
QI0042 Respondent's Highest Academic Degree .....	119
Table 5	
QI0024 Number of Years as Community College Faculty Member .....	121
Table 6	
QI0025 Number of Years as Community College Chair or Head.....	122
Table 7a	
QI0024 Number of Years as Community College Faculty Member & QI0025 Number of Years as Community College Chair or Head Crosstabulation .....	123
Table 7b	
Symmetric Measures .....	124
Table 7c	
QI0037 Amount of Release Time (3-Credit Hour Courses) Individuals who Report More Time as Chair than as Faculty .....	125
Table 7d	
QI0036 Respondent Receives Release Time From Teaching .....	126
Table 7e	
QI0037 Amount of Release Time (3-Credit Hour Courses) .....	126
Table 7f	
QI0004 Number of Full-time Faculty in Respondent's Unit .....	128
Table 7g	
QI0005 Number of Part-time Faculty in Respondent's Unit .....	128

Table 7h	
FACRATIO Ratio of Full-time to Part-time Faculty .....	130
Table 8	
QI0043 Respondent's Professional Plans in the Next Five Years .....	131
Table 9	
QI0044 Five-year Career Plans if Staying with Community Colleges .....	131
Table 10	
QI0045 Administrative Career Aspirations at Community College.....	132
Table 10b	
Crosstab Career Aspirations by Age.....	134
Table 11	
QI0050A Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Changing the Curriculum in Response to Technological Development .....	136
Table 12	
QI0050B Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing General Education Requirements .....	138
Table 13	
QI0050C Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing Human Relations Training.....	139
Table 14	
QI0050D Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Internationalizing the Curriculum.....	139
Table 15	
QI0050E Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Keeping Pace with the Increasing Cost of Technology .....	140
Table 16	
QI0050F Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Reallocating Monies to Programs because of Financial Constraints.....	141
Table 17	
QI0050G Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Offering Courses through Distance Education .....	142

Table 18a	
QI0050H Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Promoting Greater Gender Equity .....	143
Table 18b	
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Gender Equity	
by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race .....	144
Table 19a	
QI0050I Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Accommodating Cultural Diversity .....	145
Table 19b	
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Accommodating	
Cultural Diversity by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race .....	147
Table 20	
QI0050J Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Decreasing Growth in Transfer Programs .....	148
Table 21	
QI0050K Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Encouraging More Technical Preparation in High Schools .....	149
Table 22	
QI0050L Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Securing and Maintaining State-of-the-art Technical Equipment .....	150
Table 23	
QI0050M Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Increasing Influence and Impact of State Coordinating Bodies .....	151
Table 24	
QI0050N Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Increasing Influence and Impact of Accrediting Bodies .....	152
Table 25	
QI0050O Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Increasing the Use of Business and Industry Advisory Committees .....	152
Table 26	
QI0050P Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:	
Increasing Teaching Programs Sponsored by Specific Companies .....	153



Table 27	
QI0050Q	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing Involvement of the U.S. Government in Establishing Work Conditions in Colleges .....154
Table 28	
QI0050R	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Adapting to Employees who Utilize Electronic Communication Systems and who Work at Home.....155
Table 29	
QI0050S	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing the Use of Computers in the Classroom.....156
Table 30a	
QI0050T	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Responding to the Needs of a Wider Range of Students .....157
Table 30b	
	Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Responding to the Needs of a Wider Range of Students by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race .....158
Table 31	
QI0050U	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Obtaining Financial Resources .....159
Table 32	
QI0050V	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Attracting New Student Populations.....160
Table 33	
QI0050W	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Maintaining Program Quality .....161
Table 34	
QI0050X	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Strengthening the Curriculum.....162
Table 35	
QI0050Y	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Maintaining a High-quality Faculty .....163
Table 36	
QI0050Z	Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Maintaining the Physical Plant .....163

Table 36b	
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Maintaining the Physical Plant by Gender, Race, and Age .....	164
Table 37	
QI0050AA Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Addressing Issues of Training for Senior Faculty .....	165
Table 38	
QI0050BB Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Using Quality Management Techniques .....	165
Table 39	
QI0050CC Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Addressing Accountability Issues.....	165
Table 40	
QI0050DD Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Serving At-risk Students .....	166
Table 41	
QI0050EE Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Developing Efficient Advisory and Registration Systems and Procedures .....	167
Table 42	
QI0050FF Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Employing New Teaching Techniques .....	167
Table 43	
QI0050GG Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Identifying Unit Leadership Potential from among Faculty.....	168
Table 44	
QI0050HH Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Providing Leadership Training for Faculty and Chairs.....	169
Table 45	
QI0050II Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing Emphasis on the Transfer Program.....	169
Table 46	
QI0050JJ Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Utilizing more Faculty Development Techniques such as Classroom Assessment, Peer Coaching, etc. ....	170

Table 47	
Rank Ordering of Mean Scores for Perceived Challenges	
Faced by Department Chairs (Most challenging to least challenging) .....	175
Table 48	
Index of Challenge Scores by Quartile .....	179
Table 49	
Demographic Analysis of Challenge Index by	
Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race.....	180
Table 50	
Individual Challenges and Factors Identified and	
Defined by International Survey.....	181
Table 51	
Rank Ordering of Scale Means.....	186

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### *Background of the Study*

The job typically identified as that of the department chair in a community college is a difficult one to define, in part because this essential first-line academic leader has come to be identified by a variety of titles over time and from one institution to another. He or she is often still called a department chair, but other titles include division chair, division dean, coordinator, or director, to name a few. For the purposes of this discussion, the role will alternately be referred to as academic leader or department chair, but it includes all the various titles that assume the responsibilities of coordinating an academic unit consisting of a department or program of study. The matter of defining the scope of department chair is further complicated because of the complexities and variations on the role, so many authors have sought analogies that best explain this seemingly indescribable position.

Gmelch and Burns (1991) have compared the department chair to the Roman god, Janus, the gatekeeper who has two faces so that he may guard in both directions. They have chosen this representation because the chair also presents two faces as both a member of the faculty and a person with administrative responsibilities. Another metaphor, coined by Seagren and his associates (1994), compares a department chair to “a juggler who initiates, controls, and halts the objects being juggled” (p. ix). Yet another analogy describes the department chair as a tightrope walker who must balance precariously between being a representative of the faculty and being an extension of the institution’s administration (Shreeve, Brucker, & Martin, 1987, pp. 11-12). Pelatson (1984) points out the “paradoxical nature” of the chairperson’s role by saying that the

chair “is both a manager and a faculty colleague, an advisor and an advisee, a soldier and a captain, a drudge and a boss” (p. 4).

Perhaps a more apt analogy would be to air traffic controllers who have to safely guide the planes in their sectors to safe landings while considering the priority position that each demands. The pilots, their crews, and passengers could well be identified as the constituents in a college who have pressing needs, so the decision falls to the controllers, or department chairs, as to whose need must be addressed first. Will it be the plane running low on fuel (the burned out faculty member who needs a lighter load), the plane with a VIP passenger (the published scholar among the faculty who wants a sabbatical to write a new book), or the plane from the airline seeking to improve its on-time arrival record (the faculty member who is petitioning to gain promotion and/or tenure)? Perhaps attention must be given to the passenger in distress (the student who requests an extension on a project to care for an ill child) or to the airline executive who is under pressure to reduce passenger complaints (the Dean who is calling on the department chairs to present a definitive plan for reducing attrition). The pressure could come from the residents who are complaining about noise levels reducing their property values (the community’s employers who bemoan the college’s failure to provide trained employees who meet their hiring needs.)

Academic leaders who are unable to control the various issues in their departments may find themselves in the same predicament as Northwest Airlines when it held passengers on the tarmac for hours, leading to a lot of negative press and to the airlines’ being compelled to articulate a Passengers’ Bill of Rights.

Unlike the air traffic controllers who have a clear and specific charge for a designated shift, department chairs have a daunting responsibility, not only to the faculty within the

department, but also to the institution's administration, the students, and the community. Keeping all those planes circling the airport, maintaining safety, and delivering everyone safely and happily to terra firma is comparable to, but not as potentially overwhelming as, the life of the chair. After all, the academic leader has to keep the department running efficiently so that the mission of the institution is met while satisfying the pressing needs of the faculty, students, administrators, and community. The advantage is to the air traffic controller who has hours of training and a specific set of guidelines for making decisions, while the typical department chair has been thrust into the position with little preparation and only a scant sense of what the job entails.

The basic problem becomes how to provide the department chair with a tenable situation. To groom future department chairs, to prepare newly appointed department chairs for their various roles, and to support veteran department chairs, institutions need to provide orientations and on-going professional development programs in order to equip these professionals for the myriad tasks and responsibilities they face.

Department chairs in two-year higher education institutions typically come from the faculty ranks and are rarely provided training or development opportunities afforded to administrators. When thrust into the role of chair with little preparation, they experience frustration stemming from the ill-defined scope of their role, the challenge of managing a wide range of responsibilities, and the demands of students, faculty, administrators, and members of the community.

Chairs want and need more training to fulfill their duties and to support them as they carry out their myriad tasks and strive to meet nebulous expectations. Artin Arslanian (1990) tells of his selection as department chair and remarks that he and his fellow chairs found that

their “requests to the administration of the college for an orientation seminar went unanswered” (p. 5). This population includes chairs that have been in their positions for a period of time and plan to remain as chairs; it also includes newly appointed chairs and is extended to include those who aspire to chair positions. Recruiting individuals who represent diversity in ethnicity and gender as well as those who join the academic ranks after working in business and industry presents another set of development needs.

Consideration of release time, compensation, length of the term, and campus training programs can be assessed on the basis of current practices that are, or are not, working. Issues that are most frequently noted as presenting challenges to chairs include, but are not limited to, the following: financial management, personnel issues, adjunct faculty, time management, stress reduction, demands of constituents, planning, communication, problem solving, and role conflict (faculty/administrator).

Only scant national data exists on department chairs in two-year institutions since the majority of studies have been conducted among Chairs in four-year institutions. No regional data exists on the demographics and needs of department chairs in community colleges of the North Texas Community College Consortium at the University of North Texas.

Results of a survey could guide institutions and department chairs in defining the current state of department chairs and in identifying the type of training needed for current department chairs. Administrators and department chairs alike want the department chairs to fulfill their roles efficiently and confidently. Those thinking long term also want development programs for aspiring department chairs to prepare for the role.

### *The Problem*

The problem to be addressed in this study is the perception of department chairs and comparable academic leaders in North Texas community colleges regarding the challenges that they face in their role as a first-line administrator. Surveying the leaders would provide the demographic data on this group and allow a rank ordering of the challenges they will encounter in the next five years as they deal with their tasks and fulfill their responsibilities. A careful analysis of these data would guide the preparation of an appropriate program to develop future academic leaders and support current academic leaders in meeting their obligations and completing their duties while supporting their institutions, faculties, and students in fulfilling their missions and goals. Thus, using the International Community College Chair Survey will reveal what topics people currently filling department chair roles identify as top priority for their development.

### *Purpose of the Study*

The purpose of this study is to replicate the International Community College Chair Survey of 1992 in North Texas in order to describe the academic leaders in the North Texas region and to extract the data about the internal and external job challenges they face and their perceptions of the impact these factors will have on their units over the next five years. As applicable, consideration will be given to any parallels to the international findings. The subjects include department and division chairs serving during the 2002-2003 school year in two-year colleges that are members of the North Texas Community College Consortium. The data would consider the needs of current and future chairs, considering age, gender, race, and education.



### *Research Questions*

In order to accomplish this study's purpose, the research design will be guided by the following research questions:

1. What demographic profile will the responses reflect of those currently serving in chair positions in the North Texas region?
2. What internal and external job challenges will North Texas chairs identify as priorities for the next five years as they fulfill their roles and responsibilities?
3. What issues and/or needs will emerge as most important to department chairs in the North Texas region?
4. Will the data reflect any differences in age, gender, ethnicity, and education?
5. How do these data compare to the international data?
  - a. demographics
  - b. responses

There is no research to imply differences, but logic would prompt consideration of the possibility. This study would then discover either the presence or absence of differences.

### *Significance of the Study*

The professional development needs of department chairs in two-year institutions in North Texas should be identified. Such a survey will provide the data needed to promote a professional development program to better serve institutions, faculty, and students.

Administrators need to be convinced of the necessity of department chair training considering probable objections to the investment of money, time, and energy. Department Chairs will benefit from reflecting on their priorities and on the empowerment to find resolutions to the challenges they face. Trained chairs will better serve institutions, faculty, and students.

Faculty members who come to the position of department chair must possess certain skills, knowledge, and experience to face the challenges of the job. Many of the factors that make an effective department chair are already present in the veteran faculty member—organizational ability, the ability to communicate, maturity, and a moderate awareness of the responsibilities and duties. Most of the tasks of the department chair position can be learned on the job, but a systematic training program can ease the way. An orientation to the job can diffuse concern and heighten awareness, and an ongoing training program can build skills swiftly and relatively painlessly.

In *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers*, Allan Tucker provides a definitive list of the tasks and duties that department chairs must be able to perform. These tasks and duties, which reflect the necessary skills to serve as a department chair, are categorized under the topics of department governance, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, budgeting, office management, professional development, and external communication.

One of the skills needed by department chairs is the ability to govern, or manage, a department. Governing a department includes conducting efficient department meetings as well as establishing and facilitating committees to handle delegated responsibilities. Chairs must also develop, communicate, and implement long-range department programs, plans, and goals as well as manage the day-to-day activities and demands of the department. In addition, they must prepare for accreditation and evaluation. Further, chairs must demonstrate the ability to advocate for the department with the administration.

Another skill required of chairs is the ability to schedule classes, assign faculty teaching loads and other responsibilities, supervise off-site programs, and update the curriculum, courses, and programs.

As to issues regarding the faculty, chairs must be able to recruit and select new faculty, evaluate faculty performance, initiate promotion and tenure recommendations, make merit recommendations, and participate in grievance hearings. When necessary, chairs must deal with unsatisfactory performance. The chair must also keep faculty members informed of plans for the department and institution, maintain morale, and reduce, resolve, and prevent conflict. Above all, the chair must have the ability to encourage, support, and recognize faculty participation.

Regarding students, a department chair is frequently called upon to advise and counsel students. In some institutions and programs, the chairs need skills in recruitment of students, followed by selection and mentoring. The ability to deal effectively with students' complaints and problems is another needed skill.

The ability to manage the budget is another crucial skill a department chair must possess. The chair must create and advocate for the budget and then monitor the funds to be sure they are allocated appropriately. In addition to the operating budget, chairs must also frequently set priorities for the use of travel funds, the acquisition of teaching materials, and the addition and updating of technology. Preparing an accurate annual report is an essential skill in the financial area.

Managing the department office is another critical skill. Managing the department's facilities and equipment typically involves inventory control, security, and maintenance. Beyond the physical property is the human factor of hiring, training, supervising, and evaluating clerical staff assigned to the department. Record keeping is another skill area because the chairs must maintain the essential department records on faculty and students as well as the data required for accreditation.

Another responsibility of chairs is professional development, which has at its core promoting good teaching. Talented chairs will also stimulate faculty research, publication, and participation in professional conferences. With all of this, the chairs must also manage their time so that they participate in professional development and thus maintain their essential connection to their discipline.

Yet another skill that chairs must possess is the ability to communicate, both verbally and in writing. The chairs must communicate the needs of their departments to the dean and other upper-level administrators to establish the department's image and reputation. They must process department correspondence and requests for information, including completing forms and surveys. Managing the volume of phone calls, e-mails, and unexpected interruptions is yet another communication skill essential to an effective chair. In most institutions, chairs must be able to act as liaison with external agencies, especially working on grants and other outside funding.

The individuals who assume the position of department chair must possess the skills, knowledge, and experience implied in the above-listed tasks and responsibilities. Beyond these tangibles, department chairs must also be aware of the roles they will be expected to fulfill within and outside of the institution. As they deal with faculty, staff, administrators, and students, they will also have to deal with townspeople, including local businesses and industries as well as civic organizations. Added to this list will be regional and national professional organizations, counselors and students from local high schools and area colleges, and representatives from accrediting organizations. To meet the needs of all these people, department chairs will find themselves fulfilling a wide variety of roles—from teacher, mentor, leader, manager, counselor, mediator, innovator, organizer, problem solver, facilitator to peer-

colleague—to name just a few. Many seasoned chairs would add to that list—babysitter, marriage counselor, and Dutch uncle.

Given the complexity and number of tasks, responsibilities, and roles, concluding that the position of department chair needs a systematic training program is natural.

### *Definition of Terms*

**Challenges** – the internal and external job challenges that chairs face in the fulfillment of their roles and responsibilities, including the 33 challenges identified in the survey instrument

**Issues and Needs** – the concerns that chairs anticipate to create the greatest demands on their time and energy as they encounter the internal and external challenges of their jobs

**Professional development** – the systematic, ongoing education of an academician to achieve effectiveness and efficiency in the educational environment as either faculty or administrator or both

**Department Chair** – the title assigned to the individual who assumes responsibilities for administering daily operational activities for an academic department or technical program; other titles used to designate individuals who fulfill similar responsibilities include, but are not limited to, coordinator, program director, or director

**Division Chair** – the title assigned to the individual who assumes responsibilities for administering daily operational activities for an academic division made up of related departments

**Instructional unit** – the unit (department, division, area) that the respondent governs

### *Limitations*

The following are limitations:

- (1) variations by institution in role definition, remuneration, and administrative support for Chairs which may influence their attitudes and affect their responses;
- (2) variations of duties and tasks assigned to Chairs which may influence the importance they attribute to specific duties and/or tasks and thus influence their responses; and
- (3) the lack of experience in newly appointed chairs who have yet to recognize the aspects of their role.

### *Delimitations*

The study will be limited to department chairs in two-year institutions that offer transferable credits and are members of the North Texas Community College Consortium in the 2002-2003 school year.

### *Assumptions*

An assumption is that department chairs seek training because they frequently report that they need training. Further, an assumption is that self-reported needs on a survey are one way to determine what knowledge and skills are needed by department chairs to perform efficiently and effectively. In addition, an assumption is that department/division chairs will invest the time and energy to respond to the survey. The final assumption is that no substantive changes have occurred in the definition of Department Chair.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The existing research on department chairs offers only a few surveys assessing the status and needs of department chairs and only one comprehensive survey focusing on chairs in two-year schools. These few surveys, conducted by teams led by Walter Gmelch and Alan Seagren, have generated books, papers, and articles revealing that department chairs face specific challenges and need training to cope with their duties and roles, and yet they don't receive it. Other surveys address specific disciplines, particular college systems, and single issues encountered by chairs such as stress, communication, problem solving, role ambiguity, and management of time and tasks. In addition to these few empirical studies, one finds numerous anecdotal articles that draw on the authors' personal experience as chairs and offer advice on coping with the job. While these articles are not based in empirical research, they do reveal a pattern of common concerns among chairs.

#### *Lack of Research*

Given the complexity and number of tasks, responsibilities, and roles, concluding that the position of department chair needs a systematic training program is natural, and yet a review of literature confirms observations made by higher education professionals who comment on the lack of research on department chairs. In 1978 Thomas D. Clark noted that "in the vast literature of the history and organization of education, the department head is all but ignored" (p. 41). While the past 22 years have seen more attention paid to the department chair, the scholars still express concern. In the Foreword to Allan Tucker's *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers*, J. W. Peltason (1984) wrote, "Given the importance of the chairperson's position, the lack of published material about it is surprising" (p. xi). Charles O.



Warren in “Chairperson and Dean: The Essential Partnership” (1990) wrote: “In-depth analysis of the chairperson’s critical, central position in academic leadership and organization is greatly needed and long overdue” (p. 20). Gmelch and Burns, in a 1992 paper “Stress Factors, Role Conflict, and Role Ambiguity for Academic Department Chairs,” point out that “the job of academic department chair provides a fertile area for research for a variety of reasons” especially because the “chair occupies a crucial yet somewhat unique managerial position” (p. 1). In their paper “The Cost of Academic Leadership: Department Chair Stress” (1990), Gmelch and Burns note that, in spite of the importance of the chair role, “few researchers have ventured to study this multi-dimensional position. The attention it has received in the literature in the past ten years has been mostly anecdotal.” They go on to note that “despite the unique and important role chairs play in universities, few researchers have ventured to study this multi-dimensional position” (p. 1). This collection of observations refers to the role of department chair in the university setting, and even less has been written about chairpersons in community colleges who present some differences not addressed in the research studies previously conducted about chairs in four-year institutions.

In 1994, Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer published the findings of their 1992 survey of community college chairpersons. They observed that while department chairs in four-year institutions have been extensively investigated (Seagren, Creswell, & Wheeler, 1993), few efforts have focused solely on the community college department chair (Seagren & Miller, 1994). Recognizing the importance of the chair as an instructional leader and administrator, additional data and exploration were needed about this position in community colleges . . . It was felt that baseline information was needed about the

chairs to establish a profile of characteristics of chairs as well as to determine the need for leadership skills and professional development. (p. 8)

Their survey provided a profile of community college chairpersons and, as a result, revealed several topics for further study, including, but not limited to, studying (1) chair competence, (2) the chair's function in the leadership team, (3) faculty views on the chair, and (4) how leadership development should occur (pp. 123-25).

### *Roles of Department Chairs*

Establishing that there is little research conducted on department chairs, one could ask why research needs to be done. Looking at the literature again brings a number of logical, if obvious, observations about the importance and challenges of the role of the chairperson. In classic understatement, Tucker says, "The chairperson's job, obviously, is difficult and complex" (1984, p. 4). Tucker and Bryan, in *The Academic Dean: Dove, Dragon, and Diplomat* (1991), note that "department chairpersons bear the primary responsibility for the college's instructional and research programs, and the tasks that must be performed to fulfill this responsibility are myriad in number" (p. 79).

Shreeve, Brucker, and Martin in 1987 wrote: English Department Chairs serve many roles in the university setting including functioning as: a scholar and researcher, a promoter of the scholarly effort, a maintainer of high standards, an extension of an important part of the faculty, an arm of the administration in a leadership role, an instructor and manager. Universities depend upon their chairs for work in public relations. Some chairs are expected to represent the department in the community; others articulate with local high school English Departments, write press releases, serve on the Alumni Advisory Board, and/or maintain the integrity of the major. Several chairs find themselves acting as counselors. They advise undergraduate and

graduate students or hold the hands of colleagues going through divorce, death in the family, or mid-life crises . . . . The vast number of duties being performed by chairs reporting in this study would indicate that most are overworked. (p. 11)

John Bennett, in “About Department Chairs” (1989), points out the necessity of institutions’ paying attention to the situations and needs of their chairs because the chair position sets the tone of the institution and can help or hurt in accomplishing the mission. He categorizes academic chairs into four types: hopeful, survivors, transient, and adversarial. The *hopeful* chairs are energized by the opportunities to learn, share, and make a difference. The *survivor* chairs, usually selected by administration and belonging to a large, stable department, offer institutional consistency, but must be careful to avoid becoming merely caretakers. *Transient* chairs are those in institutions that rotate the position, but their brief time of service offers little to them or to the department. The smallest group, the *adversarial* chairs, demonstrates negativity stemming usually from being members of an unhappy and difficult faculty, and they demonstrate a tendency to view change or resource limitations as a personal affront. Considering the importance of the chair role, institutions would be well advised, according to these authors, to evaluate the circumstances of the chairs and support their needs for professional development.

Smith and Stewart’s “The Process of Role Transitioning” points out that “many of those who assume the role of department/division chair enter their positions without being prepared for what is in store—a multiplicity of demands, long hours, and a change in perspective” (p. 2).

Hecht, Higgerson, Tucker, and Gmelch (1999) point out that “what is needed now is a clearer understanding of the scope and dimensions of the challenges and their implications for the role of department chair” (p. 140). They further observe that “chairing a department is perhaps the most complex and ambiguous of leadership positions” (p. 275).

Gmelch and Burns in “The Cost of Academic Leadership” (1990) say: The university department chair represents one of the most complex, elusive, and intriguing positions. It is unique without common management parallel, and equally important providing the critical link between the administrative requirements of the university and the faculty values of the academic departments. (p. 1)

In a paper presented to the Association for the Study of Higher Education “The Socialization of Academic Department Heads: Past Patterns and Future Possibilities” (1981), Bragg asserts that “department heads differ in their definition of the headship role. The differences in definition, however, represent differences in emphasis and priorities rather than differences in kind” (p. 149). In a study of 39 chairs at a research university, he identified four different chair foci. He observed that the *faculty* chairs see their main duties as recruiting, facilitating, and developing faculty. Those with an *external* focus look at enhancing the department image and representing the department to groups outside the institution. The chairs with a *program* emphasis concentrate their efforts on developing the program and curriculum. Finally, the *management* chairs place their energies on coordination roles. Bragg concedes that the emphasis may be dictated by the institution or may be a byproduct of the size or reputation of the department, the nature of the discipline, or the past experiences the chair brings to the job. Whatever the emphasis, it becomes apparent in the role the chair identifies and the duties that fulfill that role.

In a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in April of 1999, Gmelch and Parkay discussed data collected in the 1995-96 Beginning Department Chair Study (BDCS). An analysis of the data “revealed that the 13 beginning chairs experienced moderate to severe difficulty in making the transition into their

new roles” (p. 7). Through interviews and an analysis of survey data, the researchers discovered that “some of these difficulties stemmed from the role conflict and/or role ambiguity the chairs experienced” (p. 7). The recommendation upon this discovery is that institutions provide leadership training and workshops to develop the skills of new chairs. In addition, the transition could be eased if beginning chairs were mentored by experienced administrators who could serve as “listeners” and “a catalyst for growth-enhancing self analysis and self reflection” (p. 26). Third, workshops in managing time and stress could enhance their sense of control over their lives. Finally, the deans and others could help chairs balance their new roles by reviewing the structure of the position, alleviating the burden of paperwork, protecting their scholarly projects, as well as supporting leadership training opportunities (pp. 27-28).

In essence, department chairs are frequently challenged by the role changes that are succinctly described by Gmelch and Miskin (1993) as a “metamorphosis.” The taxonomy they created to clarify this transformation sees the chairs adjusting to the following role changes:

1. From solitary to social. After years of working alone, chairs must learn to work with administrators and with colleagues in a new relationship.
2. From focused to fragmented. Professors typically work alone, for long period of time with minimal distraction, but chairs find they must carry out their duties with frequent interruptions.
3. From autonomy to accountability. Faculty members have control over their time and the activities they choose to pursue; however, the chair must meet the demands of upper administration and faculty who want to claim their time and energy.

4. From manuscripts to memoranda. When faculty are conducting research and pursuing scholarship, they work on manuscripts for hours, but the chair must learn to convince others in a quickly prepared memo.
5. From private to public. Professors are allowed to isolate themselves for extended periods of time in order to do their scholarly work, but the chair must keep an “open door” policy to be accessible throughout the day to administrators, faculty, students, and the public.
6. From profession to persuading. In academia, the professor provides information that will accomplish the learning objectives, but the chairs must shift their emphasis to persuading and compromising.
7. From stability to mobility. Faculty are accustomed to moving within their discipline and professional relationships, but chairs must balance their professional identity with their public role which demands that they be more visible and political.
8. From client to custodian. In terms of institutional resources, faculty are the recipients of funds and services; on the other hand, chairs become the guardians and dispensers of funds, services, and materials.
9. From austerity to prosperity. While the compensation for professor and chair vary only a little, the control of resources and the power to influence give the impression that chairs enjoy greater prosperity. (pp. 14-15)

The “metamorphosis” from professor to chair draws considerable energy, both physical and mental, as the chairs consider “their complex roles, the needs of their department, and how to respond to a seemingly endless stream of new challenges” (Gmelch & Parkay, 1999, p. 9).

*Lack of Training and Development*

The literature further confirms the assumption that chairs get little, if any, training. In the Preface to his book *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers* (1984), Tucker says: A key position in the hierarchy of colleges and university administration is that of department chairperson, for it is the chairperson who must supervise the translation of institutional goals and policies into academic practice. Yet most chairpersons are drawn from faculty ranks and assume the position having had little administrative experience. Moreover, few opportunities for orientation and training are available to them. (p. xiii)

Gmelch and Miskin, in *Chairing an Academic Department* (1995), observe that new chairs “are not sure of the new roles [they] have to play, and [they] have not been trained to take over such a weighty responsibility.” The authors conclude that “most chairs come to their positions without leadership training, without prior administrative experience, and without a clear understanding of their role” (p. 4).

In Tucker’s 1984 text and also in Hecht, Higginson, Tucker, and Gmelch’s *The Department Chair as Academic Leader* (1999), the writers note: While specifically designed national and regional workshops are conducted for new presidents, vice presidents, and deans to help prepare them for their new responsibilities, few such opportunities are available to department chairpersons, who outnumber all other types of university administrators combined. The increasing complexities of operating institutions of higher education, along with shrunken budgets, have led deans and other university administrators to delegate more and more tasks to department chairpersons. Thus it is in the best interests of colleges and universities to ensure that department chairpersons become as knowledgeable as possible about planning, management, and leadership techniques (pp. 1-2).

In *The Department Chair as Academic Leader* (1999), the authors further state that “training is campus specific and includes mostly procedures and policies. Beyond that training costs money so department chairs don’t go to workshops and yet they need help with conflict management, budget preparation, legal issues, creating and communicating the vision and direction of the department” (Hecht, et al, pp. 26-27). Later in their book they say, “Unfortunately, chairs are apt to assume their positions absent any leadership training, without a clear understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of their roles, and without an awareness of the long-term cost to their academic and personal lives” (Hecht, et al, p. 117).

In *Enhancing Departmental Leadership* (1990), Bennett and Figuli include an essay by Goldenberg on the role of the community college department chair. Testimony from Goldenberg appears in her statement: “I took comfort in my conclusion that all chairs—new or experienced, community college or four-year institution, arts and sciences or professional—begin with an absence of training” (p. 17). Arslanian, in “A Few Suggestions,” says of his experience upon assuming a chair, “Most of us had not read about department leadership, and our requests to the administration of the college for an orientation seminar went unanswered” (p. 5).

The following authors also remark on the absence of formal or comprehensive training programs. The Speech Communication Association wrote “a common problem on most college and university campuses is the failure to provide in-service training for its administrators” (1996, p. 11). In *Effective Communication for Academic Chairs* (1992), Hickson and Stacks note that most academic chairpersons receive no training in management skills, including strategies for effective communication. Gardner’s *On Leadership* contains his observation that department chairs are not trained and that no attention is given to the development of the management or leadership skills of department chairs. In the second chapter of *The Academic Chairperson’s*



*Handbook* (1990), “First, Consider Your Own Development,” the authors say, “Few chairs are given an orientation when they assume their position” (Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, & Beyer, p. 11). In a study of 39 department chairs, Bragg (1981) reported that 82 percent of the respondents had no orientation upon assuming their positions: all they received were manuals on policies and protocols and the offer to call if they had any questions. Hickson and Stacks (1992) state the simple fact: “Most academic administrators, especially at the departmental level, are educated on the job” (p. vii).

Coats, Lovell, and Franks in “Firo B: Analyzing Community College Department Chairs’ Effectiveness” recommend ways to enhance perceived effectiveness of chairs by faculty. They assert that a more positive perception would result from improving the chairs’ interpersonal behaviors. The researchers state: “The findings of this study may serve as a basis upon which policies regarding the selection process and training programs for department chairpersons may be enhanced” (1996, p. 14). Carroll in “A Typology of Career Movements...” notes: “No attention is paid to the development of management or leadership expertise at the department level,” concluding that it is “a low priority.” His most critical comment is: “The study of the careers of department chairs shows chairs to be a temporary, untrained cadre of faculty in a tenuous and ambiguous position” (1991, p. 21).

In “What Does an Academic Department Chairperson Need to Know Anyway?” Mary Kinnick discusses how chairs lack training in technical information. Her opinion is based on information she gathered in focus group sessions and from written reports and running logs prepared by 10 department chairs in a public urban university as well as an interview with the Director of Institutional Research concerning the chairs’ information needs and resources. She

found that the chairs were concerned about the lack of attention paid by the university to their training and development.

“Chairs often assume their positions with little training, and after acquiring the post, feel caught in the middle between the competing pressures of faculty expectations and mandates from upper administration” (Seagren et al, *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*, p. ix). Filan in the Foreword to the above writes, “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). Filan goes on to say, “The individual assuming the role of a department or division chair is quite often under-prepared, overworked, and undertrained. Unlike the private sector, which devotes considerable dollars to training on-line supervisors, Community/Technical Colleges have provided limited support for their mid-level academic leaders” (p. vii). In an effort to further address the need for training

A text that exposes the limited training opportunities for department chairs is Green and McDade’s *Investing in Higher Education: A Handbook of Leadership Development* (1992). Their work contains few references to department chair training, and the mere lack of information reveals the current state of affairs regarding leadership development.

In an article titled “Can Department Heads Be Trained to Succeed?” on department chair training programs in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Piper Fogg notes that “many colleges and universities traditionally have not offered basic training to chairmen and chairwomen” (October 19, 2002, p. A10). The article goes on to discuss the results of a 1997 study by the consulting firm Tillinghast-Towers Perrin which “found that 76 percent of the institutions surveyed offered no training in employee terminations, 65 percent offered no training in

disability issues, and 47 percent offered no training in handling sexual-harassment cases” (p. A10). Fogg goes on to identify grant-funded programs at Rutgers, Stanford, Michigan State, and Appalachian State which cover topics including legal issues, budgeting, faculty relationships, promotion/tenure policies, faculty evaluations, and strategies for conflict resolution. While the programs don’t profess to provide all the answers, they do intend to create opportunities through workshops, Web pages, and working luncheons for chairs to meet and exchange “knowledge and expertise” (p. A11). Even though the chairs necessarily learn on the job, such programs offer the reassurance that institutions recognize the challenges faced by chairs and respect them enough to make the effort to provide support.

### *The Need for Training*

The next logical question becomes: Why do chairs need training? Paul E. King notes in “Surviving an Appointment as Department Chair” that “no role in the academy is as difficult and demanding as that of academic department chair” (1997, p. 211). Bennett and Figuli, in the Introduction to Part One of *Enhancing Department Leadership*, say, “The number of responsibilities department chairpersons face is large indeed” (1990, p. 1). Carroll (1991) cites studies conducted by Heimler (1967) and Roach (1976) in which they discovered that as many as 80 percent of the decisions regarding administrative matters are made by department chairs. Singleton, in “Sources and Consequences of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity among Department Chairs” (1987), observes that “the role of chair is often poorly defined, and conflicting expectations are common in terms of what deans, faculty members, and chairs themselves expect the functions of the chair to include” (p. 39). Winner, in her 1989 paper to satisfy doctoral requirements, remarks that “the function of the department chair in the community college is closely linked to organizational productivity” (p. 5), leading to the natural

assumption that a well-trained chair will better serve the institution. Shreeve, in “University Department Chairs,” says, “A program must be designed to continuously upgrade the human relations and administrative skills of each chair” (p. 13). Smith and Stewart in “The Process of Role Transitioning” say, “It would appear that organizations should attend not only to providing formal training and development opportunities but also facilitate and support informal and discovery learning activities” which are already in place to supplement the learning (p. 7). Peters’ article “Institutional Responsibility and Chair Training” draws attention to the need for department chair training and suggests using the Michigan State University model for faculty development. In his article he points out that numerous programs are in place that relieve the institutions of having to design and then implement an untested program since there are so many out there that do work (1994, pp. 99-103). Roach asserts in “The Academic Department Chair” that “improving leadership at the department level requires focusing on systems of leadership development” (1991, p. 157).

In an analysis of research conducted by Gmelch and his colleagues, the data confirm the considerable stress for department chairs resulting from difficulties managing the inevitable conflict that occurs in higher education institutions. His conclusion delivered in a 1991 paper “The Creation of Constructive Conflict within Educational Administration Departments” is that “progress, change and reform cannot be made without conflict and nothing is as important for educational administration departments than the emergence of a department chair equipped to handle conflict created by the challenges . . . , so chairs need to be equipped with constructive conflict management skill” (p. 1). In “The Cost of Academic Leadership: Department Chair Stress,” Gmelch and Burns (1990) assert that while a chair must be creative in managing the

position, the institution must provide leadership training to support him/her in managing the stress factors.

Filan, in the Foreword to *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*, says, “Reports in the literature and inputs from a range of Community/Technical College systems and institutions indicate that there is a growing level of concern about the identification, selection, and preparation of individuals to assume academic leadership positions as they become available” (p. vii).

In “The Need for Leadership Training: The Evolution of the Chair Academy” (1999), Filan describes a “grassroots movement” (p. 47) begun by the department chairs of Maricopa Community Colleges in Phoenix, Arizona, who sought a program to build their leadership skills. This movement eventually led to the Chair Academy that continues to provide skills training and leadership development opportunities for community college chairs. Over the years, the Chair Academy has expanded to offer annual international conferences. Another outcome of continuing research into the training needs of community college department chairs was the formation of the Academy for Leadership Training and Development, a program that involves participants in a five-day workshop followed by a full year of practicum experience, including implementing an Individualized Professional Development Plan, a mentor relationship, journaling, and a concluding five-day workshop. Throughout the year, participants are involved in reading and dialoguing with other participants to share experiences and discoveries. In the spring of 1999, the Chair Academy began offering an on-line leadership development course titled “Effective Communication for Educational Leaders.” Future plans of the Chair Academy include expansion of current programs and a move into training future chairs to assume the leadership roles when the current leaders retire (pp. 46-55).

Two additional leadership programs discussed in Gillett-Karam's "Preparing Department Chairs for Their Leadership Roles" are the North Carolina State University program and the Administrative Leadership Institute. The NCSU program uses a collaborative approach to increase chairs' understanding of their role as well as develop their skills in management and supervision. Through participation in case studies, discussion of best practices, analysis of leadership styles, and observation of successful leaders, the chairs focus on establishing and securing learning-centered institutions. The Administrative Leadership Institute was conceived to involve chairs with their professional peers so that they might be involved in continuous training and ongoing support from colleagues (pp. 5-12).

Having discussed the absence of training and the need for development of academic department chairs given their roles and responsibilities, a review of the existing literature reveals the need to continue research that will build on this foundation. Walter H. Gmelch of the University of Washington and Alan T. Seagren of the University of Nebraska head the research teams that have made contributions to the data on department chairs in the last twenty years. Gmelch's work focused on chairs in four-year institutions and Seagren's on chairs in two-year colleges. The teams of scholars led by these men have published extensively on their findings, including articles, texts, and papers at professional conferences.

*National Survey of Department Chairs in Higher Education*

Walter H. Gmelch chairs the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology and serves as Director of the National Center for the Study of the Department Chair at Washington State University. In a series of papers and articles, many of which are co-authored with various of his colleagues, Gmelch reports on the findings of the *1991 National Survey of Department Chairs in Higher Education* which was sponsored by the Center for the Study of the

Department Chair. From the findings of this research project, Gmelch, along with various members of his research team, has written articles and books and presented scholarly papers at numerous conferences on stress, resolving conflict, career paths of department chairs, chair roles and duties, training needs, and leadership.

In a paper co-authored with Gordon S. Gates, “The Stressful Journey of the Department Chair: An Academic in Need of a Compass and Clock” (1995), Gmelch describes the instrument as being made up of five sections: (1) the Chair Stress Index (Burns & Gmelch, 1992); (2) the Administrative Role Questionnaire (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970); (3) Chair Tasks Inventory (Carroll & Gmelch, 1994); (4) General Information; and (5) Institutional and Departmental Ratings (p. 11).

In “Stress Factors and Occupational Roles of Department Chairs” (1995), Gmelch and Burns describe the methodology of the study. Using the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education’s classification system (1987), they identified the 237 research and doctorate-granting I and II institutions in the United States and randomly selected 100 for the sample. In each of the 100 institutions, eight department chairs were randomly selected from a list of academic disciplines in Biglan’s model (1973), depending on their *life* versus *non-life* orientations, *applied* versus *pure* nature of the discipline, and *hard* versus *soft* research paradigm employed in the discipline. Gmelch and Burns presented each department chair with a survey packet that relied on major aspects of the Tillman (1978) *Total Design Method* for the design and distribution of the survey. Two mailings resulted in 523 usable surveys, representing a 66% usable survey return rate (1995, pp. 13-14).

The Chair Stress Index produced a list of items ranked from most to least stressful. The most stressful item was “having insufficient time to stay current in my academic field,” followed

by “trying to gain financial support for department programs.” The next three in the top five were “evaluating faculty and staff performance,” “attending meetings which take up too much time,” and “feeling I have too heavy a workload” (Gmelch & Burns, 1995, p. 15).

The Chair Stress Index, consisting of 41 stressors, identified five stress factors: (1) Faculty Role Stress, (2) Administrative Relationship Stress, (3) Role Ambiguity Stress, (4) Perceived Expectations Stress, and (5) Administrative Task Stress. *Faculty Role Stress* identifies the tensions resulting from the chair’s continuing role as a scholar expected to continue research and publication. *Administrative Relationship Stress* reflects the chair’s obligation to represent the department to the administration as well as provide information from the administration to the faculty. *Role Ambiguity Stress* reveals the doubts chairs have about the tasks they perform, the training they receive, and issues of their authority. *Perceived Expectations Stress* is made up of items such as social responsibilities and departmental representation at events outside the normal workday. *Administrative Task Stress* is grouped into four categories: (1) time consuming/boring tasks, mostly bureaucratic; (2) supervisory tasks with the potential for conflict such as evaluation and coordination; (3) tasks linked with securing resources, mostly budget related; and (4) personal pressure derived from administrative tasks such as a heavy workload and confusion over their position (Gmelch & Burns, 1995, pp. 15-18).

Upon an analysis of independent professional variables and stress factors, Gmelch and Burns summarized their observations. They identified the major stress for all chairs coming from *Faculty Role Stress* and *Perceived Expectations Stress*, revealing no distinctions among chairs in different cells of Biglan’s model. They further found that those in very large and small departments suffered more stress than chairs in large or medium departments. They feel the difference stems from the volume of functions in a very large department and from the full



burden's falling on the chair in a small department, while those in large or medium departments have more resources to lighten their loads. Further they found that 95% of chairs identified themselves as being oriented toward their faculty role or equally split between their faculty and administrative roles, and these individuals suffered higher stress than those few who saw themselves as oriented toward their administrative role did. Transitional chairs reported considerably more stress than veteran or new chairs, especially regarding their decision whether to extend their term or return to their scholarly pursuits. New chairs, who were probably completing previous projects during their first year, still felt connected to their research and writing. Veteran chairs were believed to have found ways to cope with the demands, or they either were planning to pursue administration or were preparing to return to the faculty ranks and resume their scholarly activities. In summation, the authors state the need for deans to respect the chairs' desire to maintain their faculty identity by reducing time-consuming activities that detract from the chairs' scholarly activities (Gmelch & Burns, 1995) pp. 18-21).

Gmelch and Gates elaborated further on the research study by detailing the other parts of the survey packet. The *Administrative Role Questionnaire* is a 14-item instrument that measures role ambiguity and conflict. The *Chair Task Inventory* allowed the respondents to reflect on their perceptions of their effectiveness in each of 26 chair duties. Thus each chair received a score to measure him/herself as a manager. The *General Information* section collected personal information such as age, gender, years in the chair position, the nature of their appointment, and details on their departments. Responses allowed the researchers to determine satisfaction with the position. In the section on *Organizational and Departmental Ratings*, the chairs rated seven items on their institutions and four on their departments, as well as a question regarding how

they felt about their institution's facilities and their institution as a place to work (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, pp. 13-15).

Results revealed the mean age of chairpersons to be 50.38 years, with 10% female and 88% male (9 chairs did not respond). Over 88% were married and more than half had no children at home. Minorities comprised fewer than 5% of the chairs. Participants averaged six years experience as chair; 91.7% were tenured; 78.8% were full professors. Nearly one-fourth came from outside the institution. The average department was made up of 15 tenured faculty and 5 untenured (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, p. 16).

Gmelch and Gates conclude that the results indicate that "stress among department chairs appears to be *monolithic* in its effect" (1995, p. 21). They discovered no differences related to gender or age or experience, thus the factors that affect department chair stress appear to be more a product of the position instead of the person in the chair job. A summary of the information regarding influences on the position revealed that chairs enter the office with no leadership training, no administrative experience, no concept of the complexity of their role, and no sense of the changes that occur as they switch their emphasis from professor to chair. The primary source of stress is due to the nature of the department chair position, coming from job satisfaction and role conflict. Surprising to the researchers was the discovery that chairs who assumed their positions for intrinsic reasons experienced more stress, perhaps because they are so committed and therefore more easily frustrated by the unexpected aggravations and the time demands (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, p. 22).

When analyzing administrative relationship stress, they deduced that the source of stress lies in the chairs' relationships with their deans. Role conflict and role ambiguity were discovered to be the primary factors in creating stress, leading the researchers to conclude that

the role and expectations of the chair must be clearly defined to reduce stress from administrative relationships (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, pp. 23-24).

Administrative Tasks stress has an impact on the chairs' perception of faculty leadership as well. The frustration of paperwork, meetings, financial responsibilities and the heavy workload cause them to feel deficient in recruiting, evaluating, and supporting their faculty (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, pp. 25-26).

Role Ambiguity stress was discovered to have the greatest influence on the chairs' negative perceptions of their abilities to manage the responsibilities of the position and to provide effective faculty leadership (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, pp. 24-25).

"In order to address the leadership crisis in higher education, colleges and universities need to focus on how to restructure the chair *position* to make it more attractive and productive" (Gmelch & Gates, 1995, p. 27). But the research team concede that this study is limited to research and doctorate-granting I and II universities and may be applied to similar institutions; however, the findings may not parallel circumstances experienced by chairs in non-research colleges and universities. While many of the stress factors are generic, the issues about maintaining scholarship may not be as pressing.

Additional articles on stress by Gmelch with John S. Burns include "Sources of Stress for Academic Department Chairpersons" (1994) which again emphasizes the "monolithic" stress suffered by department chairs, in particular dealing with faculty and administrative areas. Another article is "Stress Factors, Role Conflict, and Role Ambiguity for Academic Department Chairs" (1992). In "Sources of Stress of Academic Department Chairpersons," the authors examine perceptions of the stress experienced by chairs and the impact of variables associated with these stressors. Chairs cite conflict mediation as the most stressful role and the most likely

factor to influence the chairs' continuing to serve. The focus is also on findings that chairs with high role ambiguity experience high stress in their career and that chairs with such conflict suffer higher stress than those who perceive lesser role conflict. This role ambiguity results from on the fact that chairs are in the middle, between faculty and administration. The most important finding of this focus is that relief from stress is highly correlated with reduced conditions of role conflict and role ambiguity (Gmelch & Burns, 1994, pp. 79-94).

Yet another paper presented by Gmelch and Burns is "The Cost of Academic Leadership: Department Chair Stress" (1990). Their presentation deals with an examination of stresses associated with the role of the university department chair, focusing on career paths, transitions to the chair position, commitment to administration, role orientation, and strains of chairing. They present findings that stress is primarily associated with time management, collegial confrontation, organizational constraints, and academic productivity. During the presentation, the authors offered suggestions for reducing stress, such as identifying high and low payoff activities, facilitating faculty involvement in conflict resolution, establishing a research protection plan, and using creativity in interpreting regulations.

In a position paper titled "Strategies for Dealing with Stress: Taking Care of Yourself" (1992), Gmelch points out myths pertaining to stress, including that stress is harmful, should be avoided, correlates to one's level of responsibility, is exclusively a male phenomenon, and is an appropriate coping method. He contends that the first stage to managing stress is identifying the causes of stress such as administrative tasks, the pressure of serving an added role, role ambiguity, hierarchical authority, and/or perceived high expectations. In the second stage, he says that one must recognize that controlling one's perception of stress is the first step to managing stress. Planning personal time, separating chair and non-chair activities, performing

one duty at a time, seeking personal enrichment, finding a private retreat, and living by the calendar and not the clock are the best ways to control stress. The third stage deals with finding ways to manage the stress. The final stage indicates that finding the sources of stress, controlling the perceptions, and identifying ways to manage stress will allow the chair to discover optimal stress levels and thus protect personal health so that stress is a positive rather than negative force.

Another paper drawing from this research study is Gmelch's "The Creation of Constructive Conflict within Educational Administration Departments" (1991). His analysis of data discovered that the greatest stress stemmed from responsibilities based in relationships with the faculty. Chairs reported that 40% of their stress came from having to make decisions that impact others such as settling differences between and among faculty as well as evaluating faculty, while 17% came from deans and 5% from students. Sources of faculty conflict include the faculty's bickering among themselves, resisting change, failing to support the chair, and displaying negative attitudes. The chair's dissatisfaction with higher level administration stems from lack of support, excess paperwork, lack of response, impossible deadlines, lack of information, and lack of appreciation. In closing, Gmelch provided a long section on conflict resolution by employing a principled approach which sees conflict as necessary for reaching shared goals, as long as this new constructive model is employed.

Another article by Gmelch was titled "Department Chairs Under Siege: Resolving the Web of Conflict" (1995) in which he writes of "the three main themes of department chair conflict: conflict inherent to the structure of higher education (*institutional*), conflict created when people work together (*interpersonal*), and conflict woven into the role of the chair position (*positional*)" (p. 35).

Regarding *institutional* conflict, Gmelch reassures chairs that there are inherent causes of conflict in departments and universities or colleges depending on whether the institutions follow bureaucratic, political, collegial or anarchical models. Accepting that conflict will result from the organizational structure will relieve chairs of feeling the conflict is a result of their personalities (p. 36).

On the subject of *interpersonal* conflict, Gmelch draws on his research to point out that chairs experience more conflict with colleagues than with deans or students. Some conflict took the form of “bickering, whining, and feuding” among faculty. Chairs also bemoaned faculty members’ displaying poor attitudes. Yet another area of disappointment for chairs was lack of support from faculty who resist change, act selfishly, and act counter to the department’s mission. Conflict also occurs when chairs can not support their faculty or when they have to evaluate faculty and make tough decisions. Finally, the inability to mediate conflict creates stress, leading Gmelch to suggest that chairs “be equipped with creative conflict management skills” (p. 39).

*Positional* conflict results when department chairs “move from faculty into administration” and must balance their “personal and professional lives and the conflict between [their] academic and administrative roles” (p. 39). Gmelch’s research discovered that 65% of chairs spent less time with family, 56% less time with friends, and 77% less time in leisure activities in order to fulfill their administrative duties. Their dissatisfaction with this demand on their time revealed 89% resented the time away from family, 87.5% from friends, and 80.5% from leisure activities. Thus the role conflict is profound. As to the conflict with academic and administrative roles, chairs suffer conflict and dissatisfaction when they feel they have to choose between their faculty identity and their administrative obligations. The chairs feel trapped

between producing as a faculty member and serving as an administrator, causing conflict over their loyalties and commitments (pp. 39-40). Gmelch contends that the chair must learn to weave a “healthy web of tension” in order to respond appropriately to conflict. That doesn’t mean eliminating conflict but managing conflict to achieve acceptable outcomes.

Yet another article by Gmelch, in association with James B. Carroll, is “The Three R’s of Conflict Management for Department Chairs and Faculty” (1991). In this article they discuss conflict in academic departments employing contemporary ideas about conflict resolution. Their emphasis is on what they call the “principled approach” to reach positive benefits because they contend that “progress and change cannot be made without conflict and nothing is more important for American higher education than the emergence of academic leaders equipped to handle the conflicts created by these challenges” (p. 107). The article stresses understanding the nature of conflict, finding effective responses to conflict, and developing skills in conflict resolution. Further, the authors identify the causes of conflict and offers various strategies for meeting conflict in higher education.

In “Paying the Price for Academic Leadership: Department Chair Tradeoffs” (1991), Gmelch presents a paper which “addresses the tradeoffs professors had to make to become department chairs. It illuminates the ‘dark side’ of the department chair position, not to discourage candidates from seeking the challenges of academic leadership but help them recognize, prepare for and overcome unforeseen tradeoffs” (p. 1). Gmelch’s concern is shared by many in higher education who are concerned that a high turnover rate is due to the unanticipated sacrifices that department chairs must make. The chairs revealed that they spent 88% less time on research and writing and 56% less time on teaching as well as considerably less time with family, friends, and leisure activities. His survey further discovered that 29%, or nearly one-

third, would not serve again. To relieve this concern about no one's being willing to serve as department chair, he suggests that five changes occur, including (1) restructuring the position, (2) reducing unnecessary administrative tasks, (3) reversing the hierarchy, (4) protecting scholarly interests, and (5) training chairs for their leadership role.

Carroll and Gmelch presented information on what chairpersons believe are the most important duties, how they view their roles, and the relationship of perceived roles and duties at an ASHE meeting in 1992 in a paper titled "The Relationship of Department Chair Roles to Importance of Chair Duties," and in 1994 they published an article on the same data titled "Department Chairs' Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Their Duties." Their works identifies four roles for a department chair: leader, scholar, faculty developer, and manager. They found that chairs believe those items, which are of immediate benefit to the faculty and department to be of more importance than activities, which benefit the institution as a whole. The highest-ranking duties relate to aspects of faculty development, which indicates that chairs deem assisting colleagues as their most important responsibility. They further discovered that an association between duties the chairs believe they are effective in and duties that they regard as most important.

In yet another paper on this topic, "A Factor-Analytic Investigation of Role Types and Profiles of Higher Education Department Chairs" (1992), Carroll and Gmelch elaborated on four objectives: (1) examining role factors of effective chair performance; (2) assessing the impact of variables such as gender, marital status, ethnicity, and motivation; as well as department size, clerical support, and ratio of tenured to untenured faculty; and number of years of service, discipline, current academic rank, and rank when hired; (3) exploring the link between chair performance role factors with behavioral outcomes of scholarly productivity, job satisfaction,



role ambiguity, role conflict, and job stress; and (4) identifying a department chair profile associated with each specific performance role. Their analysis of the data revealed that many effective leader chairs are often effective manager chairs as well. The authors suggest that the study provides a usable list of chair roles and some characteristics of those individuals who perceive themselves to be effective in those roles.

Carroll and Gmelch published “Department Chairs’ Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Their Duties” in 1994, noting that the study of department chairs should resist “resorting to this pathology of listing complex chair duties,” to focus on “theory and practice” in order to “move to a better understanding and clearer delineation of duties deemed important by effective chairs” (p. 49). These authors saw a correlation between the definition of the role type by a given chair with the duties he/she feels are most important. Gmelch and Carroll classified the roles as (1) leader chairs, (2) scholar chairs, (3) faculty developer chairs, and (4) manager chairs (p. 50). The second part of the investigation included the association of influences such as gender, discipline, department hiring practices, and faculty/administrative orientation with the assigned importance of duties.

As to the first goal of the study, Carroll and Gmelch discovered the following connections between roles and duties: the *leader* chairs led their departments in both internal and external issues. Internal leadership was made up of gathering ideas to improve the department, planning and evaluating curriculum development, conducting department meetings, and informing the faculty of departmental and college concerns. As to the external leadership skills, these chairs coordinated activities with constituents, represented the department at professional meetings, and participated in college committee work (pp. 50-51).

The *scholar* chairs reported their effectiveness in terms of their own scholarly work, including amassing resources for personal research, sustaining a research program, and staying current within their academic discipline. In those institutions with graduate programs, they included selecting and supervising graduate students (p. 51).

The *faculty developer* chairs identified their effectiveness by the success of faculty in their pursuits. These chairs stressed promoting professional development efforts of faculty as well as faculty research and publication. They also mediated the relationship of faculty to the institution by providing informal faculty leadership, defining long-range department goals, and maintaining a nurturing work environment. Lastly, they dealt with issues of faculty evaluation by carefully recruiting and selecting faculty as well as evaluating faculty performance (p. 51).

The *manager* chairs focused on skills in the custodial activities such as preparing budgets, managing departmental resources, keeping good records, managing staff, and assigning duties to faculty (p. 51).

As to considering the priorities by discipline, the hard disciplines indicated that long-range goals, representation to the administration, and management of department resources were significantly more important than soft-discipline chairs did (p. 52). On the differences by gender, the females indicated that encouraging professional development and faculty research were significantly more important (p. 55). Those chairs who considered themselves both faculty and administrator gave considerably more importance to evaluating faculty performance, managing department resources, and encouraging faculty research than those who considered themselves to be primarily faculty. Those with the faculty orientation rated remaining current with their academic discipline as markedly more important than those with the dual orientation (p. 55). The

study found no significant differences in the ranking of importance attached to the hiring practices by which the chairs came to their positions (p. 55).

The authors conclude that the important implication for chairs is that they consider the attitudes of the faculty they lead and the administrators to whom they report when prioritizing the duties they perceive to be important in fulfilling their identified roles (p. 62).

James B. Carroll interpreted yet another aspect of the study's findings when he reported in "A Typology of Career Movements of Department Chairs" (1991) and in an article titled "Career Paths of Department Chairs: A National Perspective." His examination of the career behaviors of department chairs found some differences by gender in that 10 percent of the chairs were women; men were full professors longer than women before becoming a chair, and females expressed more interest in administrative positions. As to the "hard" and "soft" disciplines, soft discipline chairs were older than hard discipline chairs. Also, tenure in the position of chair was longer in hard disciplines than in soft. Furthermore, hard discipline chairs were less likely to return to the faculty ranks after their term as chair ended. Career paths preceding their chair ascension revealed marked variation with some general tendencies along the hard/soft and male/female variables. In addition, respondents rarely see the chair as a career move but rather as an obligation to serve the department and institution for a short time since 65% return to their faculty duties after serving as chair.

Gmelch also wrote about leadership skills necessary to being an effective department chair. Adapting his *Leadership Skills for Department Chairs*, he presented a position paper titled "Five Skills for Becoming a More Effective Team Leader" (1994). The five characteristics identified from his research for effective leadership are as follows: (1) clearly stated long-term goals; (2) team members who are actively involved and share management authority; (3) openly

shared information with participative decision-making; (4) a constructive approach to resolving conflict with attention to individual interests; and (5) top priority attention to individual growth and self-development. Striving for collaborative solutions is the goal of a chair who establishes an open climate for conflict resolution.

Gmelch and Miskin published *Chairing an Academic Department: Survival Skills for Scholars* that discusses their national research on department chairs. The text is structured around the four key roles of department leadership that they identify, including faculty developer, scholar, manager, and leader. Their research discovered the 12 most important tasks for department chairs, along with the percentage of respondents who indicated the item deserved high importance, were as follows:

1.	Recruit and select faculty	93%
2.	Represent department to administration and the field	92%
3.	Evaluate faculty performance	90%
4.	Encourage faculty research and publication	89%
5.	Reduce conflict among faculty	88%
6.	Manage department resources	85%
7.	Encourage professional development of faculty	85%
8.	Develop and initiate long-range department goals	83%
9.	Remain current within academic discipline	78%
10.	Provide informal faculty leadership	75%
11.	Prepare and propose budgets	73%
12.	Solicit ideas to improve the department	71%. (p. 6)

They point out the irony of the chairs' not feeling "trained in or prepared for many of these important tasks" (p. 6). The survey participants ranks the training needs for department chairs as follows:

1. Evaluate faculty performance
2. Reduce conflict among faculty
3. Obtain and manage external funds
4. Prepare and propose budgets
5. Develop and initiate long-range department goals
6. Manage department resources (finances, facilities, equipment)
7. Encourage professional development activities of faculty
8. Manage nonacademic staff
9. Plan and evaluate curriculum development
10. Provide informal faculty leadership
11. Assure maintenance of accurate department records
12. Recruit and select faculty. (p. 7)

What one can deduce from reviewing these two lists is "that the items on the two lists are nearly identical," leading one to conclude "that department chairs believe they are ill prepared for the important roles they are asked to assume" (p. 7).

Rita G. Seedorf also drew from the 1991 Department Chair Study to present a paper on "The Transition of the University Department Chair: What Must Be Left Behind?" (1991) and to write an article "Department Level Leadership: Where Does the Time Go?" (1993). Added to the study, she conducted interviews with subjects in one of the major universities. She investigated

data on job satisfaction, personal adjustment to the new role, and personal/professional time allocations affected by the new role.

Seedorf's analysis found that having less time for research and writing troubled 88% of the chairs, to the extent that 77% of them suffered dissatisfaction with the loss of time for scholarly pursuits. The data also revealed that 82% were concerned about reduced time available to keep current in their academic fields with 77% of them being dissatisfied that they couldn't find time to keep abreast of new developments. Less time for teaching troubled 78% with 43% feeling dissatisfied with the loss, and less time with students occurred in 49% of the chairs, and 38% found this loss to be troubling. In the personal area, 77% found they had less leisure time and 62% were dissatisfied. Time with family suffered for 65% of the respondents and time with friends was 56%. The results indicated "that there was a notable change in the way professors used their time after they became department chairs" (p. 54).

Seedorf's conclusions were that potential chairs need to know about these time demands to decide if they can handle the compromises to their professional and personal lives or if they would be happier remaining in the faculty role. Only if they are realistic and enter the job for the right professional and personal reasons can chairs be happy. Chairs were surprised by the time demands of administrative duties, including meetings, paperwork, and the nature of administrative work. The results "indicate that chairs' academic and administrative tasks exist in dynamic tension" (p. 57). The picture that emerges is one of chairs who find the time to perform their duties but at the expense of time for more satisfying activities.

Seedorf points out that careful consideration must be given to the transition process to discover how the institution and administration can support chairpersons. Possibilities include providing research assistants, reducing the massive amounts of paperwork that chairs described

as “redundant, endless, unnecessary, mundane, overwhelming, purposeless, meaningless, and pointless” (p. 62). Teaching chairs to process paperwork efficiently, providing help, and reducing paperwork could help the chairs cope with the position. To socialize the professors to the chair position, administrators could offer training, mentoring, and an introduction to the position, perhaps by shadowing the previous chair for a semester before assuming the office. Professors who consider a chair position must consider whether the timing is best for their professional and personal lives and whether they are willing to accept the impositions on their time. Universities should consider making the position more attractive so that faculty members have enough incentive to pursue the office of department chair rather than avoid it.

In another paper “The Problem Solving Role of the University Department Chair” (1992), Seedorf elaborated on the surprises chairs experience in their new roles and how they cope with the unexpected during the adaptation stage or “sense-making stage.” The three main challenges are dealing with people, dealing with the bureaucracy, and dealing with the detractions from their research. Chairs can accept or tolerate the paperwork as a necessary evil and often delegate some of it to staff members. To deal with other people and their demands, chairs sometimes create a space away from the office in which to complete the tasks and pursue scholarship, or perhaps they leave the office and work from home. Yet another possibility is maintaining scholarship by collaborating with colleagues.

Seedorf and Gmelch collaborated on a paper in 1989 titled “The Department Chair: A Descriptive Study” in which they investigated the managerial role of a single academic department chair. They employed Mintzberg’s observation method to document the actions of the chair for eight days. They followed this observation period with in-depth interviews and collected two days of activity logs when the chair was outside the office. The study considered

the amount of time spent on five activities: (1) scheduled meetings, (2) unscheduled meetings, (3) phone calls, (4) tours, and (5) deskwork. Results found that one of the primary frustrations is the limited amount of time available for uninterrupted deskwork. They also found that time concerns are a big issue with department chairs and that time spent in meetings is not rewarding for the most part.

*Research by Dr. Alan Seagren on Chairs*

*The Academic Chairperson's Handbook* (1990) “focuses attention on the strategies ‘excellent’ chairs use in building a positive work environment for faculty and releasing individual faculty potential” (p. xii). Creswell, Seagren, Wheeler, Egly, and Beyer conducted a three-year study beginning in 1985 using qualitative research methodology that combined semi-structured interview protocol and campus visits to collect data. They interviewed 200 chairpersons from 70 campuses classified as research universities, doctoral-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges, and liberal arts schools by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The campuses, both public and private, were located in 33 states located on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, in the South and the Midwest, and ranged in size from 600 to 40,000 students.

Seven interviewers were trained to gather data in 45 minute telephone interviews and during eight campus visits with the chairs, their faculty, academic deans, and faculty development specialists. Senior academic administrators and faculty development specialists nominated the chairpersons who were selected as subjects for their outstanding work in professional growth assistance for faculty. The subjects demonstrated stellar records for supporting faculty, possessed strong interpersonal skills, held the respect of colleagues, and had a clear insight into the mission of their institutions. Fourteen percent were female, and the total



group represented a variety of disciplines including social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, and professional fields. The handbook presents 15 strategies gleaned from the interviews with the chairs that reflect “good” practices of these role models, thus allowing the readers to discover techniques that will work in their institution.

In Part I of the handbook, the authors discuss difficulties in creating a positive work environment and then present 15 strategies and discuss their application in specific situations.

The 15 strategies include the following:

1. Learn about your role and responsibilities in the department and the institution
2. Create a balance between your professional and personal life
3. Prepare for your professional future
4. Establish a collective departmental vision or focus
5. Develop faculty ownership of the vision
6. Initiate changes slowly
7. Allocate resources of time, information, and assignments to encourage the vision
8. Monitor progress toward achieving the vision
9. Establish an open atmosphere to build trust
10. Listen to faculty needs and interests
11. Collaboratively set goals
12. Provide feedback to faculty
13. Represent faculty to colleagues and senior administrators
14. Serve as a role model and mentor
15. Encourage and support faculty

The text includes a self-assessment inventory to guide the reader to identify his/her difficulties. In Part II of the book the authors apply the strategies suggesting processes and a general guide for building one's department. Application of the strategies is covered in chapters on orienting new faculty, improving teaching performance, improving scholarship of faculty, refocusing faculty efforts, addressing personal issues of faculty, and building an agenda.

Results of the seminal study on community college department chairs was published in *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges* (1994) by Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller and VanHorn-Grassmeyer. Recognizing a need for “the identification, selection, and preparation of individuals to assume academic leadership positions,” Maricopa Community Colleges of Phoenix, identified 12,500 academic leaders from over 1,500 Community/Technical Colleges in the United States and Canada and found that 40% would need to be replaced by the year 2000. The National Community College Chair Academy was created to fill this need with its primary focus on leadership development. The NCCCA developed a partnership with the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to conduct research and develop a leadership program (pp. vii-viii).

The CSHPE developed a comprehensive survey titled the “International Community College Chair Survey—1992” to gather insights into four aspects of chairs' professional lives: personal characteristics, responsibilities, challenges, and strategies. The survey is made up of nine sections:

- Section 1 - Characteristics of the Instructional Unit
- Section 2 - Characteristics of the Campus
- Section 3 - Personal Information (on the respondent)
- Section 4 - Educational Beliefs and Values

- Section 5 - Roles
- Section 6 - Tasks
- Section 7 - Skills
- Section 8 - Job Challenges
- Section 9 - Strategies

The survey's designers drew items from a variety of sources:

- (1) previous studies on department chairs;
- (2) data lists from the Department of Education;
- (3) questions designed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching;
- (4) publications by various authors which listed tasks, duties, skills, etc.;
- (5) the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Assessment Center Project; and
- (6) the staff of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education and the National Community College Chair Academy.

The survey was pilot tested (1) in Nebraska Community Colleges, (2) with student-practitioners in the doctoral program at University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and (3) with participants in the 1992 Institute for Academic Leadership Development sponsored by the National Community College Chair Academy. Their feedback led to revision and clarification.

The study had two purposes. One purpose was to develop a database regarding development needs of academic leaders so that the Chair Academy could develop conferences, workshops, and other activities. The second was to give individuals in chair positions information about topics such as "working with faculty, serving students, visioning, dealing with change, and responding to business and community interests" (p. ix).

The book is divided into three parts. Part I—Overview and Profile of Academic Leaders, Their Instructional Units and Their Campuses—is made up of chapters which introduce the study, profile the chairs, and describe the instructional units and campuses of the chairs. Part II—Chair Perceptions and Job Dimensions—discusses six job dimensions: educational beliefs and values, roles, tasks, skills, challenges, and strategies. From this section, the researchers could deduce the philosophical perspectives that direct the chairs' work as well as the importance they assign to the aspects of their work. In addition to the six job dimensions, two of the chapters list the challenges that impact the chairs' work and what particular strategies they employ to respond to those challenges. The last chapter in Part II gives considers the impact of institutional and personal characteristics on the six dimensions. Part III—Summary and Reflections—draws together the findings that create a picture of the typical chair and the need for further studies on leadership topics (pp. ix-x).

The survey population included chairs or heads of instructional units and academic departments in all community colleges in the United States and Canada. The total population of 9,000 was selected for the study, and the instrument was mailed. A total of 3,000 surveys were returned with 2,875, or 32%, proving usable.

As to personal characteristics, the survey found that 46.9% of the chairs were 45-54 years of age. Forty percent were female and 89% were Caucasian. The chairs were a well-educated group with 88% holding degrees beyond a baccalaureate. Regarding experience, 96.9% had been faculty members before taking the chair position with 80% of them having more than six years of experience. The respondents either had unlimited terms in office or were in renewable positions. Release time was available to 73.2% of the chairs, and they received stipends at an average of \$1500-2000 with the salary average in the \$40,000-60,000 range. Chairs reported working an

average of 31-40 hours per week on chair duties. Of those responding, 74% plan to stay in the community college chair position for the near future (pp. 12-28).

The profile of the instructional unit and campus of the chairs considered 21 characteristics and found a wide range of units and types of campuses. Regarding the instructional unit, the title of *Chair* was assigned to 64.5% with the term *Department* assigned to their instructional unit in 56.8% of the responses. Survey subjects were responsible for 401-600 students and supervised 11-20 full-time faculty on average. Their part-time faculty averaged 11-20, and their units had been operating for an average of 16-20 years. Degrees offered included 37.6% Associate of Arts, 18.9% Associate of Sciences, and 30% Associate of Applied Sciences. As for the campus profile, the average headcount of full-time students was 4001-6000 and exactly the same for part-time students. The average numbers of full-time and part-time faculty both fell in the 101-150 range. The number of chairpersons on the campuses averaged 11-20. Campuses from all regions of the United States were represented with the greatest response rate from the Southern region with 33.4%. The great majority (76.8%) described their institutional focus on both technical and transfer courses. Both public and private institutions were represented with the public schools showing 95.8%. State funding of 67% or greater was reported by 49.1% of the respondents. As to their appointments, 51.8% were appointed by administration with 29.5 being selected by a combination of faculty and administration.

In discovering what community college chairs believe and value about educational issues, in particular the issues of the community college environment. Results discovered six statements that were highly valued by more than 90% of the chairpersons. They included the concept of life-long learning, encouraging faculty to use a wide variety of teaching approaches, general education, preparing students to meet the needs of business or industry, preparing students to

meet the needs of the community, and providing student support services. The most highly ranked beliefs and values reflected the role and mission of community colleges.

Next the chairs were asked to respond with their perceptions of their roles as a chairperson by indicating the degree of importance of each role to them in their current positions. Four roles: planner, information disseminator, motivator, and facilitator received 90% or more agreement among respondents. Other roles that they saw as important were advocate, visionary, conflict resolver, delegator, mentor, resource allocator, evaluator, and negotiator.

Given the roles they identified, chairs were then asked to consider 32 specific tasks that related to those roles. More than 90% of the chairs ranked 10 tasks as *Very Important* or *Important*. Those included, in order, the charge to create a positive environment, communicate needs to upper level administrators, recruit and select faculty, communicate information from administration to unit faculty, provide feedback to faculty, update curriculum and courses, encourage the professional development of each staff member, set personal and professional goals, develop long-range unit plans, and integrate unit plans with institutional plans. Another nine tasks were ranked as *Very Important* or *Important* by 80% or more. These nine included scheduling classes, preparing unit budgets, monitoring unit budgets, assigning faculty responsibilities, allocating resources to priority activities, evaluating faculty performance, conducting unit meetings, advising and counseling students, and processing paperwork and answering correspondence.

The skills needed by chairs to carry out their tasks and roles reveal the importance of communication. The respondents agreed that nearly all of the administrative, interpersonal and individual skills were crucial. Three skills were ranked as *Very Important* or *Important* at a rate of 99%. These three are sensitivity (to deal effectively with people), judgment (to reach logical

conclusions and make high quality decisions), and written communication (to express ideas clearly in writing). Seven more skills were rated by 96% of the respondents and included organizational ability, leadership, decisiveness, oral communication, educational values, stress tolerance, and problem analysis.

Job challenges, internal and external, applying to the roles, tasks, and skills are largely determined by the roles the chairs accept and range in term and scope. Thirty-three challenges were presented to chairs for their perception of their importance. Four challenges were perceived as important issues encountered by 90% or more of the chairs: maintaining program quality, maintaining a high quality faculty, strengthening the curriculum, and changing the curriculum in response to technological development. In the 80-89% range were employing new teaching techniques, responding to the needs of a wider range of students, increasing the use of computers in the classroom, securing and maintaining state-of-the-art equipment, keeping pace with the increasing cost of technology, obtaining financial resources, and addressing accountability issues from accrediting agencies and local employers.

Strategies utilized in response to the challenges varied according to chairs' personalities and experiences and the institutional setting. Twenty-four strategies were proposed for the respondents' consideration and indicated that nearly half of the strategies were identified by 70% or more of the chairs as being useful. Only the strategy of conducting curriculum reviews to maintain relevance ranked in the 90% range. Three other strategies—balancing personal and professional activities, networking with other chairs, and assessing future employment trends and opportunities—received more than 80% agreement. The Chair Development Strategies cluster included 11 strategies: assessing leadership styles and profiles of chairs; writing job descriptions for chairs; participating in a training academy as well as regional and national conferences;

taking formal graduate courses; reviewing and revising the organizational chart; providing training for clerical personnel; clarifying roles and responsibilities of chairs; assessing the professional development needs of chairs; and networking with other chairs.

From all this data, the researcher drew their conclusions and explained them following with recommendations for future action and further study. They began their discussion as follows: “Given the importance of the chair position, chairs should be the major focus of leadership development” (p. 119). The development can be self-directed in a variety of ways within their institution as well as by attending conferences. They can network with other chairs and administrators and read the available texts and periodicals, professional publications, and newsletters. If, as they indicate, they wish to become leaders as well as managers, they will want to develop a plan to transform the unit. Those who are interested in becoming chairs should assess their qualifications, analyze their beliefs and values, and take advantage of their institutions’ opportunities to increase their responsibilities through committees and short-term administrative assignments to test their interest, abilities, and skills. They may already possess the skills to fulfill some roles, others can be learned on the job, and they can take advantage of the experience of current chairs to develop other roles. To increase effectiveness and efficiency in the tasks, they can network and seek training. Interpersonal skills such as communication are critical to the organization, so chairs should increase their abilities in such areas as planning or delegating. The challenges chairs face require an elevated level of understanding which comes from reading and analysis as well as mentoring from administrators. As for the strategies, they provide a list of activities that will help people prepare for and continue developing in the chair position. Not only must the chair, or aspiring chair, be committed to his/her own development, the institution should provide opportunities for development by assigning mentors, funding



workshops, and providing feedback. Institutions should also be clear on the expectations of chairs, their responsibilities, and their ongoing development goals.

Future research proposed by the authors includes investigating performance levels and ways of assessing competency in skills, tasks, and roles. They also recommended examining the part deans and presidents play in the leadership team and the evaluation of chairs. Another proposed research project involved considering how leadership development should occur including what's working and what is available. Yet another proposal was projecting future needs to address diversity issues. The researchers noted that since the survey subjects were limited to department chairs including the faculty view on leadership development of the chairs would provide another topic for research. Still another suggestion was a study about developing strategies for using part-time faculty more effectively. Beyond those topics, the research indicates a need for addressing the issues of academic transfer programs and the development of tech-prep programs as well as outcome-based education. Since the research was conducted in 1992 and academia was anticipating the growth of technology, the research teams proposed a study about preparing for the impact of technology with distance learning and expectations of computer proficiency. Given the growing interest in department chair training, a study for adapting formal graduate leadership programs to meet the demand of chairs for training would be a logical next step. Finally, the growing interest in the service capabilities of community colleges suggests a study to discover the best ways of balancing the transfer and technical demands of community colleges as they become more important in the delivery of postsecondary education (pp. 124-5).

They close by returning to the ideas of the importance of community colleges in higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and of all the changes that are possible in expanding community

colleges. The authors say, “These opportunities make the position of chair an exciting one worthy of the best in leadership development programs” (p. 126).

Miller and Seagren generated three articles from the research dealing with the topics of student services, finance, strategies for coping with job challenges. The first article was “Providing Student Services in the Community College Department: The Chair’s Role” (1995). The authors pinpointed the data from the 1992 survey that revealed the chairs’ perceptions of their responsibility to provide services for students at the department level. The respondents indicated that they *Strongly Agreed* or *Agreed* (90.3%) that support of student services was of great importance. The data indicated that chairs place great emphasis on scheduling classes (88.9%) that meet the needs of the student population. Chairs also saw their service commitment to include responding to student interests. Yet another area of responsibility to students was achieved by the chairs’ efforts to integrate computers into instruction (85.3%). At the other end of the scale was the chairs’ lack of emphasis on advising students regarding transfer, presumably because chairs typically view transfer advisement as a function of counselors and academic advisors.

Miller and Seagren’s article “Community College Finance: Department Chair Perceptions of Selected Financial Issues and Responsibilities” focuses on the department chairs’ perceptions of financial issues confronting community colleges, specifically revenue sources and strategies chairs use to tackle financial challenges. The authors point out, “Chairs have the responsibility of managing the resources, people, and dollars that must be allocated to those programs that are of highest priority of those that meet the community’s needs” (p. 38). The 1992 survey included 15 questions related to community college finance, 11 on the chairs’ financial management roles, tasks, job challenges, and coping strategies and an additional four

questions on primary funding sources for their institutions. The primary funding source for 95.1% of the respondents was public. In responding to questions about their roles, the respondents ranked the roles of planner (97.4%), resource allocator (84%), and evaluator (82.5%) as *Very Important* or *Important* (p. 41). More than 80% of the chairs who responded indicated that preparing a unit budget (88.1), monitoring the budget (88.4%), and allocating resources (85.2%) as *Very Important* to *Important*. Only 40.2% indicated that seeking external funding was crucial. As to the job challenges of financial management, 81.1% rated obtaining financial resources in the top two categories of importance. Reallocating monies in the department was rated 79% (p. 42). The implication of this data is that the role of financial manager indicates a need for “aggressive professional development program on the part of community college professionals” which “must exceed traditional conferences and the accumulation of textbooks and must involve intensive seminars and applied training in financial management” (p. 44). In particular, the specific training should focus on areas such as governmental relations, approaches to budgeting, fund-raising programs, needs assessments, and strategic planning to guarantee the fiscal future of community colleges (p. 44). The authors emphasize that administrators must support the chairs in developing their skills in financial management to ensure the survival and success of the institution.

In “Strategies for Coping with Job Challenges in the Community College Department: A Comparison of Chair Perceptions by Work Experience” (1997), Miller and Seagren extracted data from the *1992 International Community College Chair Survey*. Their study had two purposes: “(a) to identify and prioritize the strategies for coping with chairs’ job challenges and (b) to examine possible differences in the reliance on these strategies on the basis of the chairs’ prior work experience” (p. 494). The results showed that 64% of the respondents had some

experience in business and industry; 42% in K-12 schools; 35% in universities or professional schools; 33% in four-year colleges, 29% in other public agencies; and 17% in vocational or technical institutes. The highest level of agreement among the responding chairs was using curriculum reviews to maintain relevance. They also had high levels of agreement on the strategies for building stronger partnerships with business and industry, balancing personal and professional activities, and networking with other chairs. The chairs with experience in four-year colleges, universities, or professional schools differed significantly with the other four groups, and those with vocational backgrounds differed considerable with the strategies as compared with the other five groups. In summary, they found that a major challenge for the chairs is responding to the programs' constituents, followed by the strategies needed to deal with the stress of the position, and then the importance of administrative skills related to the operations of the department (p. 497). As community colleges are building external relations, they will likely be placing individuals with diverse backgrounds in the chair positions and involving them more in the community, so the training of chairs will need further research and administrative support for training all chairs in coping strategies.

#### *Other Books Written for Department Chairs*

The existing literature is made up of a few frequently cited books designed to support the department chair in his/her development. The texts that will be discussed below were not written to present the data from a particular study, but they do draw on research data, as well as the authors' personal experiences, observations, and common sense.

Allan Tucker's *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers* (1981, 1984, 1992) is a comprehensive text dealing with issues of leading the academic department. He provides a definitive list of the responsibilities and duties of a chairperson as well as a discussion

of the roles a chair serves. In his view, the department chair is an academic leader, chair, and teacher.

These tasks and duties, which reflect the necessary skills to serve as a department chair, are categorized under the topics of department governance, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, budgeting, office management, professional development, and external communication.

Tucker says that one of the skills needed by department chairs is the ability to govern, or manage, a department. Governing a department includes conducting efficient department meetings as well as establishing and facilitating committees to handle delegated responsibilities. Chairs must also develop, communicate, and implement long-range department programs, plans, and goals as well as manage the day-to-day activities and demands of the department. In addition, they must prepare for accreditation and evaluation. Further, chairs must demonstrate the ability to advocate for the department with the administration. Another skill required of chairs is the ability to schedule classes, assign faculty teaching loads and other responsibilities, supervise off-site programs, and update the curriculum, courses, and programs.

As to issues regarding the faculty, Tucker points out that chairs must be able to recruit and select new faculty, evaluate faculty performance, initiate promotion and tenure recommendations, make merit recommendations, and participate in grievance hearings. When necessary, chairs must deal with unsatisfactory performance, even to terminating faculty. The chair must also keep faculty members informed of plans for the department and institution, maintain morale, and reduce, resolve, and prevent conflict. Above all, the chair must have the ability to encourage, support, and recognize faculty participation.

Regarding students, Tucker observes that a department chair is frequently called upon to advise and counsel students. In some institutions and programs, the chairs need skills in

recruitment of students, followed by selection and mentoring. The ability to deal effectively with students' complaints and problems is another needed skill.

Tucker believes that the ability to manage the budget is another crucial skill a department chair must possess. The chair must create and advocate for the budget and then monitor the funds to be sure they are allocated appropriately. In addition to the operating budget, chairs must also frequently set priorities for the use of travel funds, the acquisition of teaching materials, and the addition and updating of technology. Preparing an accurate annual report is an essential skill in the financial area.

Managing the department office is another critical skill that Tucker discusses at length. Managing the department's facilities and equipment typically involves inventory control, security, and maintenance. Beyond the physical property is the human factor of hiring, training, supervising, and evaluating clerical staff assigned to the department. Record keeping is another skill area because the chairs must maintain the essential department records on faculty and students as well as the data required for accreditation.

Another responsibility of chairs is professional development, which has at its core promoting good teaching. Tucker observes that talented chairs will also stimulate faculty research, publication, and participation in professional conferences. With all of this, the chairs must also manage their time so that they participate in professional development and thus maintain their essential connection to their discipline.

Tucker emphasizes that yet another skill that chairs must possess is the ability to communicate, both verbally and in writing. The chairs must communicate the needs of their departments to the dean and other upper-level administrators to establish the department's image and reputation. They must process department correspondence and requests for information,

including completing forms and surveys. Managing the volume of phone calls, e-mails, and unexpected interruptions is yet another communication skill essential to an effective chair. In most institutions, chairs must be able to act as liaison with external agencies, especially working on grants and other outside funding.

The individuals who assume the position of department chair must possess the skills, knowledge, and experience implied in the above listed tasks and responsibilities. Beyond these tangibles, Tucker reminds his readers that department chairs must also be aware of the roles they will be expected to fulfill within and outside of the institution. As they deal with faculty, staff, administrators, and students, they will also have to deal with townspeople, including local businesses and industries as well as civic organizations. Added to this list will be regional and national professional organizations, counselors and students from local high schools and area colleges, and representatives from accrediting organizations. To meet the needs of all these people, department chairs will find themselves fulfilling a wide variety of roles—from teacher, mentor, leader, manager, counselor, mediator, innovator, organizer, problem solver, facilitator to peer-colleague—to name just a few. Many seasoned chairs would add to that list—babysitter, marriage counselor, and Dutch uncle.

After Tucker's death in 1992, the third edition of his text was published. Then in 1999, Hecht, Higgerson, and Gmelch published *The Department Chair as Academic Leader* (1999) with credit to Tucker, as the text takes Tucker's original work and considers new issues and practices that influence the activities of department chairs and higher education. In their introduction, the authors say that the chairs' "responsibilities have multiplied in number and expanded in compass. Chairs are not only leaders within their departments; they are also academic leaders within and, at times, even beyond their institutions" (p. xiv). The environment

in which chairs function now includes adjunct and non-tenurable faculty. They must deal with expanding budget responsibilities, and they must demonstrate skills in planning and fund-raising. The curriculum and teaching methods are also undergoing change, and technology has an undeniable influence in higher education. The newly organized text has four parts. Part I discusses the new environment and chairs' responsibilities. Part II looks at the department chairs' work with people: full-time and part-time faculty, a diverse student population, and the staff. The discussion of the chairs' duty to these constituents focuses not only on evaluating but extends to their professional development. Part III considers the current emphasis on building teams. Part IV delves into the chair's roles and responsibilities in addressing needs beyond the department, in particular the relationship with the dean, legal issues, assessment, and external audiences. Lastly, the authors point out the shift in emphasis resulting from the movement away from faculty as individuals to members of a group. This movement is attributed to the demands for accountability by outside groups and to the change in perspective that sees the actions of individuals in the context of their interaction.

Higgerson also published *Communication Skills for Department Chairs* (1996) to analyze the challenges and concerns that chairs face with communication. She uses case studies and hypothetical cases to help introduce problems and their solutions so that chairs can prepare for real life. The questions and exercises are designed to guide the chairs through the analysis, decision-making, and problem-solving activities. Subjects of the cases she includes are creating the department mission, managing conflict, implementing change, and promoting the department. She also covers such topics as academic dishonesty, affirmative action, collegiality, faculty complaints, and instructional quality.



Another frequently consulted specialist on the subject of department chairs is John B. Bennett. His book *Managing the Academic Department: Cases and Notes* (1983) opens with a detailed description of the department chair and follows with brief cases studies on responsibilities of department chairs. The purpose of discussing these specific faculty and department situations is for the department chair to learn constructive reactions to such scenarios. Bennett also contributed a chapter titled “Department Chairs: Leadership in the Trenches” to Madeleine Green’s *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education* (1988) in which he posits that the success of institutions of higher education depends upon the abilities of the chairs. In the chapter he discusses the ambiguity of the chair role, the problems associated with the position, the rewards of serving as chair, and the opportunities available for chairs to lead.

In 1981, D. R. Booth published *The Department Chair: Professional Development and Role Conflict*. Here he talks about the administrative aspects of chairing and includes chapters on role conflict, ambiguity, and how to learn the job. His conclusions are that role conflict can be diminished by improving institutional management; that education, training, and administrative development is central for chairs; that making the chair’s role meaningful requires considering career orientations and disciplines; and that new resources may be needed to make the role of chair manageable.

G. A. Kimble’s *A Departmental Chairperson’s Survival Manual* (1979), a manual derived from workshops conducted by the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology, is directed to chairpersons in psychology departments, but has content relevant to all disciplines. His fourteen lessons include such sage advice as being “prepared to budget between one-fourth and one-half of your time for the totally unexpected” (p. 4).

In *Leadership Skills for Department Chairs*, Gmelch and Miskin (1993) discuss the three major challenges for department chairs to (1) develop an understanding and clarify the motives and roles of department chairs, (2) understand the strategic planning process for creating a productive department, (3) develop key leadership skills required to be an effective department chair. There is a practical book that covers topics in Tucker's classic text, including checklists of activities and exercises, which allow the chairperson to conduct a self-assessment.

In their book *Enhancing Departmental Leadership: The Roles of the Chairperson* (1990), Bennett and Figuli have grouped articles into five parts: (1) Roles and Responsibilities of Chairs, (2) Faculty and Staff Hiring and Evaluation, (3) Faculty Development, (4) Legal Issues, and (5) Determining Departmental Priorities and Direction. Most of the articles are taken from *The Department Advisor*, a publication specifically for chairs in the form of a national quarterly newsletter which seeks to offer department chairpersons support with the myriad of tasks for which they have responsibility. The articles are written to serve both new chairs and those with considerable experience. In "A Few Suggestions to New Department Chairs," Art Arslanian offers practical suggestions such as learning to say "no" early, respecting confidentiality, working within the traditions and guidelines of one's institution, and recognizing the scholarly work of department members. Robert Wolverton's chapter on "Chairing the Small Department" offers a succinct review of the challenges facing all department chairpersons, especially those in smaller departments. Addressing community college chairs specifically, Myrna Goldenberg's chapter "Common and Uncommon Concerns: The Complex World of the Community College Department Chairs" points out that the administrative appointment and influences of the community help to define the role of the chair. Goldenberg sees the public's involvement as providing the opportunity for a skillful chairperson to design faculty development programs to

build the special relationship with the public. Such faculty involvement might include co-sponsoring a guest lecturer with a community group, serving on museum boards, speaking to local educators and civic organizations, sponsoring internships, or manning a grammar hotline. Kenneth Eble's article "Communicating Effectively" emphasizes the importance of effective communication to everything the chair does. He provides a list of suggestions that expand the definition of communication beyond memos and the delivery of information. The chair "should be a conduit through which a wide range of ideas, opinions, and activities going on elsewhere are brought to the attention of the faculty" (p. 26). Eble further encourages chairpersons to take on the job of public relations to enhance the relationship with the public. Regarding relationships between the dean and chairpersons, Warren contributes "Chairperson and Dean: The Essential Partnership." He asserts that an "in-depth analysis of the chairperson's critical, central position in academic leadership and organization is greatly needed and long overdue" (p. 30). Warren's article offers expectations of the chair that will enable him/her to build the appropriate professional environment. On the topic of stress, May and McBeath offer some help in "I Wanted to Be an Administrator; Now How Do I Cope with the Stress?" They list the ten common sources of stress, point out the effects of stress on performance, and offer concrete suggestions for managing negative stress. Some of the chairs' sources of stress include feeling caught in the middle, personality conflicts, time demands, meetings, unexpected issues, and evaluating faculty and staff. They provide a valuable list of the signs of stress, including physical signs, emotional signs, and behavioral signs, so that the chair can assess his/her stress level and create a plan for coping with the stress. They continue by offering specific steps for dealing with difficult people and practicing relaxation techniques so that the chair is more likely to find the job rewarding or at least less stressful. Robert Boice's chapter "Coping with Difficult

Colleagues” draws on a national, anonymous survey of chairpersons. In this survey he found the four highest stressors involved faculty misbehaviors, giving faculty evaluative feedback, dealing with faculty complaints, and faculty politics. Boice goes on to suggest several coping mechanisms including casual visits to faculty’s offices, helping them find meaningful activities, and offering rewards for “reengagement” (p. 137). Other topics include suggestions on dealing with the complexity of the roles, finding and evaluating the faculty and staff, developing faculty productivity, avoiding legal dilemmas, and ensuring the department’s viability.

Another valuable text to support department chairs is Kenneth Eble’s *The Art of Administration* (1978). Chapters include suggestions and explanations for managing one’s time and tasks, including a list of specific do’s and don’ts; mastering simple skills such as budgeting, conducting meetings, listening, questioning, and scheduling; planning, both short-term and long-term; and maintaining one’s sanity by balancing one’s professional tasks.

Books by Ann Lucas include *Strengthening Departmental Leadership: A Team-Building Guide for Chairs in Colleges and Universities* (1994). The book is intended to support chairs in building teams and handling problems that occur with some frequency in higher education departments. Considerable attention is devoted to the challenges of the office, leadership, visioning, dealing with faculty, supporting teaching, managing conflict, and reducing stress. Her contention is that academic chairs can develop the skills needed to become leaders and thereby have a positive impact on their departments.

Another of Lucas’ contributions to the literature is a chapter titled “The Department Chair as Change Agent” in *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching: Moving from Talk to Action in Higher Education* (1990). She argues that academic chairs are the primary figures for improving the quality of education. In her workshops in higher education leadership, she

surveyed more than 1,000 department chairs on their successes dealing with faculty development problems. In order to improve teaching, Lucas suggests the following: making teaching effectiveness a high-priority goal, creating a climate of trust and support, rewarding good teaching, discussing teaching at department meetings, providing feedback, developing a mentoring system, and sending interested faculty to workshops and inviting them to share their ideas upon their return (pp. 68-71). She goes on to provide a list of topics for exploration in department meetings. Her suggestion for motivating alienated tenured faculty focuses on valuing their contributions and cultivating a climate for rejuvenating their dreams. For the leadership development of the effective chair, she proposes administrative recognition of the chairs' responsibilities, support from deans and vice-presidents on establishing the chairs' authority, continuing professional development to deal with the role conflict and overwhelming tasks, and the setting of priorities for one's time and energy. Lucas asserts that chairs can create an environment that values teaching and inspires faculty to become more effective teachers.

Lucas takes the opportunity to extend the emphasis on the importance of teaching by editing and contributing to the book *The Department Chairperson's Roles in Enhancing College Teaching* (1989). Her opening chapter "Motivating Faculty to Improve the Quality of Teaching" echoes the concepts presented in "The Department Chair as Change Agent." Other contributors provide chapters on helping faculty develop students' critical thinking skills, increasing student participation, and helping faculty to help students learn. In particular, Peter Seldin's chapter "Using Student Feedback to Improve Teaching" provides guidelines for using students ratings that can be of great help to chairs when they review students' evaluations with faculty. Kerry Trask's "The Chairperson and Teaching" contends that "the quality of teaching could be substantially improved simply through the sharing of ideas and experiences, especially among

people working in the same field, but such a beneficial joining of forces is not like to occur spontaneously. Here, the role of the department chairperson is crucial” (p. 101). If the chairperson leads by personal example and maintains a common purpose regarding the department’s teaching mission, his/her colleagues will be encouraged by the commitment of the chair to supporting their efforts to enhance their teaching.

In *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education* (1988), Madeleine F. Green has edited a book in which she addresses the absence of leadership development in America’s colleges and universities. She and her colleagues propose approaches to new forms of leadership and new definitions of leaders that include the development of academic chairs. The articles included deal with the necessities of chair and faculty leadership and the development of women and minority leaders. In addition to discussing the new models, the authors also propose strategies and suggest resources for such development plans. Green closes by admonishing the administrative leaders to provide leadership training so that higher education can find “new ways of doing business and new models of leadership” (p. 254).

In 1992 Hickson and Stacks published *Effective Communication for Academic Chairs*, and while the text was written for chairs of communication departments, it is useful for a new chair in any discipline who is concerned about effective communication. They compile the essays of several authors on responsibilities of a chairperson such as leading the department, faculty assessment, budgeting, and motivating faculty. The reader learns about chair roles, the different types of information needed and used by chairs, the steps to resolving grievances, and 23 approaches a chair might use to reward the staff, as well as a checklist for appraisal of a staff member.

Kent Weeks presents 14 topics that can lead to legal action in *Managing Departments: Chairpersons and the Law* (1996). Topics include academic freedom, interviewing, reference checks, hiring, and confidentiality of student records. For each topic, he provides sample cases to explain the legal implications. The section in each chapter of greatest value to chairs is the explanation of preventive measures chairs can take to avoid litigation.

The literature is further made up of numerous articles that address the situation of department chairs. The articles generally commiserate and offer suggestions on how to deal with issues such as stress, time management, personnel, students, administrators, etc. The articles consistently bemoan the lack of support and training and offer many suggestions to help department chairs cope. A few are based on empirical data, while many are based on personal experience and observation. Given the preponderance of such articles, one can deduce that common problems can be identified from the pattern that emerges. Following is a review of articles on a wide range of specific subjects that are of interest to department chairs ranging from the inception of the chair position to surviving an appointment in higher education today and in the future.

### *The Chairperson*

In his 1976 article “The Academic Department Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities,” James H. L. Roach provides an overview of the duties and obligations of chairing to help chairpersons recognize their roles and be motivated to achieve their schools’ and departments’ goals. In the article he acknowledges the lack of training provided to chairs and offers insights to the issues and challenges so that chair can be prepared for what he/she will encounter. He speaks about planning, not only the time for the tasks but also the future of the department. Among the skills he promotes are leadership skills, communicating, negotiating,

representing, problem solving, organizing, and administering. While the article is direct, it does provide the reader with a clearer sense of the position and what elements the chair must manage to meet the challenge

### *Historical Perspectives on Department Chairs*

In 1978, Thomas D. Clark wrote “The Academic Hierarchy and the Department Head” and provided a history of higher education and of the department head. He remarks on the difficulty of pinpointing the creation of the department chair position or even finding consistency in the functions of the chair from one institution to another. He describes the position as “a home-grown one, designed to fill an administrative hiatus between instructional staffs and deans in the actual exercise of academic power” (p. 41). In closing, he points out that whatever the history and the destiny of the chair position, academicians should be grateful “for the fact that many a forceful and productive head helped to create a much stronger and more imaginative system of American higher education” (p. 57).

Vacik and Miller (1998) note that the recent attention to delineating the tasks and responsibilities of department chairs has overlooked the historical foundation that helps one understand the department chair position. To fill this void, they designed their study using Delphi questionnaires to identify important events and factors that have influenced the development of the department chair position from 1870 to 1925. They solicited the opinions of 15 scholars, and 13 responded. Findings of the survey were that the scholars agreed on the impact of federal legislation as it applied to vocational education. Their conclusion was that the chair role became more formalized due to the identification and definition of tasks and responsibilities. Their second observation was that fund raising and private endowments have begun to require more attention from chairs. Out of the total of 29 factors, they identified five themes as influences on



the chair position, including (1) management and personnel, (2) curricular issues, (3) federal involvement, (4) technological advances, and (5) revenue and funding (pp. 1-19). Vacik and Miller point out that “the role of the department chair or academic unit head has come under both greater professional and scholarly attention, due in part to growing demands for greater accountability throughout all sectors of higher education” (p. 1). Their contention is that studying the current demands on department chairs requires knowledge of the history of the position to support future research.

### *Gender Study*

As study of 370 administrators in four-year schools in the mid-south identified factors that enhance administrative placement with regard to gender. In a paper titled “Gender Profiles and Career Aspirations of Administrators in Higher Education” (10 Nov 1994), Hubbard and Robinson found that both the male and female respondents reported networking through professional organizations and personal contacts to be the most helpful to their career advancement. They also found that both men and women had male mentors during their master’s and doctoral programs. The authors’ observation from their data was that men are hired for their potential to learn new skills while women are hired only if they can demonstrate accomplishment in skills. In addition, sex role stereotyping sees women as caretakers of students and curricula and not capable of making the tough decisions. Of concern to the researchers regarding the future of women in higher education administration was that in 1990-91 only 14,500 women were earning doctorates, while 24,200 men were entering the field.

### *Evaluation*

Rahkonen, McFerron, Bowker, Lynch, and Krusec (1993) extracted data from a survey of nine disciplines to analyze the communication and attitudes of college deans, chairpersons, and

faculty in college music departments towards teaching, research, publication, community service, and institutional support. Their findings were that the department chairs assigned more value to research, publication and community service when recommending tenure, much more than the deans and faculty. Chairs did agree with the other participants that teaching is the most crucial consideration for tenure.

Another article regarding evaluation of faculty was developed by a team headed by Garland Hunnicutt in 1991 titled “An Exploratory Examination of Faculty Evaluation and Merit Compensation Systems in Texas Colleges and Universities.” The study identified the various methods used to evaluate faculty by chairs of management and/or marketing departments in Texas schools or colleges of business administration. Their focus was primarily on the potential problems and benefits of using merit and performance based compensation systems in the evaluations.

Marchant and Newman’s 1991 presentation on “Faculty Evaluation and Reward Procedures: Views from Education Administrators” discussed the survey of heads of education divisions of 245 colleges and universities about their opinions on faculty evaluation and reward procedures. The department chairs who participated felt that internal satisfaction was more a motivating factor than did the deans who feel that merit pay, contract renewal, promotion and tenure were greater motivators.

“Performance Appraisal of Community College Department/Division Chairperson” by James Hammons and Wanda Thomas (1980) is an article on a study conducted in 1978 to discover the performance appraisal systems used to evaluate chairs. The research team contacted 573 public community colleges and asked if they evaluated performance and wished to participate in the study. Of the 472 that responded, 313 conducted evaluations, and 250 were

willing to participate. From those remaining institutions, 921 chairpersons received a questionnaire, and 455 met the established criteria and completed the questionnaire. The instrument had three sections: (1) a description of the present appraisal system, (2) the respondents' opinions about the system, and (3) their thoughts on the components of an ideal evaluation system. All sections of the questionnaire focused on four major areas: (1) purposes (2) procedures, (3) criteria, and (4) standards. Results were summarized on seven research questions and confirmed the authors' suspicions that much needs to be done in developing an appropriate evaluation system (p. 42). Findings were that 66% of the colleges are appraising administrative performance of chairs. Of those institutions, over 77% conduct evaluations for either developmental purposes (39%) or for both developmental and judgmental purposes (49%) (p. 43). Of the 27 questions relating to the procedures of the evaluation system, the greatest areas of concurrence were as follows:

- (1) Chairpersons feel their supervisor allows them to express their opinions during the appraisal interview (93%)
- (2) Chairs are re-evaluated each evaluation period (93%)
- (3) Chairs are permitted to have or see a copy of their evaluation report (92%)
- (4) The evaluation report becomes part of their permanent record (90%)
- (5) Chairpersons have supervisors who meet and openly discuss the degree to which their performance is satisfactory and explain what is expected in the future (85%). (pp. 43-44)

As to the Criteria for evaluation, job performance figured 95% of the time, managerial skills 92%, personal traits (78%), and achievement of objectives (66%). Regarding the standards, two-thirds of the chairpersons felt the system was both objective and subjective.

Regarding the four aspects of the appraisal system, the chairpersons wanted the purpose of their evaluation to be revised to include both developmental and judgmental purposes. Approximately 44% felt the procedures needed some revision, and 39% felt the criteria were too subjective and in need of revision. On the category of standards, about 60% felt the standards were too subjective and needed to be revised or changed. Over 80% felt that all four criteria should be used to evaluate their performance with job performance first (99.1%), then managerial skills (96.9%), achievement of objectives (85.8%), and personal traits (80.7%). They further indicated that the standards should be the same for all chairpersons (60%). Discipline affiliation revealed few differences regarding the components of the evaluation system. Sixty-eight percent responded that appraisals had encouraged them to improve performance.

The recommendations of the researchers were that colleges and supervisors should conduct performance appraisals and that the appraisal system should call on ideas from faculty, chairs, and administrators. Once an appropriate system is agreed upon, the instruments should be reviewed periodically to keep the focus on the desired results (p. 48).

Yet another article on rating administrative activities was written by Hoyt and Spangler (1979) titled "The Measurement of Administrative Effectiveness of the Academic Department Head" in which they contended that, given the importance of the department chair function, the campus leadership (1) "could select department heads who clearly possess the characteristics of the effective department head; or (2) "could provide developmental experiences designed to overcome the shortcomings (and strengthen the virtues) of department heads who are already on the job" (p. 292). They asked 103 academic department heads in four universities to rate a set of 15 administrative activities as to their importance. Faculty members in these departments also

rated the importance that should be given by the department head and the effectiveness with which the head performed each set in the past year. An analysis of faculty ratings of performance indicated that the head has three major responsibilities: personnel management, departmental planning and development and building the department's reputation.

Coats, Lovell, and Franks (1996) conducted a study in 15 community colleges in Mississippi to discover any the relationship between the interpersonal behavior of department chairs and the assessment of their leadership effectiveness by department faculty. Their study included 30 chairs in humanities and social sciences as well as 171 faculty members. The chairs took Element B from W. C. Shutz's Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) to assess their interpersonal need orientation. The faculty took the Department Evaluation of Chairperson Activities for Development (DECAD) to determine their perceptions of chair effectiveness. An analysis of the data showed that 64.2% of the chairs were ranked as effective. The researchers detected no significant differences between effective and ineffective deans regarding expressed inclusion, expressed control, received control, expressed openness, and received openness. However, there were marked differences for perceived inclusion and wanted inclusion, with effective deans demonstrating a need to establish and maintain interaction with others.

Hirokawa, Barge, Becker, and Sutherland published "The Department Chair as Responsible Academic Leader: A Competency-Based Perspective" in 1989, and in this article they identified the competencies that faculty members believe their department chairs need to possess in order to function effectively as academic leaders. The researchers identified 19 competencies associated with departmental leadership. Once the list was developed, a rating instrument was designed to achieve the following:

(a) assess the extent to which faculty members perceived those skills to be important for effective departmental leadership, (b) determine whether those perceptions were stable across departments, and (c) assess the degree of relationship between perceptions of department chairs' competencies and overall leadership effectiveness. (p. 12)

The faculty members were to respond to the 19 competencies in two ways: "to indicate the importance of each skill for effective department leadership" and "to indicate the degree to which they perceived their department chair manifested those skills during the preceding twelve months" (p. 12-13). The instrument also "asked faculty members to evaluate the overall leadership performance of their DEOs" (p. 13). The instrument was sent to approximately 700 members of the faculty in the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Iowa. A total of 358 forms were returned representing each of the 38 departments.

Results were that all 19 competencies were deemed important with "effectively communicates the department's need to the college and university administration" as the most important. "Works effectively to keep the best possible faculty" and "recognizes and rewards faculty in accordance with the quality of their contribution to the department's goals" as the next most important (p. 13). Faculty members agreed more on the items they ranked most important than on the items they ranked least important. The researchers conclude that these competencies appear to be quite stable across different types of academic departments, and appear to be fairly good predictors of perceived leadership effectiveness.

#### *Professional Development*

In her research on "The Role and Function of the Department Chairperson at Delaware Technical and Community College" (1989), Cornelia Winner summarized the top ten

professional development needs identified by chairs as a guide to the professional development needs at that institution. The ten included the following by rank:

- (1) Supervise and evaluate the performance of the departmental staff
- (2) Participate in professional development activities to improve skills as departmental chairperson
- (3) Assess and provide feedback to staff about their performance on a regular basis
- (4) Analyze current salary and benefits package expenditures
- (5) Monitor and/or supervise a system for all departmental expenditures (e.g., daily, monthly, yearly)
- (6) Supervise and coordinate the planning, implementation, and evaluation of instructional materials, texts, and methodologies
- (7) Motivate faculty and staff
- (8) Prepare and explain departmental budget requests
- (9) Plan upcoming fiscal year salary and benefits package expenditures
- (10) Handle student problems and complaints. (p. 77)

The implications of her findings were that the institution needs to provide a job description and to involve deans and chairs in expanding and refining the list of roles and functions to create a job description and plan for leadership development.

#### *Role Conflict*

The subject of role conflict was the subject of a study by Larry Hubbell and Fred Homer. In 1997 they interviewed 23 current and former department chairs and sought answers to questions about how chairs cope with the numerous, often contradictory roles they assume and how they allocate resources and keep the peace. Through their interviews, they found the

preferred style was that of appeasement. Through this approach chairs say they can maintain harmony by satisfying department members' needs. While they admit this approach is often unappealing since they resort to secrecy and manipulation, it was the typical method.

#### *By Discipline*

Research conducted by Robbins, Schmidt, Ehinger, and Welliver in 1994 and presented in "Who Is Leading Us Toward Quality Professional Development?" looked into changes in leadership in schools/colleges/departments of education. They surveyed 255 individuals who left their position as head between 1983 and 1992, usually after a term of 4.5 years. The intent was to discover how long it takes to develop, implement, and institutionalize a major professional development change. The participants estimated a time frame of 3.8 years, and 84 percent the time was sufficient for one or more major programmatic changes. After stepping down as head, the majority accepted lower-level administrative positions or teaching/research positions in the same school. Not surprisingly, their most common reason for leaving was "frustrations/burnout." Noting this trend to shorter terms in a leadership role prompted the researchers to doubt the ability to accomplish meaningful change.

Shreeve, Brucker, and Martin reported in 1987 on their national survey of English department chairs in universities with enrollments between 5,000 and 12,000. Their findings included that the chairs served departments of 8-61 faculty. Seventy-one percent were professors, while 23 percent were associate professors. Their terms generally ran for three years with unlimited reelection. The average salary was \$42,985, ranging from \$21,200 to \$56,000) with 56% of the chairs receiving additional salary based on faculty size, and half received supplements for chair duties but usually less than \$4,000. Reductions in load varied from 25% to 100%. Responsibilities receiving high priority by department chairs are personnel work, advising



the dean and handling student problems; low priorities included recruiting students, teaching students and serving as a grants person (p. 11).

In the state of Florida, chairs and faculty of math departments in 28 community colleges participated in a survey to gather data for a summative review of issues affecting program leaders and planners. The survey covered 55 campus sites and brought 42 responses. Then in-depth interviews were conducted with chairs and faculty at four colleges that represented campuses in rural and urban settings. The findings were that the math departments performed well in providing labs, self-paced courses, video reinforcement and special courses on college survival. Concerns revealed in the study focused on student unpreparedness, the learning disabled, ESL students, the effect of budget cuts, and the growing number of adjunct faculty.

Bettina Huber published two articles on foreign language department chairs. The first “Compensation and Support for Foreign Language Department Chairs: A Survey of 1989 ADFL Seminar Participants” concludes the findings of a survey of 53 chair/members of ADFL. This article concedes that “the typical chair of a foreign language program . . . receives several types of administrative support to compensate for the extra work entailed in running a department” (p. 16). The chairs’ compensations include a reduced teaching load, special office and telephone facilities, as well as clerical support. Their monetary compensation varies from monetary stipends to extended contracts. She argues, however, that the “administrative task facing foreign language chairs is considerably more complex than it is in other disciplines” and that it “seems only logical that chairs of foreign language programs should receive greater support and compensation than do chairs of other humanities or science departments” (p. 16). The second article is “The Responsibilities of and Compensations for Being a Department Chair: Findings from the MLA’s 1989-90 Survey of Foreign Language Programs” (1994). This survey reports on

the information gathered from 598 two-year and four-year colleges. The dominant factors influencing the respondents' conditions were the presence of a union, the different levels of instruction, the student enrollment, the number of languages offered, and the faculty size.

Chow, Eastman, Leebron, Everett, and Dates (1996) conducted a study in media communication departments to discover trends in hiring practices by surveying 226 department chairs on their experiences in affirmative action when hiring fulltime, tenure-track faculty. The survey included questions on ethnic minorities and women, what policies guided affirmative action in hiring, whether actual minorities and women hires accurately represent efforts to hire, and what can be done to enhance diversity in hiring. The data showed that the field included more women candidates and that the small schools are attracting minorities and women just like larger ones. They further concluded that the reason schools have been able to hire minorities and women is the perceived need for them and the absence of racist and sexist attitudes in the faculty. Findings also noted that all schools receive applications from women and minorities and that they get roughly the same percentage of acceptance of their offers to ethnic minorities and women.

Results of a study on marketing department chairs were discussed in "Administrative Challenges and Response Strategies to the Job Performance of Marketing Department Chairs." Dyer and Miller (2000) used an adaptation of the survey instrument developed by the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the Maricopa Community College, National Community College Chair Academy, sending it to 50 marketing department chairs or division chairs from graduate institutions and 50 from undergraduate schools. An analysis of the results revealed the chairs perceived the greatest challenges to revolve "around curricular issues, maintaining high quality faculty and programs,

technological issues, and obtaining financial resources” (p. 8). Strategies on which the chairs concurred included “curricular relevance with the workplace and the possible expansion of this in the form of grant writing and soft dollar management” (p. 8). In summation, Dyer and Miller noted that their study attempted to the challenges the chairs face as well as the ways they react to these challenges, specifically “faculty, curriculum, money, and generally quality issues” with responses ranging from “developing partnerships, curriculum reviews, and seeking external dollars” (p. 9). Not surprisingly, these findings are consistent with the overall state of higher education.

### *Demographics*

Smith and Stewart 1998 prepared a study to develop a profile of department and division chairs appointed in the 1995-96 school year in Texas community colleges. Their goal was to identify chairs’ perceptions of the transition process into their new roles and to find ways to ease that transition. They surveyed 193 new chairs and found that 71.2% were white, 10.2% were black and that 44% of them were between 50-59 years of age. Females comprised 39% of the chairs, which is consistent with the general makeup of the faculty. Twenty percent held doctorates, and 84.7% were tenured. Twelve percent last only one year, and another 29% left after two years. Only 6 of the 59 respondents reported that formal training was required before they assumed their positions. As to recommending others to take a chair position, 62.7% said they would not recommend the job to their colleagues. The researchers conclude: “Developing a deeper understanding about the process of role transitioning of new department chairs could assist in evaluating the efficacy of current methods and practices as they relate to the transition and set the stage for newly appointed academic administrators performing an important job well” (p. 7).

In a 1999 article “A Statewide Survey of New Department Chairs: Their Experiences and Needs in Learning Their Roles,” Smith and Stewart noted that 54% of the respondents wrote comments attached to the survey and 88% asked for a copy of the results, leading the authors to deduce that the chairs care deeply about initial and ongoing training for their role. In their comments, the chairs identified informal training opportunities where they were able to ask questions, but they reiterated that the institutions need to offer specific training opportunities to include coping with the excessive paperwork, the demands on their time, and management of the frequent interruptions. While the chairs found the evaluation system to be beneficial, overall they found the rewards to be few and not sufficient to remain in the chair position.

Another study that views the department chair in a particular context is discussed in Palmer’s and Miller’s “Academic Leaders in Alabama Community Colleges: Roles and Tasks of Department Chairs” (2001). Citing Katsinas’ 1995 article “George C. Wallace and the Founding of Alabama’s Public Two-year Colleges,” the authors remark on the impact the former governor had on the state’s community college system when he sought to establish political control by appointing his allies to staff the institutions. Even three decades later, the community college system in Alabama is beset by problems of mission, finance, enrollment, and staffing, resulting from the complications of political influence (pp. 2-3). Thus, the authors designed an abbreviated study to compare findings of the 1994 National Community College Chair Academy to discover differences or similarities between the national respondents and 114 department chairs in Alabama’s two-year colleges, focusing on questions regarding demographics along with roles and tasks. The demographic information found that 60% of the chairs were male, 80% were over 45 years of age, and close to 50% had 20 years experience as a faculty member. As to prior work experience, 50% came from the ranks of K-12 administrators, 59% from business and industry,

and 41% from universities or professional schools. “The roles and tasks identified in the survey were clustered into three thematic categories, including student centered issues, faculty management issues, and administrative functions” (pp. 4-5). The comparison with the international data found striking similarities in the ratings of different roles and tasks, including planning, work environment, and information dissemination. The ultimate finding of the authors is that department chairs in Alabama’s two-year colleges face many of the same challenges faced by their colleagues in other areas of the country and the world. With this reality in mind, the chairs in Alabama should not distract themselves with their history but communicate with their peers to seek solutions to common problems (pp. 5-6).

In “A Typology of Career Movements of Department Chairs: Identifying Academic Leadership” (1991), Carroll says that the position of department chair frequently serves as the transitional phase between being a faculty member and moving into administration. He remarks that his study was to gather empirical data, but that he was also motivated to create awareness of the department chair’s dilemma.

### *Workloads*

Richard Serpe compiled information of faculty workloads, permanent and temporary, and on department chair activities in his comparative study of the California State University system of 20 campuses to similar institutions in the United States. The issues he investigated included faculty hours worked, time on research and other activities as well as teaching loads and the gender and ethnic differences in their workloads. Investigations of department chairs included hours worked, their research and creative activities, their teaching loads and their evaluations of faculty satisfaction. An analysis of the data found that regardless of rank, all respondents expressed dissatisfaction regarding institutional support for their workload.

### *Communication Skills*

Hickson and Stacks published *Effective Communication for Academic Chairs* in 1992.

This book has 11 papers that examine communication aspects of the department chair position in academia. Chapters deal with leading the department, establishing relationships with faculty, communicating with other administrators, managing grievances, budgeting, assessing faculty and the department, motivating faculty, and public relations with external entities. Instead of focusing on the tasks of being a department chair, the papers emphasize that the role of chairs is for the most part interactive and should draw people together to work effectively, and the development of communication skills is essential for the chair to meet the expectations of others.

Hickson also collaborated with James C. McCroskey in 1991 on “Diagnosing Communication Problems of Academic Chairs: Applied Communication in Context.” The article is based on a survey of workshop participants who were asked to respond to 29 statements about chairs in general questions that reflected a possible concern for chairs. They gathered responses from 47 individuals who received a questionnaire prior to attending the workshop. Results of the survey found that “most chairs feel they are overburdened with memos and/or meetings” and that they “do not know what to do with ‘deadwood’ faculty” (p. 11). Rounding out the top five problems in descending severity were “most chairs do not like being an arbiter between faculty members; most chairs do not like being an arbiter between faculty and staff; and it is hard for most chairs to tell a faculty member, ‘No’ (p. 11). Their overall communication concerns are conflict management, persuading/motivating other, public relation, and information management. Basically, the concerns that chairs have are either directly or indirectly related to communication skills.

### *Legal Issues*

Ken Weeks' *Managing Departments: Chairpersons and the Law* is a loose-leaf notebook, which covers 14 topics chairs handle that could generate legal action. The topics range from academic freedom, interviewing, and reference checks to the college catalog and disclosure of student records. Each chapter gives a brief overview of the topic and describes cases to demonstrate the legal applications. Most important to chairs is the section on each topic for reasonable preventive measures. This handbook has the advantage of being comprehensive, succinct, and easy to use.

In a presentation titled "Enlightening Chairs and Deans about Liability: How to Avoid Employment Litigation" (1996), Cindy Haston discussed the personal liability of deans and department chairs in matters of hiring and firing as well as sexual harassment. She encourages developing protocols for dealing with such matters. To avoid litigation over hiring, the chair should identify job-related criteria used to evaluate the applicants and to make an offer in writing that clearly states the contractual agreement. In the case of firing an employee, the employee should be given sufficient notice of poor performance and proper documentation must be maintained. With sexual harassment complaints, both the complaint and facts discovered in the inquiry should be documented and taken seriously. The employee or students must be informed of the sexual harassment policy and assured of an investigation. The chair's further responsibility is to inform human resources and enforce corrective action if the allegation is found to be sound. Developing and following guidelines will enable the chair to take appropriate action and avoid legal action.

### *Enrollment Management*

Gordon Benson's presentation "The Chair's Role in College Enrollment Management: Matriculation of Students" (1993) stresses the importance of creating an approach to enrollment management that involves the faculty in recruiting, orienting, and supporting students. His presentation includes a thorough discussion of the enrollment management system used at Mesa Community College in Arizona. He covers marketing strategies, the role of academic advisors, counseling, and the duties of personnel in the offices of registrar, career planning, financial aid, and veterans affairs.

### *Hiring*

Articles on hiring include coaching on the hiring process and on matters of diversity in hiring. Gordon Watts' "Effective Strategies in Selecting Quality Faculty" (1993) focuses on the steps of hiring new faculty members that will ensure hiring outstanding professors. He divides the steps into pre-search, search, and post-search activities. Pre-search activities include selecting a search committee and advertising the position. The search phase moves from screening the applicants to conducting reference checks, conducting a screening interview, and making the selection decision. The post-search activities include offering the position and smoothing the transition for the new hire. Finding the best match between the individual and the institution can be achieved in the selection interview by asking each interviewee the same questions to form a basis for comparison. Questions should ask the candidates to describe their behaviors in previous situations that apply to anticipated situations in the new position. A sample teaching presentation and an assessment of a student's performance will help the committee discover if the candidate uses methods and standards that are consistent with the institutions' culture and values. Klein's article "Hiring Faculty: Broadening the Racial and Cultural Base" (1991) discusses the



University of Mississippi's efforts to achieve faculty diversity. As the chair of the modern language department, he suggests guidelines for hiring minority faculty. To achieve diversity in the department, he says the chair should present the department in a realistic way, should target all minorities, and should build relationships with his/her counterparts in other institutions and secondary schools.

### *Conflict Management*

In their presentation titled "How to Resolve Conflicts Effectively" (1996), Carmichael and Malague posit that conflict resolution calls for an analysis of four factors: the issue, the organizational setting, role relationships, and the personal styles of the parties in conflict. The chair must always keep ethics and productivity in the forefront to resolve the conflict and achieve a shared view. Understanding the elements of conflict and constructing a clear strategy will help chairs when called upon to mediate.

Conflict management is the subject of 14 chapters in *Mending the Cracks in the Ivory Tower: Strategies for Conflict Management in Higher Education*. Susan Holton, the editor, offers two chapters defining the concept and offering a management program. Other chapters by Gmelch, Higerson, and Lucas echo their other writings on challenges faced by chairs. In addition to their discussions on managing up and down, other contributors discuss administration/faculty conflict, student problems, and dean/chair relationships.

### *Change*

"The Role of the Community College Chair in Organizational Change: Chaos, Leadership and the Challenge of Complexity" is the title of a paper presented by Gail Mellow in 1996, a presentation that addresses the challenge for higher education institutions that find themselves needing to move from an industrial age to an information age. She sees that academic

leaders must deal with changes in learning as well as the organization by ensuring that information is available quickly. The chairs must also involve the faculty in the change process and encourage communication using the new technology that is available and ever expanding.

When a school experiences a change in leadership, the transition period can be especially challenging, so Brennan and his associates offer suggestions based on their experiences when Floyd College in Georgia experienced such a challenge in “When a Whole College Changes: Overcoming Inertia, Motivating Veteran Faculty and Staff” (1996). They offer specific advice to chairs to ease the changes and adjustments. They suggest chairs accept the fact that people resist change and to consider why they resist. After that they encourage chairs to choose their battles carefully, involve the faculty in decision-making, admit mistakes, keep their sense of humor, praise others, and maintain contact with fellow chairs.

In a similar article titled “So They Are Resistant to Change? Strategies for Moving an Immovable Object” (1996), Kesler, Perry, and Shay acknowledge the resistance to change displayed by educators. The three barriers that they identify are a lack of strategic vision and mission, low commitment, and an organizational culture that is dominated by bureaucracy. They point out that the manifestations of resistance include lower productivity, absenteeism, and resignation. Such behaviors are caused by fear of failure or fear of the unknown, by misunderstanding, and by poor timing or approaches to the change. It then becomes the responsibility of chairs to help the faculty get through a process by thinking in new ways. If chairs are aware of the particular styles of the individuals in the department, they can reduce resistance to change by providing training, involving faculty in decision making, and implementing a trial period.

### *Budget*

Regarding resources, Lesley Brill offers specific suggestions for chairs in an article titled “*Quid Pro Quo Vadis: Gathering Resources for Your Department*” (1992). The author suggests that chairs consider how to secure resources from their home institutions, specifically from deans, vice presidents, and provosts. To justify the request for funds, chairs should create an inventory of the department’s strengths and weaknesses and present a detailed plan for expenditures rather than just asking for more money.

William Sheldon, in “Who’s in the Driver’s Seat, the Budget or the Strategic Plan: Which Comes First?” (1994), speaks to the loss of public resources for community colleges that necessitate careful budgeting. He encourages a budgetary system that spells out options, projects consequences, sets priorities, and makes requests that provide recognizable results. Typically, chairs are encouraged, or allowed, to merely resubmit the previous year’s budget without considering a strategic plan. He proposes a structured process that includes clarifying the department’s mission and values, analyzing the department’s strengths and weaknesses, developing goals for these areas, developing a plan to reach those goals, implementing the plan, and evaluating the results. If the priorities are set and the action plan is designed, requesting the appropriate funds will naturally follow. A carefully thought out plan will be more likely to gain approval by administration.

### *Deans*

“Dealing with the Dean” is the subject of Michael Pincus’ article published in 1994. In it he includes 10 rules for chairs, including knowing the dean, embracing the college’s mission, speaking the dean’s language, keeping track of numbers, meeting deadlines, providing accurate information on the department’s good work, and avoiding any surprises in the budget. Chairs that

neglect to respect the influence of the dean over their department are sure to suffer loss of trust and support from the dean.

### *Faculty Development*

Maxine Mott's presentation "The Hunt for Hidden Resources: A Chair's Guide to Finding Campus Support for Faculty and Staff Development" (1994) encourages chairs to secure funds for faculty development activities to maintain morale and motivation in this era of financial constraints and budget reductions. Before requesting funds, Mott suggests setting goals for the department with input from the faculty and staff and then continuing with individual goals that support the department's overall priorities. After developing an action plan, the group can participate in identifying how and where money might be found. To actually start the search for resources, chairs should investigate hidden talents with staff and students. Then the chair should consider other departments such as a teaching resource center and professional development committees and coordinators for their ideas. Last the chair should look into the community for inexpensive but valuable resources. The process can be long and filled with setbacks, so the chair should encourage department members by demonstrating support and keeping the focus on the purpose of the professional development plan.

### *Promoting Effective Teaching*

In his 1988 position paper "The Role of the Chair in Fostering Teaching and Learning," Larry Litecky says that community college department chairs are in the best position to identify good teaching and to create a climate for good teaching. Chairs can encourage student-faculty contact, prompt feedback for work, high standards for student performance, and diverse methods for learning and teaching. The emphasis on teaching and learning can be extended beyond the

department to the entire campus by sponsoring professional development activities on topics such as writing across the curriculum critical thinking, or collaborative learning.

In “Linking the Faculty Recognition Process to Teaching Excellence” (1994), Shirk and Miller suggest using the evaluative conference to encourage excellence. Other tools that can support achieving excellence are student evaluations, self-evaluations, and peer evaluations. The chair can further promote faculty effectiveness by addressing the importance of teaching in a faculty recognition document, assigning emphasis of faculty recognition to teaching, encouraging collegiality, developing faculty enrichment programs, organizing a faculty mentoring program, and organizing informal faculty discussions about their successful teaching practices. The increasing emphasis on excellence in teaching makes it essential for chairs to reconsider the best ways to demonstrate efforts to improve learning in the academy.

“Promoting Excellent Teaching: The Chair as Academic Leader” by Bill Lamb (1993) addresses community college department chairs who are charged with promoting teaching excellence. To achieve this goal, chairs must communicate honestly and positively, provide immediate feedback on job performance, and cultivate an environment in which individuals can acknowledge and learn from their mistakes. Chairs must make teaching meaningful, refrain from micromanaging, assist in faculty’s setting realistic goals, praise generously, communicate respect for the faculty, build pride in achievement, draw on the strengths of individuals, encourage self-improvement, promote independence and responsibility, recognize effort, provide immediate feedback, solicit faculty suggestions to improve situations, keep communication channels open, promote quality, try a variety of approaches, and serve as a role model for faculty.

The subject of teaching portfolios is the subject of John P. Murray in “The Teaching Portfolio: The Department Chairperson’s Role in Creating a Climate of Teaching Excellence”

(1994). The portfolio allows professors the opportunity to display their teaching abilities and achievements as well as the chance to reflect on their teaching. The chair must create a climate in which the individual faculty members see that compiling a portfolio will not jeopardize their jobs and that it will prove beneficial. To create this climate, chairs must give up some control of the evaluation process so that faculty can create their own portfolios. They must guide the department to articulate a definition of good teaching, and they must reassure faculty that the portfolio won't be misused and that they will have time to develop the materials. Chairs must also assist faculty with teaching strategies, learning theory, and development of the portfolio. Included in the portfolio must be a statement of the professor's philosophy of education, as well as a statement of goals for the course, a demonstrated connection between teaching and learning, consideration of how teaching effectiveness may be evaluated, and documentation of the professor's effectiveness, perhaps even with a personal journal. In an ideal situation, the portfolio may be used for professional development, including contract renewal, tenure, merit pay, and promotion.

### *Surviving as Chair*

In 1994, Jane Harper wrote "Survival Tips for New Department Chairs." Writing from a quarter century of experience as a department chair and trainer of department chairs, the author offers advice for new chairs. The advice includes strategies for how to work with the dean, how to gain support from people outside the department, and how to belong to a network of administrators. Many of the tips intended for new chairs apply to veteran department chairs who wish to solidify their working relationships with the dean and colleagues. Among those suggestions are cultivating an open environment, valuing faculty members' good points, being a team player, and building trust. One of her suggestions for promoting the department's

accomplishments to the administration and for communicating crucial information is to generate a newsletter that includes important dates and celebrates achievements and events in the lives of the faculty. She further encourages chairs to become computer literate and knowledgeable of the law. She closes her list of suggestions with the admonition to take care of one's body and spirit in order to sustain one's energy and enthusiasm for the duties of chairing. Included with the article is an appraisal form that she suggests chairs use to provide a systematic means for faculty to review the chair's performance and a list of recommended readings for department chairs.

In "The First Year in Office: Strategies and Tactics for Success" (1994), Elvira Garcia points out that "departments differ tremendously, but there are certain principles and techniques of leadership that apply to almost all of them and that you should consider before taking office as chair" (1994, p. 87). Garcia suggests that chairs get acquainted with their colleagues and set reasonable goals right away. To manage the workload, she suggests delegating responsibility to teams once one discovers what the faculty has in mind. Accessibility is crucial, but chairs must be sure to reserve time to get their work done. To manage the numerous tasks, Garcia encourages chairs to learn about administrative details and handle each piece of paper only once. Making decisions and sticking to them is crucial to earn respect. She further suggests creating a procedures manual if one does not exist and being sure to represent the department. She closes with encouraging chairs to attend workshops to prepare for the job.

Susan Hoffman, in her 1996 presentation "Teaching and Managing: Conflicting Roles of the Department Chair" suggests that chairs can manage the distractions of role conflict with particular techniques. She suggests developing chair networks, collecting faculty input, sharing constructive evaluations with faculty, avoiding making decisions under pressure, developing time management skills, and leaving problems at the office.

In “Ex Cathedra? The Changing Role of the Department Chair” (1997), Reed Anderson discusses the shift in the role of a language department chair from that of colleague and leader to manager. The shift, he contends, is the result of changes within institutions and within the professional culture. To adjust to the changes, Anderson encourages department chairs to study current research on department leadership, to investigate changes in higher education and the role of the faculty, and to attend professional conferences on a regular basis. Anderson warns that failure to respond to the shift will exacerbate role conflict and compound the frustrations chairs experience in fulfilling their duties.

Chairing a multi-disciplinary department is often the situation for chairs in community colleges. Thomas Hamel addresses the unique challenges to such chairs in his 1994 presentation “Chairing the Multi-Disciplinary Department.” Chairs who find themselves in such a culture must use departmental meetings and off-campus retreats to help faculty recognize their common interests and avoid competition among the disciplines. It is also important for chairs to establish standards for quality teaching, considering the methods that work best in each discipline. Another charge for chairs is to become knowledgeable about all the disciplines by talking with faculty, reading about their field, or attending courses with leading faculty. Even though the chair may be pulled in many directions, he/she must provide leadership for all the disciplines in a fair and consistent manner. Given the diversity within the department, the chair must share decision-making duties with faculty to enlist their support. Involving the faculty in professional development could be as simple as inviting them to share information about their discipline with the other members of the department. Chairs who face such challenges will discover the benefits of fostering a cooperative atmosphere.



From this review of the literature, one sees that only a few empirical studies have gathered comprehensive data on department chairs, that other studies focus on particular locales and issues, and that a number of authors write from personal experience and observation. This overview indicates that department chairs face numerous challenges and yet receive little training. The data indicate that department chair roles and tasks are well identified and described and that they are many, divergent, and often in conflict. In addition the new chairs generally are unprepared and experience low levels of satisfaction. These data further indicate that institutions need to consider the leadership development of their chairs and devise on-going programs to offer the training and support the chairs need if they are to fulfill their roles and responsibilities. Department chairs are essential to the institutions' constituents, and if they are to survive and affect meaningful change and ensure the quality of the education delivered, they need professional development opportunities. These opportunities can be achieved through their own efforts to prepare for the job, through local workshops, and through national conferences, but the chairs need the support of administration to reach their potential.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

#### *Research Design*

This study was designed to use survey research methodology to describe the perception of community college chairs in the North Texas region regarding the challenges they face in the next five years and to include a demographic analysis of the regional sample by age, gender, race and education. Comparisons were made to the demographic distributions found within an international survey completed in 1992. The comparison data was extracted from a published report of the international study (Seagren, et al, 1994, *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*).

#### *Procedures for Collection of Data*

Approval to conduct survey research was obtained June 6, 2002, from The University of North Texas Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB). A cover letter was mailed to each subject along with a survey and a return stamped envelope. A follow-up e-mail or postcard was sent one month after the initial survey mailing to remind subjects to return the survey.

#### *Instrument*

The instrument chosen to assess the demographics and perceptions of academic leaders in community colleges was The International Community College Chair Survey. Permission to use the survey was granted by Dr. Alan Seagren, Director of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and leader of the team of researchers who developed the survey for The National Community College Chair Academy of Maricopa Community Colleges. The instrument is designed with nine sections.

Section 1	-Characteristics of the Instructional Unit
Section 2	-Characteristics of the Campus
Section 3	-Personal Information (on the respondent)
Section 4	-Education Beliefs and Values
Section 5	-Roles
Section 6	-Tasks
Section 7	-Skills
Section 8	-Job Challenges
Section 9	-Strategies

The survey's designers drew items from a variety of sources:

1. previous studies on department chairs;
2. data lists from the Department of Education;
3. questions designed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching;
4. publications by various authors which listed tasks, duties, skills, etc.;
5. the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Assessment Center Project; and
6. the staff of the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education and the National Community College Chair Academy.

The survey was pilot tested in Nebraska Community Colleges, with student-practitioners in the doctoral program at University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and with participants in the 1992 Institute for Academic Leadership Development sponsored by the National Community College Chair Academy. Results led to revision and clarification.

### *Population*

The population in this study is made up of the first-line academic leaders in 26 two-year colleges that offer transferable credit classes and are members of the North Texas Community College Consortium in the 2002-2003 school year. The North Texas Community College Consortium is an entity that serves the community colleges in geographical proximity to the University of North Texas, located in Denton, Texas. The mission of the Consortium includes providing professional development opportunities for community college administrators, faculty, and staff; furthering institutional planning, institutional research, and institutional effectiveness; improving resource development capabilities; enhancing international educational initiatives; and promoting communication, cooperation, and collaboration among the member schools and the university.

### *Sample*

The survey subjects included those first-line academic leaders who hold titles such as department chair, division chair or dean, coordinator, or director. Six hundred and sixteen subjects were identified through a search of member institutions' web pages, and a survey was mailed to sample participants. Of the 616 surveys sent to study participants, 188 were returned. This represents a 30.5 % response rate.

### *Procedure for Data Analysis*

After all the survey instruments were collected, the data were analyzed using the techniques employed by the international survey group. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx) was used and focused on standard descriptive statistics, and the discussion includes tables illustrating response frequencies, means, and standard deviation for the survey

questions related to demographics and challenges. The factor analysis established by the international survey was adopted for the analysis of the regional data.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The results of the study on the perception of department chairs in community colleges in the North Texas region regarding the challenges they face are reported in this chapter along with a description of the demographics of the sample, including an analysis by age, gender, race, and education. Comparisons have been made with the demographic distributions found within the international survey completed in 1992.

Career characteristics of the regional sample were explored in an effort to identify the experience level of the chair population both within the chair position and as faculty, the career path of the chair, institutional support for the chairs as measured by release time and size of departments, and future career plans. Again, comparisons were made with the international survey where appropriate, and some demographic analysis of career characteristics is provided.

The third section of this report examines the regional sample's perceptions of a series of 36 challenges that they could face within their departments over the next five years. Frequency distributions for each individual challenge, rank ordering of the mean scores for individual challenges, as well as measures of total challenge load are provided. Demographic analysis of the challenge data and comparison with the international sample are included.

The final section of the report creates a series of scales based upon a factor analysis completed in the international study. This analysis allows for not only the rank ordering of specific challenges faced by chairs, but permits the identification of challenge areas that are perceived as most pressing by the chairs.

*Demographic Characteristics of the Sample*

Demographic analysis of the survey data by age shows that 77.7% of the sample respondents were between the ages of 45 and 64. Table 1 shows that the most frequently cited age category was 45-54 years of age, with 44.7% of the respondents identifying this as their age category. There were only 2 respondents who identified themselves as younger than 30 years of age. The data for this variable was coded as 1 ‘Under 30,’ 2 ‘30-44,’ 3 ‘45-54,’ 4 ‘55-64,’ and 5 ‘65 and over.’ The mean, median, and mode for the distribution are 3.22, 3.00, and 3.00 respectively. The measures of central tendency are reflective of the concentration of respondents in the 45-54 and 55-64 age categories and reflect the graying of the faculty population.

Comparison with the international data collected ten years earlier (Table 1) shows the mean age of chairs to remain within the 45-54 age category; however, a 10% decline is noted within the 30-44 age category, and a 10% increase is noted within the 55-64 age category. This finding is, again, reflective of the aging of the faculty population.

Table 1  
QI0021 Respondent’s Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL STUDY PERCENT
1) Under 30	2	1.1	1.1	1.1	.4
2) 30-44	32	17.0	17.0	18.1	27.0
3) 45-54	84	44.7	44.7	62.8	46.9
4) 55-64	62	33.0	33.0	95.7	23.5
5) 65+	8	4.3	4.3	100.0	2.1
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Analysis by gender (Table 2) shows 52.1% of the sample to be female and 47.9% male. This finding approximates the distribution by gender in the overall population. Comparison with

findings from the international sample shows an 11.4% increase in the percent of female chairs and a corresponding 11.4% decrease in the percent of chairs held by males. This shift is significant from an approximate 60/40 percent distribution in the international sample to a 52/48 percent distribution in the regional sample and is reflective of an increase in gender equity among departmental chairs.

Table 2a  
 QI0022 Respondent's Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Female	98	52.1	52.1	52.1	40.7
2) Male	90	47.9	47.9	100.0	59.3
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Comparison of the mean age distribution by gender shows that the female respondents tended to be younger than the male respondents. Female respondents had a mean age score of 3.07 (45-54 years of age), and the male respondents had a mean age score of 3.39 showing a movement toward the higher age categories. An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if the difference in the mean age scores by gender was significant. This analysis yielded a t-value of -2.708 with 186 degrees of freedom and a 2-tailed significance level of .007. A significant difference does exist between the mean age scores of male and female respondents.



Table 2b  
 QI0022 Mean Age Distribution by Gender

Respondent's Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
1) Female	3.07	98	.82
2) Male	3.39	90	.79
Total	3.22	188	.82

The distribution by race and ethnicity (Table 3) shows 2.7% Native American, Canadian Aleut, Eskimo, or Inuit, .5% Asian or Pacific Islander, 5.9% African American, 90.4% White, and one respondent (.5%) who identified his/her race as 'Other.' None of the respondents identified themselves as Hispanic. The skewness and kurtosis statistics for this distribution are – 3.546 and 16.746 respectively and are reflective of the high concentration of respondents in the “White” category. Overall, 9.6% of the sample self-identify themselves as belonging to a minority group. The lack of Hispanic representation in the sample is of particular significance since a large percentage of the sample is located within the state of Texas, a state that has the second largest Hispanic population in the nation. Comparison with the international sample shows the same distribution by dominant/minority status with approximately 90% of both samples identifying their race as “White” and approximately 10% of both samples identifying a minority group membership.

Table 3  
 QI0023 Respondent's Race/Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Native American, Canadian Aleut, Eskimo, Inuit	5	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.5
2) Asian or Pacific	1	.5	.5	3.2	1.4

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
Islander (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Asia)					
3) Black/ African American	11	5.9	5.9	9.0	3.6
4) White	170	90.4	90.4	99.5	89.3
5) Hispanic/ Latino	0	0	0	99.5	1.8
6) Other	1	.5	.5	100.0	.4
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Analysis of educational attainment (Table 4) shows that seven (3.7%) of the sample hold less than a baccalaureate, and 12.2% report a baccalaureate as their highest degree held. The majority of the respondents, 58.5% of the sample, hold a master's degree as their highest academic degree. Slightly over a quarter of the sample (25.5%) report a doctorate as their highest academic degree. None of the respondents report their highest level of educational attainment to be a specialist certificate/degree. Comparison with the international sample shows that the number of faculty holding advanced degrees, master's or doctorates, remains constant at 82.9% for the international sample and 84% for the regional sample.

Table 4  
QI0042 Respondent's Highest Academic Degree

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SAMPLE PERCENT
Less than baccalaureate		3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3
Baccalaureate	23	12.2	12.2	16.0	9.2
Masters	110	58.5	58.5	74.5	59.3
Specialist	0	0	0	74.5	4.6

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SAMPLE PERCENT
Certificate/Degree					
Doctorate	48	25.5	25.5	100.0	23.6
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

### *Career Characteristics of the Sample*

With respect to the respondents' work experience within the community college setting, 17.0% of the sample report having 1-5 years of experience as community college faculty, 19.7% report 6-10 years of faculty service, 19.1% report 11-15 years, 9.6% report 16-20 years, 31.4% of the sample report having been a community college faculty member for over 20 years, and 6 individuals (3.2%) report that they have no experience as community college faculty. The strongest showing is in the "Over 20 years" category and reflects a high level of faculty experience among a significant proportion of the chairs. It is, however, noteworthy that for approximately 20% of the sample, movement into the chair position occurs either without faculty experience or during the first five years of faculty employment. The percent of respondents assuming the chair position with five years or fewer faculty experience increases from 15.1% in the international sample to 20.2% in the regional sample ten years later. The mean for both samples falls within the 11-15 years category. The mode, the most frequently appearing number in the distribution, falls within the "Over 20 years" category for both samples.

Table 5  
 QI0024 Number of Years as Community College Faculty Member

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENTS
1) 1-5 years	32	17.0	17.0	17.0	12.0
2) 6-10 years	37	19.7	19.7	36.7	16.8
3) 11-15 years	36	19.1	19.1	55.9	19.8
4) 16-20 years	18	9.6	9.6	65.4	19.5
5) Over 20 years	59	31.4	31.4	96.8	28.8
6) No Experience	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	3.1
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

When asked about the number of years that they had been a community college chair or head, the majority (42.6%) reported that they had been chair or head for 1 to 5 years. Data presented in Table 6 shows an additional 22.3% had been chair or head for 6-10 years; 16.5% had been chair or head for 11-15 years; 7.4% had been in the position for 16-20 years; and 10.1% had held the position for over 20 years. Two individuals reported that they have no experience as a chair or head. One individual identified his/her present position as Coordinator/Director, and the other identified his/her present position as “Other.”

Comparison with the international sample also shows the mode for the distribution to be within the 1-5 years category. However, it is noteworthy that when comparing cumulative percentages, the international sample is reporting less experience in the chair position than the regional sample. For example, 71% of the international sample reports 10 years or less chair experience. This percentage drops to 64.9% in the regional sample and continues to lag across categories until the “Over 20 years” category. This shift would be indicative of an increase in chair experience either regionally or over time, indicating stability within the chair population.

Table 6  
 QI0025 Number of Years as Community College Chair or Head

	Fre- quency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumul- ative Percent	INTER- NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT	INTER- NATIONAL SURVEY CUMULATIVE PERCENT
1-5 years	80	42.6	42.6	42.6	44.8	44.8
6-10 years	42	22.3	22.3	64.9	26.2	71.0
11-15 years	31	16.5	16.5	81.4	14.8	85.8
16-20 years	14	7.4	7.4	88.8	7.1	92.9
Over 20 years	19	10.1	10.1	98.9	5.8	98.7
No Experience	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	1.3	100.0
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0	

To further explore the relationship between number of years as a faculty member and number of years as a chair or head, a cross-tabulation was run between these two variables in an attempt to identify the career path of a chair or head in a community college setting. Table 7a shows the frequency distribution of the crosstab for the two variables, and Table 7b shows the gamma statistic. The original coding on this variable was (1) 1-5 years, (2) 6-10 years, (3) 11-15 years, (4) 16-20 years, (5) Over 20 years, and (6) No experience. A recode was completed to create an ordinal scaled variable by recoding the value of “6” (No experience) to a value of “0.” The variables were treated as ordinal level data in the analysis because the quality of equal distancing is lost within the “Over 20 years” category.

The results of the crosstab frequency distribution show that 80 (43%) of the 188 respondents who answered both of these questions have been functioning in the chair position for 1-5 years. Of those 80 respondents, over 25% (n=22) have 1-5 years of experience as a faculty

member, indicating rapid career advancement for approximately 12% of the sample population. The Pearson Chi-square statistic is 79.209, with 25 degrees of freedom, and is significant at the .000 level of significance. A measure of the strength of the relationship between the number of years as a chair and the number of years as a faculty member is reported in Table 7b. The gamma statistic is .458 and is significant at the .000 level of significance. A gamma statistic of .458 indicates a moderate positive association between number of years as a chair and number of years as a faculty member. Traditional career mobility based upon years of experience would seem to indicate that not only should the relationship between length of time in the chair position and number of years as a faculty member be positive, but the strength of that relationship should also be strong. The finding of a moderate positive relationship seems to indicate that, for a significant portion of the sample population, career advancement is more rapid than would be expected.

Table 7a  
 QI0024 Number of Years as Community College Faculty Member &  
 QI0025 Number of Years as Community College Chair or Head Crosstabulation

Number of Years as Faculty	NUMBER OF YEARS AS HEAD OR CHAIR						Total
	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	
0	1	4		1			6
1-5		22	2	4		4	32
6-10		19	13	4	1		37
11-15	1	17	11	6	1		36
16-20		4	6	4	4		18
Over 20		14	10	12	8	15	59
Total	2	80	42	31	14	19	188

Table 7b  
 Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error	Approx. T	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.458	.076	5.875	.000
	Spearman Correlation	.408	.069	6.094	.000
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.407	.069	6.078	.000
N of Valid Cases		188			

Interestingly, 17 of the respondents in Table 7a report more years of experience as chair than as a faculty member. This finding was explored further by selecting cases within the data set in which the assigned value on questionnaire item # 25 (number of years as chair) was greater than the assigned value on questionnaire item #24 (number of years as faculty member). This conditional statement selects, from within the data set, those individuals who report greater years of experience as a department chair than as a faculty member. To explore a possible explanation for this apparent disparity, a frequency distribution of responses to questionnaire item # 37 was run. Question 37 asked the respondents how much release time from teaching duties they were granted as chairs. The results of this exploration are reported in Table 7c. Of the 17 cases in which the respondent reported greater time in the chair position than as faculty, one individual reported release from two 3-credit hour classes; one individual reported release from four 3-credit hour classes; and 5 individuals reported full time release from teaching duties. The 10 missing cases for question 37 represent individuals who reported that they did not receive release time from teaching (question 36) while serving as department chair. In part, this disparity between years of experience as chair and years of experience as faculty can be explained by the full time release from teaching duties for some chairs. It is possible that the remaining

individuals interpreted their status as department chair as not existing concurrently with their status as faculty and may be reflective of how chairs self-identify or that their institutions define their position as administrative rather than a faculty position.

Table 7c  
 QI0037 Amount of Release Time (3-Credit Hour Courses)  
 Individuals who Report More Time as Chair than as Faculty

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2 classes	1	5.9	14.3	14.3
4 classes	1	5.9	14.3	28.6
Full-time	5	29.4	71.4	100.0
Total	7	41.2	100.0	
Missing	10	58.8		
Total	17	100.0		

In comparison with the international sample, it is interesting to note the following differences regarding release time. The international sample reported (Table 7d) that 73.2% of their respondents received some release time from teaching duties. Comparatively, only 59.6% of the regional sample reported release from teaching duties. Additionally, the international sample reported the mean amount of release time to be three classes; the regional sample mean is two classes. Table 7e shows that in both samples the mode is one class, but the percentage of chairs receiving release from one class is 27.3% in the international sample and 39.6% in the regional sample. These data seem to indicate that chairs in the regional sample are receiving less support, in terms of release time from teaching duties, than the international sample.

Table 7d  
 QI0036 Respondent Receives Release Time From Teaching

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative	INTERNATIONAL
--	-----------	---------	-------	------------	---------------



			Percent	Percent	PERCENT
1) Yes	112	59.6	59.6	59.6	73.2
2) No	76	40.4	40.4	100.0	26.8
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Table 7e  
 QI0037 Amount of Release Time (3-Credit Hour Courses)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) 1 class	44	23.4	39.6	39.6	27.3
2) 2 classes	36	19.1	32.4	72.1	26.9
3) 3 classes	12	6.4	10.8	82.9	15.6
4) 4 classes	4	2.1	3.6	86.5	10.1
5) 5 classes	2	1.1	1.8	88.3	3.1
6) Full-time	13	6.9	11.7	100.0	17.0
Total	111	59.0	100.0		100.0
Missing	77	41.0			
Total	188	100.0			

To further explore the differences regarding release time between the international and regional samples, a comparison of the frequency distributions for questionnaire items #004 and #005 was completed. Questionnaire item #004 asked the respondent how many full-time faculty members are in the unit, and questionnaire item #005 asked the respondent how many adjunct faculty members are in the unit. The frequency distributions for QI004 and QI005 appear in Tables 7f and 7g respectively. Each of these questions provides a measure of relative workload for the chair.

Upon initial examination of Table 7f, it appears that, at least in part, the difference in release time can be explained by smaller departmental size, as measured by number of full-time

faculty, in the regional sample. The regional sample shows that 68.1% of the chairs have 10 or fewer full-time faculty members, while the corresponding percentage for the international sample is 56.3%. This number is also reflected in the mean for the regional sample which is 1.61 indicating that the mean falls somewhere at mid-point between the assigned value of “1” indicating 10 or fewer faculty members and “2” indicating 11-20 faculty members. The international sample does not report an actual mean for the data, but they report the mean number of full-time faculty members to be 11-20.

However, examination of Table 7g that assesses the number of part-time or adjunct faculty reveals the mean for both the regional and international sample to be 11-20 part-time faculty members. The actual mean for the regional sample is 2.28; the international sample does not report the actual mean. However, the finding of fewer full-time faculty members compared with part-time faculty raises the question of full-time to part-time ratios within the departments. A separate analysis was run to explore this ratio and is reported in Table 7h.

Table 7f  
 QI0004 Number of Full-time Faculty in Respondent’s Unit

Number of Full-time Faculty	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) 10 or less	128	68.1	68.1	68.1	56.3
2) 11-20	28	14.9	14.9	83.0	26.7
3) 21-30	19	10.1	10.1	93.1	9.7
4) 31-40	6	3.2	3.2	96.3	3.2
5) 41-50	5	2.7	2.7	98.9	1.7
6) Over 50	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	2.4
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Table 7g  
 QI0005 Number of Part-time Faculty in Respondent's Unit

Number of Part-time Faculty	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) 10 or less	102	54.3	54.3	54.3	49.9
2) 11-20	29	15.4	15.4	69.7	20.8
3) 21-30	21	11.2	11.2	80.9	10.2
4) 31-40	5	2.7	2.7	83.5	7.2
5) 41-50	1	.5	.5	84.0	4.3
6) Over 50	30	16.0	16.0	100.0	7.6
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

To explore the relationship between the number of full-time faculty relative to the number of part-time faculty, a transformation was completed to create a new variable labeled as “FACRATIO.” Dividing the assigned value for each categorical response to QI004 (number of full-time faculty) by the assigned value for the categorical response to QI005 (number of part-time faculty), the new variable of “FACRATIO” was created. The logic of this variable is that a value of 1.0 would indicate perfect correspondence between the categorical number of full-time faculty and part-time faculty. A value greater than 1.00 would indicate a smaller categorical reporting of part-time faculty relative to full-time faculty, and a value less than 1.00 would indicate a greater categorical reporting of adjunct faculty relative to full-time faculty. As shown in Table 7h, 53.7% of the respondents report a faculty ratio of 1.00, indicating that within pre-specified numerical categories, they have the same number of adjunct faculty as full-time faculty. A percentage of 10.6 of the sample report more full-time faculty than part-time faculty, and 35.6% of the sample report more adjunct than full-time faculty. Well over thirteen percent (13.8%) of the sample report a faculty ratio of twice as many adjunct faculty as full-time faculty

(ratio value .50), and an additional 12.2% report three times as many part-time faculty as full-time faculty (ratio value .33). The mean value for this distribution is .92 indicating that the chairs, overall, have more part-time than full-time faculty for whom they are responsible.

Although a more in-depth analysis of the international data would be necessary for comparison, it does not appear that the differences in release time can be explained by smaller departments.

Additionally, the issue of full-time to part-time faculty ratio is significant to the workload of a department chair since part-time faculty must be recruited and scheduled on an ongoing basis, are less familiar with campus policies, and are more prone to have difficulties with students than full-time faculty.

Table 7h  
FACRATIO Ratio of Full-time to Part-time Faculty

Ratio Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
4.00	2	1.1	1.1	1.1
3.00	3	1.6	1.6	2.7
2.00	9	4.8	4.8	7.4
1.67	1	.5	.5	8.0
1.50	4	2.1	2.1	10.1
1.25	1	.5	.5	10.6
1.00	101	53.7	53.7	64.4
.83	3	1.6	1.6	66.0
.75	2	1.1	1.1	67.0
.67	5	2.7	2.7	69.7
.50	26	13.8	13.8	83.5
.40	1	.5	.5	84.0
.33	23	12.2	12.2	96.3
.17	7	3.7	3.7	100.0
Total	188	100.0	100.0	

In response to a question about future career plans (Table 8), almost three-quarters (72.9%) said that they planned to stay at the same community college. Seven (3.7%) of the respondents plan to move to another community college; 8 (4.3%) plan to move to a four year institution; and 2 (1.1%) have plans to enter either the non-profit or private sector. Twenty-six (13.8%) of the respondents plan on retiring within the next five years. Eight individuals identified their career plans as “Other” or non-specified. This distribution reflects both the high level of stability within the community college faculty, as well as the graying of the faculty population. This distribution is consistent with the findings of the international survey.

Table 8  
 QI0043 Respondent’s Professional Plans in the Next Five Years

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Stay at the same community college	137	72.9	72.9	72.9	73.9
2) Move to another community college	7	3.7	3.7	76.6	4.9
3) Move to a 4-year institution of higher education	8	4.3	4.3	80.9	2.9
4) Move to a position in the non-profit, private sector	2	1.1	1.1	81.9	1.3
5) Retire	26	13.8	13.8	95.7	13.3
6) Other	8	4.3	4.3	100.0	3.7
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

When asked about future career plans, 96 individuals (51.6%) report that they expect to remain in the chair position for the next five years. Table 9 shows that 13 respondents (7.0%)

plan to move to a faculty position; 32 individuals (17.2%) plan to move to another administrative position; and 10 individuals (5.4%) identify their future five-year plans as “Other.” This distribution shows a high level of stability among the chair population and is consistent with the data found in the international sample.

Table 9  
 QI0044 Five-year Career Plans if Staying with Community Colleges

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENTS
1) Not applicable	35	18.6	18.8	18.8	14.2
2) Remain in chair position	96	51.1	51.6	70.4	54.4
3) Move to a faculty position	13	6.9	7.0	77.4	11.3
4) Move to another administrative position	32	17.0	17.2	94.6	17.3
5) Other	10	5.3	5.4	100.0	2.8
Total	186	98.9	100.0		100.0
Missing System	2	1.1			
	188	100.0			

Regarding their career aspirations at the community college (Table 10), 36 individuals (21.5%) responded that they aspire to achieve higher-level administrative positions, Dean (27), Vice President (7), and Campus President (2). Four individuals identified “Other” career aspirations. None of the regional sample respondents identified “System Chancellor” as a career aspiration. This distribution is consistent with the findings in the international sample.

Table 10  
 QI0045 Administrative Career Aspirations at Community College

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Not Applicable	146	77.7	78.5	78.5	75.7
2) Dean	27	14.4	14.5	93.0	14.5
3) Vice-President	7	3.7	3.8	96.8	3.8
4) Campus President	2	1.1	1.1	97.8	1.4
5) System Chancellor	0	0	0	97.8	.2
6) Other	4	2.1	2.2	100.0	4.3
Total	186	98.9	100.0		100.0
Missing	2	1.1			
	188	100.0			

The variable, “QI0045 Administrative Career Aspirations at Community College” was recoded to remove the impact of the categories of “Not Applicable” and “Other” within a correlational analysis of gender, age, race/ethnicity, and career aspirations. The recode for QI0045 was completed as follows: (1) Not Applicable and (6) Other were recoded with a value of “0.” (2) Dean was recoded as (1); (3) Vice-President was recoded as (2); (4) Campus President was recoded as (3); and (5) System Chancellor was recoded as (4). This recode allowed for the creation of an ordinaly-scaled variable in the analysis. Additionally a recode was completed for variable QI0023 Race/Ethnicity. The recode of this variable collapsed all minority racial/ethnic categories into one group coded as “1” and labeled “Minority.” Respondents who had self-identified their race as white were recoded to a value of “2.”

Analysis of the relationship between age and career aspirations yielded a Pearson Chi-Square statistic of 26.282 with 12 degrees of freedom and a significance level of .010. The gamma statistic for this relationship is  $-3.58$  and is significant at the .01 level. The gamma

statistic indicates a weak negative association between age and career aspirations. Although the gamma statistic indicates a weak negative relationship between age and career aspirations, it should be noted that across the categories of dean, vice-president, and president, respondents in the 45-54 age category reported a higher actual cell frequency than expected. This pattern seems to indicate that individuals in the 45-54 age group have higher career aspirations than either the younger or older chairs. In Table 10b, an analysis of the relationship between gender and career aspirations yielded a Chi-square statistic of 3.246 with 3 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for this statistic was .355 and indicates that a significant relationship does not exist between gender and career aspirations. The recoded variable for race/ethnicity and career aspirations did not reveal a significant relationship between the variables. The Chi-Square statistic was 1.375 with 3 degrees of freedom and a significance level of .711.

Table 10b  
Crosstab Career Aspirations by Age

		REC45 Recode Career Aspirations at Community College				
Age		0	1	2	3	Total
		Other/Not Applicable	Dean	Vice- President	Campus President	
Under 30	Count	0	2	0	0	2
	Expected Count	1.6	.3	.1	.0	2.0
30-44	Count	26	5	0	0	31
	Expected Count	25.0	4.5	1.2	.3	31.0
45-54	Count	60	16	6	2	84
	Expected Count	67.7	12.2	3.2	.9	84.0



REC45 Recode Career Aspirations at Community College						
Age						Total
		0 Other/Not Applicable	1 Dean	2 Vice- President	3 Campus President	
55-64	Count	57	3	1	0	61
	Expected Count	49.2	8.9	2.3	.7	61.0
65 and over	Count	7	1	0	0	8
	Expected Count	6.5	1.2	.3	.1	8.0

*Perceived Challenges Faced by Chairs or Heads*

The second part of this data analysis examines the challenges reported by the sample respondents in the execution of their duties as chair. This series of variables is a measure of chairs' perceptions of significant issues that they face. The study participants were asked, "To what extent do you agree that the following are challenges you will have to face in your unit in the next five years?" This question was followed by a series of 36 separate challenges with which the respondents could agree or disagree. The coding for this variable was (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Neutral, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly disagree. A reporting of the frequency distributions of responses to each individual challenge follows. Each table (Tables 11–46) also includes the percent responses from the international survey data. The international survey collapsed the categories of "Strongly agree" and "Agree" and the categories of "Disagree" and "Strongly disagree" in the reporting of percentages. An adaptation has been made to each of the tables to accommodate this method of reporting

Table 11 reports the sample’s level of agreement that they will face the challenge of changing the curriculum in response to technological development. Over half of the sample (53.7%) strongly agree with this statement. The cumulative percentage for the categories of “Strongly agree” and “Agree” is 93.6% and is slightly higher than the distribution in the international sample, which is 90.6%. The issue of changing the curriculum in response to technological development is consistently perceived to be a challenge faced by department chairs across samples and over time.

Table 11  
 QI0050A Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Changing the Curriculum in Response to Technological Development

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	101	53.7	53.7	53.7	90.6
2) Agree	75	39.9	39.9	93.6	
3) Neutral	8	4.3	4.3	97.9	6.5
4) Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	99.5	3.0
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

The level of agreement that increasing general education requirements is a challenge for department chairs (Table 12) is relatively low with 50.5 % of the sample agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge. Interestingly, they are more likely to maintain a neutral position on this challenge than to express disagreement with this challenge. The corresponding level of agreement within the international survey is 54.4%. Overall, the department chairs are about evenly divided on the issue of increasing general education requirements.

Table 12  
 QI0050B Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing General Education Requirements

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	29	15.4	15.4	15.4	54.4
2) Agree	66	35.1	35.1	50.5	
3) Neutral	64	34.0	34.0	84.6	26.1
4) Disagree	27	14.4	14.4	98.9	19.4
5) Strongly Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

With respect to the challenge of increasing human relations training, 59% of the regional sample and 61.6% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this represents a challenge faced by their departments. Once again, there is a stronger showing in the “Neutral” category than in the expression of disagreement that this represents a challenge. This inclination toward neutrality is true for both samples. Increasing human relations training does not appear to be a significant issue for department chairs.

Table 13  
 QI0050C Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing Human Relations Training

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	27	14.4	14.4	14.4	61.6
2) Agree	84	44.7	44.7	59.0	
3) Neutral	57	30.3	30.3	89.4	27.3
4) Disagree	18	9.6	9.6	98.9	11.1
5) Strongly Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

As to the challenge of internationalizing the curriculum, a relatively low level of consensus exists in both samples that this is a challenge they will face within the next five years. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge is 45.2% in the regional sample and 41.8% in the international sample. Once again, in both samples they are more likely to express a neutral position than to express disagreement. Internationalizing the curriculum is not perceived to be a significant challenge for either sample.

Table 14  
 QI0050D Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Internationalizing the Curriculum

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	22	11.7	11.7	11.7	41.8
2) Agree	63	33.5	33.5	45.2	
3) Neutral	63	33.5	33.5	78.7	32.6
4) Disagree	34	18.1	18.1	96.8	25.5

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
5) Strongly Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

When considering the next five years, 88.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that keeping pace with the increasing cost of technology would be a challenge for their department. The level of agreement is approximately evenly split between the responses of “Strongly agree” and “Agree” with respective percentages of 43.1% and 45.2%. The corresponding international survey percentage is 84.5%. Within the regional sample there were no respondents who strongly disagreed that this item represents a challenge to their department. Both across samples and across time, the cost of technology is perceived to be a significant challenge by department chairs.

Table 15  
 QI0050E Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Keeping Pace with the Increasing Cost of Technology

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	81	43.1	43.1	43.1	
2) Agree	85	45.2	45.2	88.3	84.5
3) Neutral	17	9.0	9.0	97.3	11.0
4) Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0	
5) Strongly Disagree	0	0	0		4.4
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

As to the challenge of reallocating monies to programs because of financial constraints, 73.4% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that this was a challenge that they expected within their unit during the next five years. A slightly higher percentage was found in the international sample with 77.3% of the respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge. Within the regional sample, the respondents were more likely to agree, rather than strongly agree with this challenge. Corresponding percentages are 45.2% and 28.2%. Interestingly, the data for the regional sample, which is predominantly Texan, was collected just months before a state reduction in funding for higher education. It is surmised that under the current fiscal climate this challenge would be rated at a much higher level among department chairs as they face hiring freezes, cuts in course offerings, and a multitude of other budgetary restraints.

Table 16  
 QI0050F Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Reallocating Monies to Programs because of Financial Constraints

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	53	28.2	28.2	28.2	77.3
2) Agree	85	45.2	45.2	73.4	
3) Neutral	35	18.6	18.6	92.0	16.1
4) Disagree	13	6.9	6.9	98.9	6.6
5) Strongly Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

On the topic of offering courses through distance education, a significant shift occurs within the regional sample relative to the international sample. The percentage of chairs who agree or strongly agree with the perception that this is a challenge faced within their departments

increases from 51.3% in the international sample to 84.0% in the regional sample. Almost half of the regional sample (46.3%) strongly agree that offering courses through distance education is a challenge that they will face within their departments during the next five years. The regional sample is also less likely to hold a neutral position on this issue with only 9.0% of the sample selecting a neutral response compared with 28.9% of the regional sample holding a neutral position. As with other technology issues, the regional sample is more concerned with the impact of such issues within their departments than the international sample was ten years earlier.

Table 17  
 QI0050G Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Offering Courses through Distance Education

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	87	46.3	46.3	46.3	51.3
2) Agree	71	37.8	37.8	84.0	
3) Neutral	17	9.0	9.0	93.1	28.9
4) Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	96.3	19.8
5) Strongly Disagree	7	3.7	3.7	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

The issue of promoting greater gender equity (Table 18a) is of moderate concern in both samples. The corresponding percentages of chairs who agree or strongly agree with this issue as a departmental challenge is 55.9% in the regional sample and 59.5% in the international sample. Although this issue is not perceived as a highly significant challenge in either sample, it is interesting that the regional sample does demonstrate greater gender equity in the awarding of chair positions than the international sample with 52.1% of the respondents identifying their gender as female compared to 40.7% of the international sample.

Table 18a  
 QI0050H Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Promoting Greater Gender Equity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	36	19.1	19.1	19.1	
2) Agree	69	36.7	36.7	55.9	59.5
3) Neutral	57	30.3	30.3	86.2	27.2
4) Disagree	20	10.6	10.6	96.8	
5) Strongly Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	13.3
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Because this particular challenge relates to demographic issues, a comparison of mean values for this challenge by gender, race, age, and gender/race is provided in Table 18b. A lower mean score is indicative of a higher level of agreement that gender equity is a challenge faced by department chairs within the next five years. Female chairs believe more strongly that gender equity is a challenge than male chairs with respective mean values of 2.30 and 2.56. Minority chairs agree more strongly with this challenge than White chairs with corresponding mean values of 1.78 and 2.49. Although there is not a great deal of variation across the 30 plus age categories, those chairs under the age of 30 present the lowest mean score of 1.50. There are only two respondents in the under 30 category and both are white females. The gender by race analysis shows that minority females most strongly agree that this is a challenge (mean = 1.67), followed by minority males (mean = 2.00), followed by white females (mean = 2.38), and the least likely group to consider gender equity a challenge is white males with a mean value of 2.60.

Table 18b  
 Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Gender Equity by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race



DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON GENDER EQUITY CHALLENGE
Gender:		
Female	98	2.30
Male	90	2.56
Race:		
Minority	18	1.78
White	170	2.49
Age:		
Under 30	2	1.50
30-44	32	2.44
45-54	84	2.42
55-64	62	2.42
65 and over	8	2.63
Gender by Race:		
Minority Female	12	1.67
White Female	86	2.38
Minority Male	6	2.00
White Male	84	2.60

When asked their level of agreement on the need to accommodate cultural diversity, 73.4% of the regional sample either agreed or strongly agreed with this challenge. In Table 19a the greatest showing is in the “Agree” category with 47.3% of the sample citing this response. Comparison with the international sample shows a similar distribution with 72.1% of the international sample agreeing or strongly agreeing with this issue as a challenge. Interestingly, the regional sample is slightly less likely to hold a neutral position on this issue than the international sample. Corresponding percentages are 16.0% for the regional sample and 19.5% for the international sample. The regional sample is also slightly more likely to disagree that

accommodating cultural diversity is a challenge faced by their units than the international sample. Respective percentages are 10.7% for the regional sample and 8.3% for the international sample. The regional sample appears to be slightly more opinionated on this issue.

Table 19a  
 QI0050I Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Accommodating Cultural Diversity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	49	26.1	26.1	26.1	
2) Agree	89	47.3	47.3	73.4	72.1
3) Neutral	30	16.0	16.0	89.4	19.5
4) Disagree	18	9.6	9.6	98.9	
5) Strongly Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	8.3
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

Once again, because cultural diversity is a demographic issue, a separate analysis was run to compare the mean values on this challenge by gender, race, age, and gender/race. One finds that the lower the mean score the higher the level of agreement that accommodating cultural diversity represents a challenge. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 19b.

Once again, female respondents were more likely to agree that accommodating cultural diversity was a challenge that their departments would face within the next five years. Respective mean values for female and male chairs were 1.95 and 2.31. Analysis by age shows that for those department chairs under the age of 30 (n=2) accommodating cultural diversity is a more significant issue than for other age categories. This finding is somewhat interesting since both of these respondents are white females, indicating that possibly sensitivity to the issue of cultural diversity is more driven by gender than race. Also, individuals in the 45-54 age category

seem to distinguish themselves more on the issue of cultural diversity than gender equity. They show greater difference in mean scores on this issue relative to other age categories than they did when asked about gender equity.

Minority females show the highest level of agreement that cultural diversity is a challenge that will be faced by department chairs over the next five years (mean = 1.33). This is a lower mean score than minority females reported for the challenge of gender equity (mean = 1.67) indicating that cultural diversity is a more significant issue for this group. A strong level of agreement pertaining to this challenge was also found among minority males with a mean value of 1.50, which again is lower than their mean value of 2.00 on gender equity issues. White females had a mean score of 2.03, followed by white males with a mean score of 2.37. Both white females and white males express more concern with issues of accommodating cultural diversity than they express regarding gender equity. Overall the same pattern of concern by gender/race exists with respect to accommodating cultural diversity and gender equity, but across all gender/race categories there is a higher level of agreement that cultural diversity is a challenge that will be faced by department chairs within the next five years.

Table 19b  
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Accommodating Cultural Diversity by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON ACCOMMODATING CULTURAL DIVERSITY CHALLENGE
Gender:		
Female	98	1.95
Male	90	2.31
Race:		
Minority	18	1.39

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON ACCOMMODATING CULTURAL DIVERSITY CHALLENGE
White	170	2.20
Age:		
Under 30	2	1.50
30-44	32	2.22
45-54	84	2.02
55-64	62	2.19
65 and over	8	2.38
Gender by Race:		
Minority Female	12	1.33
White Female	86	2.03
Minority Male	6	1.50
White Male	84	2.37

The survey question asking the respondents to rate their perception of the decreasing growth of transfer programs as a challenge that will be faced by their units is reported in Table 20. This decline in growth does not appear to be a significant issue for either the regional or the international sample with the percent of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this issue as a challenge to be 30.9% and 19.3% respectively. However, there does exist a significant increase in the percent of regional respondents who consider transfer programs to be a challenge. The regional respondents are also more likely to hold a neutral position on this issue, rather than a position of disagreement. In the international sample, almost 50% of the sample either disagreed or strongly disagreed on this issue. Although this difference may be a regional variation, it is possible that the decreasing growth of transfer programs is an emerging issue for chairs ten years after the international survey.

Table 20

QI0050J Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
Decreasing Growth in Transfer Programs

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	21	11.2	11.2	11.2	
2) Agree	37	19.7	19.7	30.9	19.3
3) Neutral	74	39.4	39.4	70.2	31.2
4) Disagree	35	18.6	18.6	88.8	
5) Strongly Disagree	21	11.2	11.2	100.0	49.5
Total	188	100.0	100.0		

The level of agreement that encouraging more technical preparation in high school is a challenge faced by department chairs remains relatively constant across the regional and international samples with respective cumulative percentages for “Agree” or “Strongly agree” of 62.8% and 59.6% respectively. The distribution of individuals who feel neutral on this issue is also constant with 25.5% of the regional sample and 24.3% of the international sample selecting a neutral response. Technical preparation in high school does not appear to be an issue of great significance for either sample, nor does it appear to be a challenge that is evolving on a regional level or over time.

Table 21  
QI0050K Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
Encouraging More Technical Preparation in High Schools

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	31	16.5	16.5	16.5	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
2) Agree	87	46.3	46.3	62.8	59.6
3) Neutral	48	25.5	25.5	88.3	24.3
4) Disagree	16	8.5	8.5	96.8	
5) Strongly Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	16.0
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

The issue of securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment appears to be a significant challenge both regionally and internationally. The percent of respondents who agree or strongly agree with this issue as a challenge is 87.8% for the regional sample and 85.3% for the international sample. In addition, almost half of the regional sample (47.3) strongly agree that this is a challenge for their unit. Only 1% of the regional respondents believe that securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment is not a significant challenge to their unit. The corresponding percentage for the international sample is 4.9%. It appears that technology is a significant and ongoing challenge faced by chairs.

Table 22  
 QI0050L Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Securing and Maintaining State-of-the-art Technical Equipment

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	89	47.3	47.3	47.3	85.3
2) Agree	76	40.4	40.4	87.8	
3) Neutral	21	11.2	11.2	98.9	9.9
4) Disagree	1	.5	.5	99.5	4.9
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

Concerning the increasing influence and impact of state coordinating bodies, 68.6% of the regional sample and 54.0% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that these entities represent a challenge for their units within the next five years. The regional sample is less likely to assume a neutral position or to disagree that this issue represents a challenge for them. Although this issue does not appear to be an issue of extremely high concern to the respondents, an increase of approximately 14% of respondents who express agreement with this issue as a departmental challenge appears to be significant. Possibly state coordinating boards are more influential within Texas or there has been an increase in their influence over the past ten years. Another possible explanation is that several community colleges in North Texas are in the midst of SACS accreditation reviews under a new system of reporting. Because regional data is not accessible from the international sample, it is not possible to make a determination if this is a regional issue or one of time since the international survey.

Table 23  
 QI0050M Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Increasing Influence and Impact of  
 State Coordinating Bodies

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER- NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	37	19.7	19.7	19.7	
2) Agree	92	48.9	48.9	68.6	54.0
3) Neutral	42	22.3	22.3	91.0	28.2
4) Disagree	14	7.4	7.4	98.4	
5) Strongly Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	100.0	17.9
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

Regarding the challenge of the increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies, once again there is an increase in the percentage of respondents in the regional sample who either agree or strongly agree that this represents a departmental challenge. Over 65% of the regional sample expresses agreement on this issue compared with 45.2% of the international sample. Once again, one sees a significant increase in the level of agreement with approximately 20% more of the regional respondents agreeing that this issue is a challenge. However, most of the respondents (46.3%) agree rather than strongly agree (19.1%). This is the same pattern that was found in Table 23 and seems to indicate an increase in the level of concern with external regulating bodies. Again, the question as to whether this is a regional issue or one of an increase in external influences over time remains unanswered.



Table 24  
 QI0050N Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing Influence and Impact of Accrediting Bodies

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	36	19.1	19.1	19.1	45.2
2) Agree	87	46.3	46.3	65.4	
3) Neutral	48	25.5	25.5	91.0	33.9
4) Disagree	16	8.5	8.5	99.5	20.9
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

As to the challenge of the increasing influence of business and industry advisory committees, the regional and international samples appear to be relatively consistent on the issue. Slightly over 63% of the regional sample and 58.5% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this is a challenge that they face. The category of “Neutral” is consistent across both groups with corresponding percentages of 26.6% (regional sample) and 26.1% (international sample).

Table 25  
 QI0050O Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing the Use of Business and Industry Advisory Committees

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	47	25.0	25.0	25.0	58.5
2) Agree	72	38.3	38.3	63.3	
3) Neutral	50	26.6	26.6	89.9	26.1
4) Disagree	16	8.5	8.5	98.4	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
5) Strongly Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	100.0	15.5
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

A question about increasing teaching programs sponsored by specific companies yielded a consistently low level of agreement across both samples that this represented a significant challenge to their units. Slightly more than one-third of the respondents in both samples agreed or strongly agreed that this was a challenge that they face. In both samples there was a tendency towards neutrality on this issue. Increasing teaching programs does not appear to be an issue that chairs are particularly concerned with as a challenge to their units.

Table 26  
 QI0050P Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing Teaching Programs Sponsored by Specific Companies

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	21	11.2	11.2	11.2	38.9
2) Agree	48	25.5	25.5	36.7	
3) Neutral	78	41.5	41.5	78.2	36.4
4) Disagree	33	17.6	17.6	95.7	24.7
5) Strongly Disagree	8	4.3	4.3	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Increasing involvement of the U.S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges also does not appear to be a significant challenge for department chairs in either the regional or international sample with only 25% of the chairs in the regional sample and 21% of the chairs in the international sample expressing agreement that this is a challenge they will face

within the next five years. Based upon the data presented in Tables 23 and 24, the increased concern with external regulation appears to be relative to state and regional accrediting bodies and not the federal government. Again, in both samples there is a tendency towards neutrality on this issue rather than the expression of disagreement.

Table 27  
 QI0050Q Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing Involvement of the U.S. Government  
 in Establishing Work Conditions in Colleges

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	10	5.3	5.3	5.3	21.0 36.6 42.4
2) Agree	37	19.7	19.7	25.0	
3) Neutral	81	43.1	43.1	68.1	
4) Disagree	45	23.9	23.9	92.0	
5) Strongly Disagree	15	8.0	8.0	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

As to the challenge of adapting to employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work from home, there is a significant increase in the percent of department chairs who agree or strongly agree with this issue as a challenge to their departments. The regional sample reports an agreement level of 57.4% which is almost 25% higher than the distribution in the international sample (32.7%). The regional sample is also less likely to hold a neutral position on this issue or to disagree with this as an issue of concern. Although overall this adaptation is not a strong issue of concern for the chairs, there is a significant shift in this data from the international survey ten years earlier. The issue of employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work from home is probably becoming more significant given

the increase in distance education course offerings, a significant challenge that was identified in Table 17. This shift may be indicative of the cultural lag within the community college setting in which ideas about the organization of education lag behind the technology of delivering education.

Table 28  
 QI0050R Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Adapting to Employees who Utilize Electronic Communication Systems  
 and who Work at Home

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	25	13.3	13.3	13.3	32.7
2) Agree	83	44.1	44.1	57.4	
3) Neutral	48	25.5	25.5	83.0	35.2
4) Disagree	27	14.4	14.4	97.3	32.1
5) Strongly Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Once again, with respect to a technology issue, a strong level of consensus exists among the chairs in both samples that the increasing use of computers in the classroom is a challenge they will face within their units over the next five years. Over 83% of the regional sample and 87% of the international sample identified this challenge as one they will face. Additionally, there is a pronounced showing in the “Strongly agree” category for the regional sample with 41.0% of the respondents specifying strong concurrence. In the regional sample, fewer than 3% of the respondents express disagreement with this issue, and in the international sample fewer than 4% express disagreement with this issue. The increasing use of computers within the classroom is perceived to be a significant issue that chairs face and will face during the next five years.

Table 29  
 QI0050S Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing the Use of Computers in the Classroom

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	77	41.0	41.0	41.0	87.0
2) Agree	80	42.6	42.6	83.5	
3) Neutral	26	13.8	13.8	97.3	9.3
4) Disagree	4	2.1	2.1	99.5	3.8
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

Regarding the challenge of responding to the needs of a wider range of students, a high level of consensus is again noted between the regional and international samples. Almost 90% of the regional sample and 88.6% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this is a challenge that they face. There is a marked showing in both the “Strongly agree” category with 39.4% of the regional respondents selecting this response and 50.5% of the regional sample selecting “Agree” as their categorical response. Responding to the needs of a wider range of students is a significant challenge for chairs in both samples.

Table 30a  
 QI0050T Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Responding to the Needs of a Wider Range of Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	74	39.4	39.4	39.4	88.6
2) Agree	95	50.5	50.5	89.9	
3) Neutral	17	9.0	9.0	98.9	8.4
4) Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	3.0
5) Strongly Disagree	0	0	0		
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Because responding to the needs of a wider range of students is a diversity issue, a demographic analysis of the sample respondents was completed for this challenge. The same format used in Tables 18b (gender equity) and 19b (cultural diversity), a comparison of mean scores by gender, race, age, and gender/race, is presented in Table 30b. Although across the categories of gender, race, age, and gender/race there is a high level of agreement that this is a challenge of significance for department chairs, similar patterns by each of the demographic characteristics were found in the two earlier tables. Female chairs show a higher level of agreement that responding to the needs of a wider range of students is a significant challenge that they face (mean = 1.58). The mean value for male chairs was 1.87. Minority chairs show stronger agreement on this issue than white chairs with respective means of 1.22 and 1.77. Once again, the youngest chairs, under 30 years of age (n=2), express the strongest level of agreement that this is a challenge they will face with a mean value of 1.00. The remaining age categories cluster relatively close together with the exception of the chairs aged 65 and over who show the lowest level of agreement on the significance of this issue. However, even the oldest chairs

acknowledge the issue as one that they will face within their departments. The analysis of gender by race duplicates the earlier pattern of minority females expressing the highest level of agreement on this issue (mean = 1.08), followed by minority males (mean = 1.50), followed by white females (mean = 1.65), and last, white males (mean = 1.89). Once again, race, age, and gender influence chairs' perceptions of the significance of challenges that they face within their units.

Table 30b  
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Responding to the Needs of a Wider Range of Students by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF A WIDER RANGE OF STUDENTS CHALLENGE
Gender:		
Female	98	1.58
Male	90	1.87
Race:		
Minority	18	1.22
White	170	1.77
Age:		
Under 30	2	1.00
30-44	32	1.66
45-54	84	1.70
55-64	62	1.76
65 and over	8	2.00
Gender by Race:		
Minority Female	12	1.08
White Female	86	1.65
Minority Male	6	1.50

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF A WIDER RANGE OF STUDENTS CHALLENGE
White Male	84	1.89

In response to the challenge of obtaining financial resources, across both the regional and international samples, the data shows a high level of agreement that this is a significant challenge faced within their units. Seventy-five percent of regional chairs agreed or strongly agreed with this challenge, and 81.1% of the international sample expressed agreement regarding this issue. The 6% difference in respondent agreement between the international and regional samples is expressed within the regional sample as a neutral attitude toward the issue rather than as disagreement with the issue. Once again, the regional sample was surveyed just months prior to significant state budget cuts for higher education and thus may express significantly higher levels of agreement on this issue if surveyed today.

Table 31  
 QI0050U Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Obtaining Financial Resources

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	61	32.4	32.4	32.4	81.1 12.3 6.7 100.1
2) Agree	80	42.6	42.6	75.0	
3) Neutral	35	18.6	18.6	93.6	
4) Disagree	9	4.8	4.8	98.4	
5) Strongly Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		



With respect to the topic of attracting new student populations, 84% of the regional sample and 73.2% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this represents a challenge to their unit. The disparity of approximately 10% between the two distributions can be explained by a shifting from the neutral category in the international sample to an increase in agreement in the regional sample. Although the level of disagreement is about the same in the two samples, the regional sample is less likely to remain neutral on the issue of attracting new student populations. This finding is consistent with other measures of diversity within the study in which strong consensus exists regarding the importance of addressing issues of cultural diversity (Table 19) and responding to the needs of a wider range of students (Table 30).

Table 32  
 QI0050V Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Attracting New Student Populations

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	79	42.0	42.0	42.0	73.2
2) Agree	79	42.0	42.0	84.0	
3) Neutral	24	12.8	12.8	96.8	18.4
4) Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	99.5	8.3
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

As will be discussed later in this report, the challenge of maintaining program quality is the number one ranked challenge in both the regional and the international sample with 98.9% of the regional sample and 97.3% of the international sample expressing agreement with this statement. This finding is significant not only because of the high level of consensus, but also in the midst of multiple challenges. The chair or head seems to remain committed to and focused on the primary task of an educational institution, to provide a quality educational program. This

observation is further reflected in that almost three-quarters of department chairs in the regional sample strongly agreed that this is a challenge that they face. None of the respondents in the regional sample maintained a neutral position on this issue. Two respondents disagreed that this was a challenge that they would face in the next five years.

Table 33  
 QI0050W Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Maintaining Program Quality

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	138	73.4	73.4	73.4	97.3  1.8  0.8  99.9
2) Agree	48	25.5	25.5	98.9	
3) Neutral	0	0	0	98.9	
4) Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	
5) Strongly Disagree	0	0	0		
Total	188	100.0	100.0		

Once again, with respect to an issue of academic quality, strengthening the curriculum, there is a very high level of agreement among the chairs in both samples that this is a challenge that they face. Slightly over 97% of the regional sample and 94.0% of the international sample agree or strongly agree with this item. Within the regional sample, respondents demonstrate a high level of commitment to this issue with 61.2% of the sample strongly agreeing that strengthening the curriculum is a challenge within their units. Only two individuals remain neutral on this issue, two disagree, and one individual strongly disagrees.

Table 34  
 QI0050X Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Strengthening the Curriculum

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	115	61.2	61.2	61.2	94.0
2) Agree	68	36.2	36.2	97.3	
3) Neutral	2	1.1	1.1	98.4	4.9
4) Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	99.5	1.2
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

Again, with respect to an issue of academic quality, maintaining a high quality faculty, a high level of consensus exists in both samples that this challenge is significant. The percentages of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge are 96.3% for the regional survey and 95.4% for the international study. Almost 72% of the regional sample expresses strong agreement that this is a significant challenge for their units. Few respondents assumed a neutral position or voiced disagreement on this issue.

Table 35  
 QI0050Y Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Maintaining a High-quality Faculty

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	135	71.8	71.8	71.8	95.4
2) Agree	46	24.5	24.5	96.3	
3) Neutral	3	1.6	1.6	97.9	2.7
4) Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	99.5	1.9
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Concern with the issue of maintaining the physical plant is consistent across both studies with 66.0% of the regional sample and 66.5% of the international sample expressing agreement or strong agreement that this factor is a challenge for their units. Although maintenance is not a highly significant challenge in either study, the concern does remain constant over time.

Table 36  
 QI0050Z Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Maintaining the Physical Plant

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	41	21.8	21.8	21.8	66.5
2) Agree	83	44.1	44.1	66.0	
3) Neutral	37	19.7	19.7	85.6	17.6
4) Disagree	18	9.6	9.6	95.2	15.9
5) Strongly Disagree	9	4.8	4.8	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

An analysis by demographic characteristics of the sample was completed for the challenge of maintaining the physical plant. The findings which are reported in Table 36b show that based upon a comparison of mean values for this challenge, male respondents express greater concern with this issue than female respondents with respective mean values of 2.17 and 2.45. With respect to age, the greatest level of concern is expressed in the 45-54 age category with a mean value of 2.14. Minority respondents also expressed greater concern with maintaining the physical plant than white respondents with corresponding mean values are 2.11 and 2.34. Once again, the influence of demographics is seen in the identification of unit challenges.

Table 36b  
Comparison of Means Regarding Challenge of Maintaining the Physical Plant  
by Gender, Race, and Age

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN VALUE ON MAINTAINING THE PHYSICAL PLANT CHALLENGE
Gender:		
Female	98	2.46
Male	90	2.17
Race:		
Minority	18	2.11
White	170	2.34
Age:		
Under 30	2	3.00
30-44	32	2.59
45-54	84	2.14
55-64	62	2.34
65 and over	8	2.63

When asked their level of agreement on addressing issues of training for senior faculty, slightly over 63% of both samples agreed that this issue represented a departmental challenge. The distribution within the neutral and disagreement categories is consistent across the samples. The issue of professional development for senior faculty is not perceived to be a highly significant issue for department chairs in either sample.

Table 37  
 QI0050AA Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Addressing Issues of Training for Senior Faculty

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	33	17.6	17.6	17.6	63.3
2) Agree	87	46.3	46.3	63.8	
3) Neutral	50	26.6	26.6	90.4	25.3
4) Disagree	12	6.4	6.4	96.8	11.4
5) Strongly Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

The use of quality management techniques is also not a highly significant issue for department chairs in either sample with 47.3% of the regional sample and 58.6% of the international sample agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge. However, comparatively there is an 11.3% decline in the level of agreement by the regional sample that is probably reflective of a shift in focus from management philosophies promoted ten years earlier.

Table 38  
 QI0050BB Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Using Quality Management Techniques

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL
--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------	----------------

			Percent	Percent	SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	26	13.8	13.8	13.8	58.6
2) Agree	63	33.5	33.5	47.3	
3) Neutral	65	34.6	34.6	81.9	29.8
4) Disagree	20	10.6	10.6	92.6	11.6
5) Strongly Disagree	14	7.4	7.4	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

In response to the challenge of addressing accountability issues, 79.3% of the regional sample and 80.6% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this is a challenge that they will face within their units. The agreement with this challenge is consistent with the shift towards increasing accountability for educational quality that is experienced both internationally and over time within education.

Table 39  
 QI0050CC Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Addressing Accountability Issues

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	51	27.1	27.1	27.1	80.6
2) Agree	98	52.1	52.1	79.3	
3) Neutral	32	17.0	17.0	96.3	15.3
4) Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	99.5	4.1
5) Strongly Disagree	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

The issue of serving at-risk students is perceived to be a relatively significant challenge for chairs in both samples with 74% of the chairs agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge. The distribution across the neutral and disagreement categories is also consistent

across the samples. This finding is consistent with other issues of student diversity found within the study.

Table 40  
 QI0050DD Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Serving At-risk Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	53	28.2	28.2	28.2	74.1
2) Agree	87	46.3	46.3	74.5	
3) Neutral	37	19.7	19.7	94.1	20.5
4) Disagree	11	5.9	5.9	100.0	5.5
5) Strongly Disagree	0	0	0		
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.1

On the topic of developing efficient advisory and registration systems and procedures, once again there is a consistent level of agreement with this challenge across samples with 71.3% of the regional sample and 72.3% of the international sample agreeing or strongly agreeing with this challenge. The distribution is also consistent across the neutral and disagreement categories. Efficiency is a challenge of relatively high significance for the chairs in both samples.

Table 41  
 QI0050EE Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Developing Efficient Advisory and Registration Systems and Procedures

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	58	30.9	30.9	30.9	72.3
2) Agree	76	40.4	40.4	71.3	
3) Neutral	34	18.1	18.1	89.4	17.3



4) Disagree	15	8.0	8.0	97.3	
5) Strongly Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0	10.3
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

Once again, when confronted with an issue of educational quality such as employing new teaching techniques in the classroom, chairs in both samples reveal a high level of agreement that pedagogy represents a significant challenge to their units. Almost 90% of both samples agree or strongly agree. These chairs are particularly focused on providing high quality educational experiences within the classroom. Less than 2% of the chairs in either sample expressed disagreement with this challenge.

Table 42  
 QI0050FF Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Employing New Teaching Techniques

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTERNATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	66	35.1	35.1	35.1	
2) Agree	103	54.8	54.8	89.9	89.0
3) Neutral	16	8.5	8.5	98.4	9.1
4) Disagree	1	.5	.5	98.9	
5) Strongly Disagree	2	1.1	1.1	100.0	1.9
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

With respect to identifying unit leadership potential from among the faculty, 77.7% of the regional sample and 75.7% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that identification is a challenge. However, within the regional sample almost twice as many chairs stated

agreement rather than strong agreement with this challenge. Across both samples future leadership is considered to be a somewhat important challenge.

Table 43  
 QI0050GG Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Identifying Unit Leadership Potential from Among Faculty

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	45	23.9	23.9	23.9	
2) Agree	101	53.7	53.7	77.7	75.7
3) Neutral	26	13.8	13.8	91.5	17.4
4) Disagree	13	6.9	6.9	98.4	
5) Strongly Disagree	3	1.6	1.6	100.0	6.9
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

Providing leadership training for faculty and chairs, an issue of professional development, is perceived to be a challenge by 73.4% of the regional sample and 71.6% of the international sample. Across both samples it is an issue of relative importance.

Table 44  
 QI0050HH Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Providing Leadership Training for Faculty and Chairs

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	53	28.2	28.2	28.2	71.6
2) Agree	85	45.2	45.2	73.4	
3) Neutral	32	17.0	17.0	90.4	19.7
4) Disagree	13	6.9	6.9	97.3	8.7
5) Strongly Disagree	5	2.7	2.7	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		100.0

When considering the increasing emphasis on the transfer program, 58.5% of the regional sample and 57.6% of the international sample agree or strongly agree that this is a challenge they will face in the next five years. The regional sample is slightly less likely to take a neutral position on this challenge and more likely to disagree that it is a challenge. Increasing emphasis on the transfer program is not perceived to be a significant challenge in either sample.

Table 45  
 QI0050II Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years:  
 Increasing Emphasis on the Transfer Program

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	33	17.6	17.6	17.6	57.6
2) Agree	77	41.0	41.0	58.5	
3) Neutral	49	26.1	26.1	84.6	30.5
4) Disagree	19	10.1	10.1	94.7	11.8
5) Strongly Disagree	10	5.3	5.3	100.0	
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

When asked about utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc., slightly over 70% of both samples agreed that professional development was a significant challenge that their units would face. Among the regional sample, the respondents were more than twice as likely to agree rather than strongly agree with the challenge. Utilizing more techniques is an issue of faculty professional development, and although it is perceived to be somewhat of a challenge, it is not a highly rated challenge for chairs. There is also a slight increase in the percent of chairs who disagree that faculty development represents a challenge to their units.

Table 46  
 QI0050JJ Expected Unit Challenges in the Next Five Years: Utilizing More Faculty Development Techniques such as Classroom Assessment, Peer Coaching, etc.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	INTER-NATIONAL SURVEY PERCENT
1) Strongly Agree	39	20.7	20.7	20.7	
2) Agree	94	50.0	50.0	70.7	71.3
3) Neutral	39	20.7	20.7	91.5	22.4
4) Disagree	10	5.3	5.3	96.8	
5) Strongly Disagree	6	3.2	3.2	100.0	6.2
Total	188	100.0	100.0		99.9

To further assess the data regarding challenges that unit chairs face over the next five years, Table 47 provides a rank ordering of the mean scores for each of the challenges for both the regional and international samples, as well as a total mean weight across all 36 challenges. The total mean weight was calculated by summing the means for each individual challenge for

each of the samples. A lower mean weight would be indicative of a higher challenge load. This table allows for the observation of shifts in challenge rank over time and across samples and provides a measure of the relative cumulative weight of the total challenge load that chairs perceive they face.

The rank ordering of the first four items, maintaining program quality, maintaining high quality faculty, strengthening the curriculum, and changing the curriculum in response to technological development remains the same across the two samples. The regional sample ranks keeping pace with the cost of technology four ranks (rank 5) above the international sample (rank 9); however, both samples rank securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment as their sixth most pressing challenge. Possibly money for technology costs was more readily available to the international sample. The international sample is somewhat more concerned with responding to a wider range of students (rank 5) than the regional sample that ranks this challenge seventh.

A significant shift occurs across the two samples with respect to offering courses through distance education. The regional sample ranks this challenge as the eighth most pressing challenge; the corresponding rank in the international sample is 30. This marked difference is probably reflective of the tremendous expansion in distance education over the ten-year period since the international survey. The ranks for employing new teaching techniques are close between the regional and international sample with respective ranks of 9 and 8. The regional sample is more concerned with attracting new student populations (rank 10) than the international sample (rank 14); however, they are less concerned with the increasing use of computers in the classroom (rank 11) than the international sample which ranks this item at 7.

The regional sample is more concerned with identifying unit leadership potential from among faculty than the international sample, respective ranks of 12 and 15. This shift may be reflective of the aging of the faculty population and the need to find replacements for current chairs as they approach retirement. The two samples are relatively close on their rankings of addressing accountability issues although the regional sample is slightly less concerned with this issue with respective ranks of 13 and 11. The regional sample is also less concerned with obtaining financial resources (rank 14); the international sample rank is 10.

The regional sample is slightly more concerned with accommodating cultural diversity, ranking this challenge at 15; the corresponding rank for the international sample is 17. Both groups rank providing leadership training for faculty and chairs at 16. The international sample is significantly more concerned with reallocating monies because of financial constraints (rank 12) than the regional sample that ranks this item at 17. Both samples rank developing efficient advisory and registration procedures at 18. The international sample is significantly more concerned with the issue of serving at-risk students, ranking this challenge thirteenth compared with the regional ranking of 19.

Both samples have similar ranks for the challenges of utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc. (regional rank 20, international rank 19) and maintaining the physical plant (regional rank 21, international rank 20). However, the regional sample is significantly more concerned with the increasing influence of state coordinating boards (rank 22) than the international sample that ranks this item at 29. A fair amount of disparity occurs with respect to their ranking of increasing the use of business and advisory committees with the regional sample ranking this item at 23 and the international sample ranking it at 27. The apparent concern within the regional sample with external

regulation is also evidenced in the ranking of the increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies; corresponding ranks are 24 for the regional sample and 31 for the international sample.

Both the international and regional samples rank their concern with increasing technical preparation in high schools at 25. However, the international sample is more concerned with addressing issues of training for senior faculty, ranking this challenge at 21; the corresponding rank for the regional sample is 26. Both samples have similar ranks for the challenge of increasing emphasis on the transfer program; the regional rank is 27 and the international rank is 26. The regional sample expresses more concern with the issue of adapting to employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work from home (rank 28) than the international sample (rank 34).

The international sample is more concerned with the issues of increasing human relations training and promoting greater gender equity. The corresponding ranks for these items within the international sample are 22 and 23 respectively. The respective ranks within the regional sample for these items are 29 and 30. The international sample also ranks the challenge of increasing general education requirements slightly higher than the regional sample. For the international sample, the mean rank is 28, and the regional mean rank is 31. Both samples rank the challenge of internationalizing the curriculum at 32.

When ranking the use of quality management techniques, the two samples display a fair amount of disparity. The international sample ranks this challenge as more significant (rank 24) compared with the regional sample rank of 33. The remaining three challenges, increasing teaching programs sponsored by companies (regional rank 34, international rank 33), decreasing growth in transfer programs (regional rank 35, international rank 36), and increasing

involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges (regional rank 36, international rank 35) are in close proximity across the two samples.

It is also interesting to note from this table that the top three challenges for both samples have mean scores of less than 1.5 indicating strong agreement among the respondents on these issues. The top twelve issues for the regional sample have a mean score of less than 2.00, again, indicating a high level of agreement among the respondents that these are challenges that they will face within their units over the next five years. The top 30 of 36 issues have a mean score of less than 2.5 indicating that the sample as a whole is in more agreement on the challenge than neutral or disagreeing on the challenge. Only one challenge, increasing involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges, has a mean score above a 3.0 that would indicate more than a neutral position on the issue. Overall, the regional sample perceives a multitude of challenges facing their units within the next five years.

A tally of the mean scores across all 36 challenges was completed to assess the magnitude of the challenge weight across the regional and international samples. The total mean weight for the regional sample is 76.71. The corresponding weight for the international sample is 79.04. A lower mean score would be indicative of greater agreement that these issues are challenges for chairs. The regional sample perceives more challenges ahead of them than the international sample did 10 years earlier. It is also possible to calculate a relative mean score across the 36 challenges for each of the samples by dividing the total mean by 36. For the regional sample, the average mean score is 2.13 indicating a significant agreement with the challenges. The corresponding average mean score for the international sample is 2.19. Across both samples, the respondents are more likely to express agreement with the challenges than to hold a neutral or disagreement position.



Table 47  
 Rank Ordering of Mean Scores for Perceived Challenges Faced by Department Chairs  
 (Most challenging to least challenging)

RANK REGIONAL SAMPLE	RANK INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE	SPECIFIC CHALLENGE	MEAN REGIONAL SAMPLE	MEAN INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE
1	1	Maintaining program quality	1.29	1.32
2	2	Maintaining high quality faculty	1.35	1.37
3	3	Strengthening the curriculum	1.44	1.47
4	4	Changing the curriculum in response to technological development	1.55	1.51
5	9	Keeping pace with the increasing cost of technology	1.66	1.79
6	6	Securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical programs	1.71	1.73
7	5	Responding to the needs of a wider range of students	1.72	1.69
8	30	Offering courses through distance education	1.78	2.57
9	8	Employing new teaching techniques	1.78	1.74
10	14	Attracting new student populations	1.79	2.06
11	7	Increasing the use of computers in the classroom	1.80	1.74
12	15	Identifying unit leadership potential from among the faculty	1.98	2.06
13	11	Addressing accountability issues	2.01	1.94
14	10	Obtaining financial	2.03	1.84

RANK REGIONAL SAMPLE	RANK INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE	SPECIFIC CHALLENGE	MEAN REGIONAL SAMPLE	MEAN INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE
		resources		
15	17	Accommodating cultural diversity	2.07	2.10
16	16	Providing leadership training for faculty and chairs	2.09	2.10
17	12	Reallocating monies to programs because of financial constraints	2.11	1.96
18	18	Developing efficient advisory and registration systems and procedures	2.11	2.11
19	13	Serving at-risk students	2.12	2.04
20	19	Utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc.	2.20	2.12
21	20	Maintaining the physical plant	2.22	2.27
22	29	Increasing influence and impact of state coordinating boards	2.23	2.50
23	27	Increasing the use of business and industry advisory committees	2.25	2.41
24	31	Increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies	2.31	2.67
25	25	Encouraging more technical preparation in high schools	2.31	2.36
26	21	Addressing issues of training for senior faculty	2.36	2.29
27	26	Increasing emphasis on the	2.38	2.38

RANK REGIONAL SAMPLE	RANK INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE	SPECIFIC CHALLENGE	MEAN REGIONAL SAMPLE	MEAN INTER-NATIONAL SAMPLE
		transfer program		
28	34	Adapting to employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work from home	2.42	3.02
29	22	Increasing human relations training	2.45	2.32
30	23	Promoting greater gender equity	2.49	2.35
31	28	Increasing general education requirements	2.51	2.49
32	32	Internationalizing the curriculum	2.64	2.79
33	24	Using quality management techniques (e.g., TQM)	2.68	2.35
34	33	Increasing teaching programs sponsored by specific companies	2.78	2.83
35	36	Decreasing growth in transfer programs	2.99	3.42
36	35	Increasing involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges	3.10	3.33
Total Mean Weight			76.71	79.04

To further assess the magnitude of the challenge load faced by chairs and to provide analysis of the challenge load by demographic characteristics of the regional sample, an index of challenges was created for the regional sample. The possible range for the sample is 144 with a minimum score of 36 (the respondent strongly agrees with all 36 challenges) and a maximum score of 180 (the respondent strongly disagrees with all 36 challenges). The actual range of the

scores is 91 with a minimum score of 36 and a maximum score of 127. The measures of central tendency for the index are a mean score of 76.70; the median is 77.00; and the mode is 88.00.

Table 48 provides the frequency distribution for the challenge index by quartiles. Forty-eight individuals had index scores of 67 or less with a mean score per challenge for this quartile of 1.86, indicating a high level of agreement across the 36 challenges. The second quartile shows that 95 individuals had an index score of 77 or less. The mean score per challenge for this group is 2.13 and is still indicative of a high level of agreement across the 36 challenges. One hundred and forty-two individuals had index scores of 87 or less with a mean score per challenge of 2.41. These data indicate that three-quarters of the sample are more closely aligned with a position of agreement on the challenges than a position of neutrality or disagreement. The fourth quartile shows that 100% of the sample (N=188) had an index score of 127 or less and a mean score per challenge of 3.52. It is only in the fourth quartile that one sees a strong showing of neutrality and a very slight shift towards disagreement with the challenges.

Table 48  
Index of Challenge Scores by Quartile

QUARTILE	INDEX SCORE	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN SCORE PER CHALLENGE BY QUARTILE
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	67.00	48	1.86
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	77.00	95	2.13
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	87.00	142	2.41
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	127.00	188	3.52

Demographic analysis of the challenge index by gender, race, age, and gender/race is provided in Table 49. Once again a recode of the race variable has been employed that collapses all minority group members into one group coded as “1” and labeled as “Minority.” Individuals

who self-identified as “White” are coded as “2” and labeled “White.” Once again, females express more agreement on the challenges than males with corresponding mean index scores of 75.18 and 78.36 respectively. Minority chairs express more concern than white chairs. The mean index score for minority chairs is 61.28 and 78.34 for white chairs. Across the table, the two chairs under the age of 30, both white females, express the highest level of concern, by age, with the challenges (mean score = 68.00). The oldest chairs are the least likely, across all groups, to express agreement with the challenges. The mean index score for chairs aged 65 or over is 80.88. The remaining age categories cluster around the mean value for the challenge index of 76.70. As seen previously with specific demographic analyses, minority females express the highest level of concern with the challenges (mean index score = 58.75), followed by minority males (mean index score = 66.33), followed by white females (mean index score = 77.48), and white males express the least concern, by race and gender, with a mean index score of 79.21.

Table 49  
Demographic Analysis of Challenge Index by Gender, Race, Age, and Gender/Race

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN SCORE ON CHALLENGE INDEX
Gender:		
Female	98	75.18
Male	90	78.36
Race:		
Minority	18	61.28
White	170	78.34
Age:		
Under 30	2	68.00
30-44	32	76.66
45-54	84	77.39
55-64	62	75.53
65 and over	8	80.88

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	N	MEAN SCORE ON CHALLENGE INDEX
Gender by Race:		
Minority Female	12	58.75
White Female	86	77.48
Minority Male	6	66.33
White Male	84	79.21

### *Challenge Scales*

The final section of the data analysis creates a series of scales based upon the results of a factor analysis completed by the international study. This section of the report accepts not only the results of the factor analysis, but also the conceptual identification and definition of each of the factors. Within the international study, nine factors related to challenges were identified and defined. These nine factors are faculty challenges, student challenges, external regulation challenges, technology challenges, program quality challenges, external accountability challenges, financial resource challenges, curriculum challenges, and international accountability challenges. A tabular presentation of each factor and the corresponding variables that loaded on each of the factors is presented in Table 50.

Table 50  
Individual Challenges and Factors Identified and Defined by International Survey

FACTOR	ASSOCIATED CHALLENGES
Faculty Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Addressing issues of training for senior faculty.</li> <li>2. Employing new teaching techniques.</li> <li>3. Identifying unit leadership potential from among the faculty.</li> <li>4. Providing leadership training for faculty and chairs.</li> <li>5. Utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc.</li> </ol>

FACTOR	ASSOCIATED CHALLENGES
Student Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offering courses through distance education.</li> <li>2. Promoting greater gender equity.</li> <li>3. Accommodating cultural diversity.</li> <li>4. Responding to the needs of a wider range of students.</li> <li>5. Serving at-risk students.</li> <li>6. Attracting new student populations.</li> </ol>
External Relations Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decreasing growth in transfer programs.</li> <li>2. Encouraging more technical preparation in high schools.</li> <li>3. Increasing the use of business and industry advisory committees.</li> <li>4. Increasing teaching programs sponsored by specific companies.</li> <li>5. Adapting to employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work from home.</li> </ol>
Technology Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changing the curriculum in response to technological development.</li> <li>2. Keeping pace with the increasing cost of technology.</li> <li>3. Securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment.</li> <li>4. Increasing the use of computers in the classroom.</li> </ol>
Program Quality Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintaining program quality.</li> <li>2. Strengthening the curriculum.</li> <li>3. Maintaining a high quality faculty.</li> </ol>
External Accountability Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing influence and impact of state coordinating boards.</li> <li>2. Increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies.</li> <li>3. Increasing involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges.</li> </ol>
Financial Resources Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obtaining financial resources.</li> <li>2. Maintaining the physical plant.</li> <li>3. Reallocating monies to programs because of financial</li> </ol>

FACTOR	ASSOCIATED CHALLENGES
	constraints.
Curriculum Challenges	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing general education requirements.</li> <li>2. Increasing human relations training.</li> <li>3. Internationalizing the curriculum.</li> <li>4. Increasing emphasis in the transfer program.</li> </ol>
International Accountability Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using quality management techniques (e.g. TQM)</li> <li>2. Addressing accountability issues.</li> <li>3. Developing efficient advisory and registration systems and procedures.</li> </ol>

A scale was created for each individual factor by summing the scores of the respondents across the associated variables and then dividing by the number of variables. Scales were chosen in lieu of indexes because of the variation in the number of variables that loaded on each of the factors. A scale score yields a standardized means of comparison across scales and allows for the rank ordering of the mean scale scores. Table 51 provides a rank ordering of the means for each of the scales, as well as an estimate of the mean value for each of the factors from the international survey. Summing the mean values for each associated scale variable and then dividing by the number of variables made this calculation for the international survey. In essence it is a mean of the means for the variables that loaded on a particular factor within the international study.

Maintaining program quality is the number one ranked challenge scale in both samples with mean scores of 1.36 for the regional sample and 1.39 for the international sample. Across samples and over time, department chairs remain focused on classroom issues of maintaining program quality, strengthening the curriculum, and maintaining a high quality faculty. This finding is consistent with the emphasis on teaching in the community college setting.



Chairs in both samples identify technology issues as the second highest-ranking issue cluster with corresponding mean scores of 1.68 and 1.69. Even with the passing of a ten year time period between the surveys, issues such as changing the curriculum in response to technological development, keeping pace with the increasing cost of technology, securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment, and increasing the use of computers in the classroom remain high on the list of challenges faced by chairs.

A significant disparity exists between the samples with respect to their ranking of the student challenge cluster. The regional sample ranks student challenges third with a mean scale score of 1.98. This cluster ranks sixth for the international sample with a mean scale score of 2.14. The regional sample agrees somewhat more strongly that the issues of offering courses through distance education, promoting greater gender equity, accommodating cultural diversity, responding to the needs of a wider range of students, serving at-risk students, and attracting new student populations are significant issues that they face within their units. Although there is not a great difference in the mean scale scores between the samples, the difference in rank is driven primarily by concern with offering distance education courses and attracting new student populations, rather than diversity issues. In fact, on two of the diversity issues the international sample has lower mean scores and has only minimally higher means on the other two issues. The differences in the mean scores for offering distance education courses and attracting new student populations are significant (Table 47).

Both the regional sample and the international sample rank financial resources challenges at four. In both samples, issues of obtaining financial resources, maintaining the physical plant, and reallocating monies to programs because of financial constraints of some significance with a mean score for the regional sample of 2.13 and 2.02 for the international sample. As discussed

earlier, the survey of the regional sample occurred just months prior to significant state budget cuts for higher education. This cluster might be ranked significantly higher if the survey were conducted today.

Again, some disparity exists in the ranking of the faculty challenge cluster. The regional sample ranks faculty challenges at 5 with a mean scale score of 2.15. The international sample ranks this cluster at 3 with a mean scale score of 1.99. The challenges of addressing issues of training for senior faculty, employing new teaching techniques, identifying unit leadership potential from among the faculty, providing leadership training for faculty and chairs, and utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc. appear to be more significant for the international sample than the regional sample.

The international sample is also more concerned with issues of international accountability than the regional sample with respective ranks of 5 and 6 and corresponding means of 2.13 and 2.24. The challenges associated with this cluster are using quality management techniques (e.g. TQM), addressing accountability issues, and developing efficient advisory and registration systems and procedures. The difference in the rank of this cluster and the respective mean scores is driven primarily by the higher ranking of the use of quality management techniques in the international sample. The individual mean score for this item in the international sample (Table 47) is 2.68; the corresponding mean for the regional sample is 2.35. This change may well be reflective of the ebb and flow in the popularity of particular management techniques.

Both samples rank curriculum challenges at seven. This cluster included increasing general education requirements, increasing human relations training, internationalizing the

curriculum, and increasing emphasis on the transfer program. Both samples have a mean score of 2.50 for this cluster indicating a movement toward a neutral attitude on these issues.

The final two clusters, external accountability challenges and external relations challenges, have reversed ranks between the two samples. The regional sample ranks external accountability challenges at 8 and external relations challenges at 9. The reverse is true for the international sample. However, there is significant disparity in the mean scale scores for these two challenge clusters between the samples. The regional sample has a mean scale score on external accountability issues of 2.52 compared with the international sample mean of 2.83. The issues related to this cluster are increasing influence and impact of state coordinating boards, increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies, and increasing involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges. Returning to Table 47, the regional sample reports mean scores on each of these three items of 2.33, 2.31, and 3.10 respectively. The corresponding means for the international sample are 2.50, 2.67, and 3.33. It is evident from these mean scores, as well as the mean scores for this challenge cluster, that the regional sample is significantly more concerned with issues of external accountability than the international sample was ten years earlier, particularly the influence of accrediting bodies and state coordinating boards.

Table 51  
Rank Ordering of Scale Means

REGIONAL RANK	INTERNATIONAL RANK	CHALLENGE SCALE	REGIONAL SCALE MEAN	ESTIMATE OF INTERNATIONAL MEAN
1	1	Program Quality Challenges	1.36	1.39
2	2	Technology Challenges	1.68	1.69

REGIONAL RANK	INTERNATIONAL RANK	CHALLENGE SCALE	REGIONAL SCALE MEAN	ESTIMATE OF INTERNATIONAL MEAN
3	6	Student Challenges	1.98	2.14
4	4	Financial Resource Challenges	2.13	2.02
5	3	Faculty Challenges	2.15	1.99
6	5	International Accountability Issues Challenges	2.24	2.13
7	7	Curriculum Challenges	2.50	2.50
8	9	External Accountability Challenges	2.52	2.83
9	8	External Relations Challenges	2.57	2.81

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### *Summary*

The purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of academic leaders in community colleges that are members of the North Texas Community College Consortium regarding the challenges their units will face in the next five years. The instrument used was The International Community College Chair Survey developed in 1992. The survey yielded demographic data on the subjects that was used to facilitate analysis of their responses by age, gender, race, and education. Comparisons were made to the international survey of demographic distributions, including career characteristics and perceptions of challenges.

The population for this study consisted of first-line academic leaders typically titled department chair, division chair or dean, coordinator, or director. Data for the study were collected from the administration of the ICCCS survey that was given to 616 individuals who serve in 26 institutions that are members of the NTCCC. The demographic distribution of the regional respondents shows shifts in gender, age, education, experience, and release time. The distribution by race remains constant, as does the stability of the population. Both the regional and international samples perceive a heavy challenge load with the regional respondents perceiving a somewhat heavier load. Similarities between the two samples exist regarding program quality challenges, technology challenges, and financial challenges. The regional sample expresses greater concern about the challenges of distance education, external accountability, and student matters. The international sample showed greater concern about faculty professional development.

### *Discussion*

The demographic distribution of the sample shows a significant shift by gender among department chairs/heads. The distribution shifts from approximately 40% females and 60% males in the international sample to 52% females and 48% males in the regional sample. It is doubtful that this is a regional variation and more likely that this represents an increase in gender equity over time. Further supporting this conclusion is the finding of two predominant demographic profiles within the regional sample. The first was of a white woman, aged 45-54, (n=19) and the second profile was of a white male, aged 55-64 (n=20).

With respect to age of the chairs, the mean age by category was 45-54 years of age, but the aging of the faculty population is reflected in a 10% decline in the 30-44 years of age category and a 10% increase in the 55-64 years of age category in the regional sample when compared with the international sample. Not only are faculty getting older, but community college faculty tend to age in place as a result of the high level of career stability among faculty.

The distribution by race remains constant across the two samples with approximately 90% of both samples self-identifying their race as white. The remaining 10% of the samples are identifying their race as a minority group. Among the minority groups, African-American chairs were most strongly represented. However, within the regional sample none of the chairs identified themselves as Hispanic and this is somewhat puzzling because of the large percentage of Hispanics residing in Texas.

The educational level of the two samples remains constant with 82.9% of the international sample and 84% of the regional sample reporting graduate degrees as their highest degree held. It is noteworthy that there is almost a 2% increase in the number of doctorates in the regional sample.

With respect to career characteristics, the regional sample demonstrates a high level of faculty experience with a mode in the twenty-plus years category. However, it is also significant that for approximately 20% of the regional sample, movement into the chair position occurs either without faculty experience or during the first five years of their faculty position. This change represents an increase of 5% from the international sample and may be reflective of the need to replace retiring chairs with newer faculty.

A significant finding was the reduction in release time from teaching duties in the regional sample. This reduction was demonstrated by a decline in the percentage of chairs who reported receiving release time, as well as by a decline in the amount of course relief time granted. Although attempts were made within this analysis to flesh out the pattern relative to other measures of the chairs workload such as departmental size and ratio of full time to part-time faculty, further research is required to fully understand this pattern.

It is also impossible to identify if the reduction in release time is a regional variation or one that has occurred over time as organizations are faced with the need to “do more with less.”

The chair population in both samples is highly stable with over 50% of the respondents stating that they plan to remain in the chair position for the next five years. Almost three-quarters of both samples plan to remain at the same community college over the next five years. This information again demonstrates that not only are the chairs aging, but they are aging in place.

Analysis of the challenge data shows that chairs across both samples perceive a heavy challenge load ahead of them during the next five years; however, this load is perceived as somewhat heavier by the regional sample. The top ranked 30 of the 36 challenges presented to the respondents have a mean score of less than 2.5 indicating that the chairs are more in agreement that the specific issue represents a challenge than neutral or disagreeing with the

challenge. One possible shortcoming of the challenge questions is the wording that merely asks the respondents if a particular issue is a challenge that they will face within their departments over the next five years. Although the scaling for these variables allows for some discrimination among responses, possibly a question that asked chairs about the amount of time or effort that they spend addressing each of the specific challenges would have led to greater discrimination within the challenge data. The commitment of time, energy, and financial resources is a more valid and reliable measure of actual challenge load than the mere perception of challenges.

With respect to the rank ordering of specific challenges, it is noteworthy that both samples rank maintaining program quality, maintaining high quality faculty, strengthening the curriculum, and changing the curriculum in response to technological development as the top four challenges. This finding is significant and is consistent with the conclusion of the international study that chairs or heads are strongly focused on the classroom and the task of providing quality education to students. Further support of this finding is the number 1 ranking of Program Quality Challenges among the challenge scales. These data strongly support the contention that the community college has not lost sight of its mission.

A second major area of concern within both samples is the technology challenge: incorporating technology into the classroom, paying for the cost of technology, adapting the curriculum to technological developments, and securing and maintaining the equipment. Although these concerns remain constant across the samples and over time, a significant shift occurs with respect to other technology related issues. For the regional sample, offering distance education courses is a significant challenge that was not faced by the international sample ten years earlier. Additionally, the regional sample is more concerned with adapting to employees who use electronic communication systems and who work from home. Although both samples



are confronted with the burdens of using, paying for, and maintaining technology, the regional sample appears to face the additional challenge of how to organize the delivery of education relative to technological developments.

Although both samples rank the financial resource challenge scale fourth, the international sample mean indicates a higher level of concern with financial resources than the regional sample. However, the regional sample's concern with financial resources may increase tremendously in the future as they face significant budgetary cuts for higher education within Texas.

The regional sample appears to be more concerned with issues of external accountability, particularly with respect to the increasing influence of state coordinating boards and accrediting bodies. It is not possible to ascertain if this is a regional variation or an indication of increasing regulation over the ten-year period.

The international sample was more concerned with issues related to faculty professional development. Their higher ranking of the faculty challenges scale evidenced this, as well as a significant difference in their mean scores for this scale. The focus on faculty professional development was probably one of the reasons for completing the international study and that emphasis is reflected in the study data.

Interestingly, the regional sample was more concerned with issues related to student challenges. Four of the six challenges included in the student challenge scale relate to diversity issues; promoting greater gender equity, accommodating cultural diversity, responding to the needs of a wider range of students, and serving at-risk students. However, the mean values on the diversity issues across the samples are either very close or the international sample actually has a lower mean score. The two variables that are driving the rank for this scale are the significantly

higher levels of agreement with the challenge of offering courses through distance education and attracting new student populations found within the regional sample. Apparently the high ranking of student challenges within the regional sample is not the result of an increase in sensitivity to diversity issues.

The final finding of the study relates to a rather strong pattern by the demographics of the sample. With respect to both diversity issues and overall perception of the challenge load faced by chairs, female chairs were more concerned than male chairs, minority chairs were more concerned than white chairs, and the youngest chairs were more concerned than the older chairs. When analysis was completed by both gender and race, minority females expressed the highest level of concern, followed by minority males, followed by white females, and the least concern was expressed by white male chairs. This finding is significant in an era when diversity issues are prominent within higher education. The pattern suggests that an increase in sensitivity to the issues would be greatly enhanced by diversification of the chair population.

More specifically, the study revealed the following:

1. Gender equity has increased with a higher percentage of females in chair positions.
2. The faculty is aging and aging in place.
3. Racial or ethnic diversity in these positions remains unchanged with striking underrepresentation of Hispanics.
4. The number of chairs reporting doctorates as their highest degree has increased slightly.
5. Chairs are being replaced with younger and less experienced faculty.
6. Released time for these positions is reduced in community colleges.

7. The chair population remains stable in the intent to stay at the same college and in the chair position.
8. Program quality continues to be the prime concern of chairs.
9. Technology continues to be a challenge with increased concern about organizing and delivering education via technology, as well as managing employees who work from home using technology.
10. The regional sample revealed less concern about financial challenges, although their responses were logged prior to recent budget cuts.
11. Concern about accountability to external agencies has increased, especially to regional accrediting and regulating bodies, but not the federal government.
12. The regional sample placed somewhat less emphasis on faculty professional development.
13. The regional sample expressed more concern on student challenges regarding distance education and attracting new student populations, not on the issue of diversity as one would expect in the present climate.
14. The demographics revealed that the profile of the chair influences his/her responses to issues of diversity and perception of challenge loads with females expressing more concern than males, minorities expressing more concerns than whites, and younger chairs expressing more concern than older chairs. When factoring both race and gender, minority females expressed the highest level of concern, followed by minority males, white females, and white males.

### *Recommendations*

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Institutions should continue efforts to achieve greater diversity in the chair population. While there is a higher percentage of female chairs, only 10% identify themselves as representatives of racial minorities. In particular, the institutions in Texas should investigate the lack of Hispanic representation. Chairs should be trained to cultivate outreach plans in order to attract more minority faculty. Increasing racial diversity among the institutions' faculties will enhance sensitivity to the diverse student population.
2. As the population continues to age, efforts should be made to develop younger and less experienced faculty to assume leadership roles in preparation for the anticipated number of retirements. Institutions could encourage faculty to consider accepting chair positions by offering them leadership development programs to prepare them for the duties and responsibilities they would assume.
3. Institutions should revisit their policies of release time from teaching and consider decreasing the chairs' teaching loads so they can better manage the administrative tasks and responsibilities. Training could also support chairs in hiring and supporting the increasing numbers of adjunct faculty.
4. Given students' increased interest in distance education, chairs would benefit from the institutions' reconsidering their practices on delivering education via technology and their policies regarding faculty assignments.

5. As society and industry become more reliant on technology, chairs need more institutional support acquiring and maintaining computers to deliver the educational programs.
6. The concerns of chairs regarding the demands of external accountability could be allayed with institutional sensitivity and support in dealing with this responsibility through training on effective methods of reporting to coordinating boards and accrediting agencies.
7. Chairs' concerns about the needs of a diverse student population signal the need for a systematic approach to recruiting and supporting students with particular attention to sensitizing constituents to cultural diversity. Better trained chairs could implement sensitivity training for the faculty they supervise.
8. Given the chairs' prioritization of program quality, chairs could be supported by their institutions if the administration invested in professional development programs for faculty and chairs.

Also, based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. a further survey of the chairs to discover how many hours they invest in addressing the challenges in order to discover a more precise measure of the demands of their job
2. a survey of the chairs that asks them what training they feel they need to fulfill their duties and responsibilities more effectively
3. an analysis of other sections of the survey, particularly strategies for addressing the perceived challenges, to discover further influences on the life of a department chair.

## APPENDIX

### COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHAIRPERSON SURVEY

**Directions:** Please mark your responses directly on the sheets in pen or pencil. As you complete this survey, key terms are being utilized: “**Chair**” means comparable position/title such as coordinator, director, associate dean, or head. By “**academic unit**” we mean your department, division, area or section—the unit you administer.

#### Characteristics of Your Instructional Unit:

1. Your present position:
  - (1) Chair\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Head\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Both Chair and Head\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Coordinator/Director\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Asst/Assoc Dean\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Other\_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of the instructional unit for which you are responsible:
  - (1) Department\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Division\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Area\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Specialization \_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Other\_\_\_\_\_
3. Student headcount (full + part-time) in your unit:
  - (1) 200 or less\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) 201-400\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) 401-600\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) 601-800\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) 801-1000\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Over 1000\_\_\_\_\_
4. Full-time faculty (headcount) in your unit:
  - (1) 10 or less\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) 11-20\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) 21-30\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) 31-40\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) 41-50\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Over 50\_\_\_\_\_
5. Part-time faculty (headcount) in your unit:
  - (1) 10 or less\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) 11-20\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) 21-30\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) 31-40\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) 41-50\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Over 50\_\_\_\_\_
6. Years your unit has been operating as an instructional unit:
  - (1) Less than 1 year\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) 1-5 years\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) 6-10 years\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) 11-15 years\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) 16-20 years\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) More than 20 years\_\_\_\_\_
7. Indicate the type of degree most commonly conferred on graduates from your unit:
  - (1) Associate of Arts\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) Associate of Sciences\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Associate of Applied Sciences\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Associate of General Studies\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Diploma or Certificate\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Other\_\_\_\_\_
8. Below are listed program areas in community colleges identified by the American Association of Community Colleges. Identify the program area with the largest student enrollment in your unit:
  - (1) Liberal Arts and Sciences\_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) General Studies\_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) Nursing/Allied Health\_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) Business Admin/Accounting\_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) Office/Business Support\_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) Engr and Sci Technology\_\_\_\_\_
  - (7) Education/Human Services\_\_\_\_\_
  - (8) Fine and Performing Arts\_\_\_\_\_
  - (9) Trades/Precision Production\_\_\_\_\_
  - (10) Sciences\_\_\_\_\_
  - (11) Computer Science Data Processing\_\_\_\_\_
  - (12) Personal Services\_\_\_\_\_
  - (13) Other\_\_\_\_\_

## Characteristics of Your Campus

9. Number of full-time students (headcount) on your campus:  
(1) 2000 or less \_\_\_\_\_ (4) 6001-8000 \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) 2001-4000 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) 8001-10,000 \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) 4001-6000 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Over 10,000 \_\_\_\_\_
10. Number of part-time students (headcount) on your campus:  
(1) 2000 or less \_\_\_\_\_ (4) 6001-8000 \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) 2001-4000 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) 8001-10,000 \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) 4001-6000 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Over 10,000 \_\_\_\_\_
11. Number of full-time faculty (headcount) on your campus:  
(1) 50 or less \_\_\_\_\_ (4) 151-200 \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) 51-100 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) 201-250 \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) 101-150 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Over 250 \_\_\_\_\_
12. Number of part-time faculty (headcount) on your campus:  
(1) 50 or less \_\_\_\_\_ (4) 151-200 \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) 51-100 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) 201-250 \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) 101-150 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Over 250 \_\_\_\_\_
13. The number of chairpersons (or comparable position) on your campus:  
(1) 5 or less \_\_\_\_\_ (4) 21-30 \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) 6-10 \_\_\_\_\_ (5) 31-40 \_\_\_\_\_  
(3) 11-20 \_\_\_\_\_ (6) More than 41 \_\_\_\_\_
14. Accrediting region where your campus is located:  
(1) New England \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Southern \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Northwest \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Middle States \_\_\_\_\_ (4) North Central \_\_\_\_\_ (6) Western \_\_\_\_\_
15. The instructional focus of your campus:  
(1) Occupational/Technical \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Both Technical & Transfer \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Academic Transfer \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Other \_\_\_\_\_
16. The primary source of your funding:  
(1) Public \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Private \_\_\_\_\_  
(If you chose "Private," go to Question #20.)
17. If public, degree of funding support from the State:  
(1) 33% or less \_\_\_\_\_ (2) 34% to 66% \_\_\_\_\_ (3) 67% or more \_\_\_\_\_
18. If public, degree of funding support from the County/Region:  
(1) 33% or less \_\_\_\_\_ (2) 34% to 66% \_\_\_\_\_ (3) 67% or more \_\_\_\_\_
19. If public, degree of funding support from local/city:  
(1) 33% or less \_\_\_\_\_ (2) 34% to 66% \_\_\_\_\_ (3) 67% or more \_\_\_\_\_
20. Individual or group responsible for appointing/electing department or division chairs (or comparable position) after the search process on your campus:  
(1) Elected by faculty \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Combination of faculty/admin \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) Appointed by administration \_\_\_\_\_ (4) Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Personal Information**

21. Your age:

- (1) Under 30\_\_\_\_\_ (3) 45-54\_\_\_\_\_ (5) 65 and over\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) 30-44\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 55-64\_\_\_\_\_

22. Your gender:

- (1) Female\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Male\_\_\_\_\_

23. Your race:

- (1) Native American, Canadian Aleut, Eskimo, Inuit\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) Asian or Pacific Islander (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Asian Indian, Korean, Vietnamese, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Samoan, other Asian)\_\_\_\_\_
- (3) Black/African American\_\_\_\_\_
- (4) White\_\_\_\_\_
- (5) Hispanic/Latino\_\_\_\_\_
- (6) Other\_\_\_\_\_

24. Number of years of your professional experience working in community colleges as a faculty member:

- (1) 1-5 years\_\_\_\_\_ (3) 11-15 years\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Over 20 years\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) 6-10 years\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 16-20 years\_\_\_\_\_ (6) No experience\_\_\_\_\_

25. Number of years of your professional experience working in community colleges as a chair or head (or comparable position):

- (1) 1-5 years\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 16-20 years\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) 6-10 years\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Over 20 years\_\_\_\_\_
- (3) 11-15 years\_\_\_\_\_ (6) No experience\_\_\_\_\_

26. Number of years of your professional experience working in community colleges in other administrative positions:

- (1) 1-5 years\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 16-20 years\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) 6-10 years\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Over 20 years\_\_\_\_\_
- (3) 11-15 years\_\_\_\_\_ (6) No experience\_\_\_\_\_

27. Do you have prior experience working business/industry?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

28. Do you have prior experience working in 4-year colleges?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

29. Do you have prior experience working in K-12 schools?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

30. Do you have prior experience working in public agencies (e.g., government agencies)?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

31. Do you have prior experience working in a university or professional school?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

32. Do you have prior experience working in a vocational/technical college or institute?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_

33. Is your appointment as chair or head (or comparable position) limited to a specific term?

- (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_
- (2) No\_\_\_\_\_ (If you chose "No," go to Question # 31.)



34. If yes, length of term:  
 (1) Less than 3 years\_\_\_\_\_ (2) 3 years\_\_\_\_\_ (3) More than 3 years\_\_\_\_\_
35. If yes, is the appointment renewable?  
 (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_
36. Do you receive reassigned or released time from teaching for being a chair?  
 (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_ (If you chose "No," go to Question # 33.)
37. If yes, how much time is reassigned or released in terms of 3-credit hour semester or quarter courses?  
 (1) 1 class\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 4 classes\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) 2 classes\_\_\_\_\_ (5) 5 classes\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) 3 classes\_\_\_\_\_ (6) Full time\_\_\_\_\_
38. Do you receive a stipend for being a chair or head (or comparable position)?  
 (1) Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (2) No\_\_\_\_\_ (If you chose "No," go to Question # 35.)
39. If yes, how much (on an annual basis)?  
 (1) \$500 or less\_\_\_\_\_ (4) \$1501-2000\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) \$501-1000\_\_\_\_\_ (5) \$2001-2500\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) \$1001-1500\_\_\_\_\_ (6) Over \$2500\_\_\_\_\_
40. Your annual salary:  
 (1) \$20,000 or less\_\_\_\_\_ (4) \$60,001-80,000\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) \$20,001-40,000\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Over \$80,000\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) \$40,001-60,000\_\_\_\_\_
41. Average number of hours you work in a typical week as a chair or head (or comparable position):  
 (1) 10 or less\_\_\_\_\_ (4) 31-40\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) 11-20\_\_\_\_\_ (5) 41-50\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) 21-30\_\_\_\_\_ (6) 51-60\_\_\_\_\_
42. Highest academic degree you have achieved:  
 (1) Less than baccalaureate\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Specialist Certificate/Degree\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Baccalaureate\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Doctorate\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Masters\_\_\_\_\_
43. Your professional plans in the next five years:  
 (1) Stay at the same community college\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Move to another community college\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Move to a 4-year institution of higher education\_\_\_\_\_  
 (4) Move to a position in the non-profit, private sector\_\_\_\_\_  
 (5) Retire\_\_\_\_\_  
 (6) Other\_\_\_\_\_
44. If you plan to stay in community colleges, what are your career plans for the next five years?  
 (1) Not applicable\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Move to another administrative position\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Remain in the chair position\_\_\_\_\_ (5) Other\_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) Move to a faculty position\_\_\_\_\_
45. If you plan to move to another administrative position at a community college, what is the position to which you aspire?  
 (1) Not applicable\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Vice-pres\_\_\_\_\_ (5) System chancellor\_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Dean\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Campus president\_\_\_\_\_ (6) Other\_\_\_\_\_

## Educational Beliefs and Values

Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements. Complete this sentence, "I place a high value on . . ." in terms of your current position in the unit.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
46A. General education	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46B. Occupational/Tech education	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46C. Elective courses for students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46D. Students gaining in-depth knowledge through a major	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46E. Values education incorporated into the curriculum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46F. Opportunities for students to experience and understand leadership	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46G. Using computers in the classroom	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46H. An open admission policy for my department	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46I. An open admission policy for my college	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46J. Preparing students to meet the needs of the community	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46K. Encouraging faculty to use a wide variety of teaching approaches	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46L. Promoting and encouraging the enrollment of minority students in the college	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46M. Preparing students to meet the needs of business/industry	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46N. Limiting the influence of accrediting agencies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46O. Having selective admissions policies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46P. Courses designed with open entry/open exit	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46Q. Students completing a degree program	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46R. The role of an advisory committee in establishing the curriculum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46S. Training workers for specific companies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46T. The concept of life-long learning	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46U. Student support services	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46V. Serving at-risk students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46W. Offering courses for limited English-speaking students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
46X. Providing developmental courses to students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

## Roles

How do you perceive your role as a chairperson? Indicate the degree of importance of each role to you in your current position:

		Very Important	Important	Undecided	Not Very Important	Not Important
47A.	Visionary	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47B.	Motivator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47C.	Information disseminator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47D.	Resource allocator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47E.	Evaluator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47F.	Negotiator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47G.	Conflict resolver	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47H.	Entrepreneur	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47I.	Facilitator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47J.	Mentor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47K.	Delegator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47L.	Advocator	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47M.	Caretaker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
47N.	Planner	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

## Tasks

Below are listed tasks identified in the research literature as being performed by a chair or head (or comparable position). Indicate the degree of importance of each task to you in your current position.

		Very Important	Important	Undecided	Not Important	Very Not Important
48A.	Conduct unit meetings	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48B.	Create unit committees	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48C.	Develop long-range unit plans	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48D.	Prepare for accreditation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48E.	Create a positive work environment	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48F.	Schedule classes	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48G.	Update curriculum and courses	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48H.	Recruit and select faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48I.	Assign faculty responsibilities	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48J.	Evaluate faculty performance	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48K.	Provide feedback to faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48L.	Terminate faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48M.	Recruit students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		Very Important	Important	Undecided	Not Very Important	Not Important
48N.	Advise and counsel students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48O.	Prepare enrollment projections	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48P.	Help students register	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48Q.	Develop relationships with business and community groups	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48R.	Communicate needs to upper-level administrators	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48S.	Process paperwork & correspondence	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48T.	Prepare unit budgets	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48U.	Monitor unit budgets	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48V.	Allocate resources to priority activities	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48W.	Seek external funding	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48X.	Supervise clerical/technical staff	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48Y.	Maintain unit databases	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48Z.	Maintain facilities and equipment	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48AA.	Set personal and professional goals	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48BB.	Encourage the professional development of each faculty member	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48CC.	Promote affirmative action	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48DD.	Communicate information from administration to unit faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48EE.	Integrate unit plans with institutional plans	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
48FF.	Develop clerical/technical staff	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

### Skills

Below are listed several skills. How important are these skills to you in your present position? (Adapted from the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Assessment Center Project.)

		Very Important	Important	Undecided	Not Very Important	Not Important
49A.	Problem analysis – Ability to seek out data and information to solve a problem	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49B.	Judgment – Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49C.	Organizational ability – Ability to be organized in dealing with a volume or paperwork and heavy demands on one's time	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49D.	Decisiveness – Ability to recognize when a decision is required	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49E.	Leadership – Ability to recognize when a group requires direction	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		Very Important	Important	Undecided	Not Very Important	Not Important
49F.	Sensitivity – Ability to deal effectively with people	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49G.	Stress tolerance – Ability to perform under pressure	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49H.	Oral communication – Ability to make a clear oral presentation	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49I.	Written communication – Ability to express ideas clearly in writing	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49J.	Range of interests – Ability to discuss a variety of societal issues	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49K.	Personal motivation – Ability to show a need to achieve	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
49L.	Educational values – Ability to be receptive to new ideas and change	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

### Job Challenges

To what extent do you agree that the following are challenges you will have to face in your unit in the next five years:

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50A.	Changing the curriculum in response to technological development	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50B.	Increasing general education requirements	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50C.	Increasing human relations training	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50D.	Internationalizing the curriculum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50E.	Keeping pace with increasing cost of technology	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50F.	Reallocating monies to programs because of financial constraints	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50G.	Offering courses through distance education	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50H.	Promoting greater gender equity	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50I.	Accommodating cultural diversity	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50J.	Decreasing growth in transfer programs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50K.	Encouraging more technical preparation in high schools	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50L.	Securing and maintaining state-of-the-art technical equipment	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50M.	Increasing influence and impact of state coordinating bodies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50N.	Increasing influence and impact of accrediting bodies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50O.	Increasing the use of business and industry advisory committees	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50P.	Increasing teaching programs sponsored by specific companies	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50Q	Increasing involvement of the U. S. Government in establishing work conditions in colleges	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50R.	Adapting to employees who utilize electronic communication systems and who work at home	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50S.	Increasing the use of computers in the classroom	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50T.	Responding to needs of a wider range of students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50U.	Obtaining financial resources	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50V.	Attracting new student populations	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50W.	Maintaining program quality	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50X.	Strengthening the curriculum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50Y.	Maintaining high quality faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50Z.	Maintaining the physical plant	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50AA.	Addressing issues of training for senior faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50BB.	Using quality management techniques (e.g., TQM)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50CC,	Addressing accountability issues	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50DD.	Serving at-risk students	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50EE.	Developing efficient advisory and registration systems and procedures	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50FF.	Employing new teaching techniques	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50GG.	Identifying unit leadership potential from among the faculty	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50HH.	Providing leadership training for faculty and chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50II.	Increasing emphasis on the transfer program	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
50JJ.	Utilizing more faculty development techniques such as classroom assessment, peer coaching, etc.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

### Strategies

Below are listed several strategies useful in addressing the challenges (identified in Question 36). Indicate the extent to which you agree that the strategies would be useful to you in your current position.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
51A.	Increasing the emphasis on long-range institutional planning	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51B.	Developing unit mission statements	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51C.	Developing campus-wide mission statements	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51D.	Conducting internal/external environment statements	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
51E.	Assessing future employment trends and opportunities(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51F.	Conducting curriculum reviews to maintain relevance	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51G.	Considering different approaches for allocating financial resources	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51H.	Seeking external funding	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51I.	Assessing leadership styles and profiles of the chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51J.	Writing job descriptions for chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51K.	Participating in training academy for chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51L.	Participating in regional conferences for chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51M.	Participating in national conferences for chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51N.	Participating in formal graduate courses	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51O.	Reviewing and revising the organizational chart	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51P.	Providing training for clerical and service personnel	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51Q.	Clarifying roles and responsibilities of chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51R.	Assessing the professional development needs of chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51S.	Building stronger partnerships with business and industry	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51T.	Emphasizing the integration of unit plans with institutional plans	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51U.	Increasing staff development programs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51V.	Becoming involved in mentoring	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51W.	Balancing personal and professional activities	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
51X.	Networking with other chairs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

## REFERENCES

- Ambrose, C. M. (1988). A comparison of faculty members' and administrators' definitions of, and attitudes toward, academic freedom. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 087).
- Anderson, R. (1997). Ex cathedra? The changing role of the department chair. *ADFL Bulletin*, 28 (3), 12-17.
- Arslianian, A. (1990). A few suggestions to new department chairs. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 5-7). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Bennett, J. B. (1983). *Managing the academic department: Cases and notes*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Bennett, J. B. (1988). Department chairs: Leadership in the trenches. In M. F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 625).
- Bennett, J. B. (1989). About department chairs. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin*, 42 (2), 9-11.
- Bennett, J. B., & Figuli, D. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Benson, G. L. (1993, February). The chair's role in college enrollment management: Matriculation of students. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 036).



- Boice, R. (1990). Coping with difficult colleagues. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 132-140). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Booth, D. B. (1982). The department chair: Professional development and role conflict. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 689).
- Bowker, L. H., & Lynch, D. M. (1985, April). What every department chair should know about the dean: Findings from four national surveys. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 113).
- Bragg, A. K. (1981, March). The socialization of academic department heads: Past patterns and future possibilities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 813).
- Brennan, E. B., Mugleston, W. F., & Perdue, J. C. (1996, February). When a whole college changes: Overcoming inertia, motivating veteran faculty and staff. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 600).
- Brill, L. (1992). *Quid pro quo vadis*: Gathering resources for your department. *ADE Bulletin* (101), 26-28.
- Burns, J. S., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, April). Stress factors, role conflict, and role ambiguity for academic department chairs. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational

- Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 630).
- Burns, J. S., & Gmelch, W. H. (1995). Stress factors and occupational roles of department chairs. *Journal of Technical Studies* 21 (1), pp. 12-23.
- Carmichael, G., & Malague, M. (1996, February). How to resolve conflicts effectively. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 572).
- Carroll, J. B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 32 (6), pp. 669-688.
- Carroll, J. B. (1991, October). A typology of career movements of department chairs: Identifying academic leadership. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 298).
- Carroll, J. B., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, April). A factor-analytic investigation of role types and profiles of higher education department chairs. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 629).
- Carroll, J. B., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, October). The relationship of department chair roles to importance of chair duties. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 910).
- Carroll, J. B., & Gmelch, W. H. (1994). Department chairs' perceptions of the relative importance of their duties. *Journal for Higher Education Management*, 10 (1), 49-63.

- Chow, C., Eastman, S. T., Leebron, E., Everett, S. C., & Dates, J. (1996, April). Gaining on the goals? Affirmative action policies, practices, and outcomes in media communication education. Paper presented at the meeting of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 457).
- Clark, T. D. (1978). The academic hierarchy and the department head. In D. B. Robertson (Ed.), *Power and empowerment in higher education* (pp. 41-57). Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Coats, L. T., Lovell, N. B., & Franks, M. E. (1996, August). FIRO B: Analyzing community college department chairs' effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southeastern Association for Community College Research, Panama City, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 999).
- Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). *The academic chairperson's handbook*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dyer, B. G., & Miller, M. T. (2000, January). Administrative challenges and response strategies to the job performance of marketing department chairs. Research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 441 373).
- Eble, K. E. (1978). *The art of administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eble, K. E. (1990). Communicating effectively. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 24-29). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan Publishing.
- Filan, G. L. (1994). Foreword to *Academic leadership in community colleges*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. vii-viii.

- Filan, G. L. (1999, March 1). The need for leadership training: The evolution of the chair academy. In R. Gillet-Karam (Ed.), *Preparing department chairs for their leadership roles* (47-55). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 27 (105).
- Fogg, P. (2001, October 19). Can department heads be trained to succeed? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A10-11.
- Garcia, E. (1994). The first year in office: Strategies and tactics for success. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25 (3), 87-89.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gillett-Karam, R., (Ed.). (1999). *Preparing department chairs for their leadership\_roles*. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 105, (27) 5-12.
- Gmelch, W. H. (1991, October). The creation of constructive conflict within educational administration departments. Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Baltimore. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 123).
- Gmelch, W. H. (1991, April). Paying the price for academic leadership: Department chair tradeoffs. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 143).
- Gmelch, W. H. (1992). Strategies for dealing with stress: Taking care of yourself. Position paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 632).
- Gmelch, W. H. (1994, February). Five skills for becoming a more effective team leader. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 412).

- Gmelch, W. H. (1995). Department chairs under siege: Resolving the web of conflict. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (92), 35-42. Republished in *Conflict Management in Higher Education*. Susan A. Holton (Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1990, October). The cost of academic leadership: Department chair stress. Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 146).
- Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (1), 79-94.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Carroll, J. B. (1991). The three R's of conflict management for department chairs and faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 16 (2), 107-123.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Gates, G. S. (1995, April). The stressful journey of the department chair: An academic in need of a compass and clock. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 188).
- Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1993). *Leadership skills for department chairs*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1995). *Chairing an academic department: Survival skills for scholars*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Parkay, F. W. (1999, April). Becoming a department chair: Negotiating the transition from scholar to administrator. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Ontario. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 430 493).

- Goldenberg, Myrna. (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* (pp. 16-22). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Green, M. F. (1988). *Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 625).
- Green, M. F., & McDade, S. (1992). *Investing in higher education: A handbook of leadership development*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hamel, T. (1994, February). Chairing the multi-disciplinary department. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 414).
- Hammons, J. O., & Thomas, W. (1980). Performance appraisal of community college department/division chairpersons. *Community College Review*, 7 (3), 41-49.
- Harper, J. (1994). Survival tips for new department chairs. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25 (3), 94-98.
- Haston, C. (1996, February). Enlightening chairs and deans about liability: How to avoid employment litigation. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 563).
- Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Tucker, A. & Gmelch, W. H. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/ ORYX Press Series on Higher Education.
- Heimler, C. H. (1967). The college departmental chair. *Educational Record*, 48(2), 158-163.

- Hickson, M., III, & McCroskey, J. C. (1991). Diagnosing communication problems of academic chairs: Applied communication in context. *ACA Bulletin* (78), 8-13.
- Hickson, M., III, & Stacks, D. W. (Eds.). (1992). *Effective communication for academic chairs*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Higgerson, M. L. (1996). *Communication skills for department chairs*. Jaffrey, NH: Anker Publishing Company/Publishers Business Services.
- Hilosky, A., & Watwood, B. (1997, February). Transformational leadership in a changing world: A survival guide for new chairs and deans. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Chair Academy, Reno, NV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 027).
- Hirokawa, R. Y., Barge, J. K., Becker, S. L., & Sutherland, J. L. (1989, January). The department chair as responsible academic leader: A competency-based perspective. *ACA Bulletin* (67), 8-19.
- Hoffman, S. (1996, February). Teaching and managing: Conflicting roles of the department chair. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 594).
- Holton, S. A. (Ed.). (1998). *Mending the cracks in the ivory tower: Strategies for conflict management in higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Hoyt, D. P., & Spangler, R. K. (1979). The measurement of administrative effectiveness of the academic department head. *Research in Higher Education*, 10 (4), 291-303.
- Hubbard, S. S., & Robinson, J. P. (1994, November). Gender profiles and career aspiration of administrators in higher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South

- Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 377 350).
- Hubbell, L., & Homer, F. (1997). The academic department chair: The logic of appeasement. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 30 (2), 209-13.
- Huber, B. J. (1990). Compensation and support for foreign language department chairs: A survey of 1989 ADFL seminar participants. *ADFL Bulletin*, 21 (3), 10-17.
- Huber, B. J. (1994). The responsibilities of and compensations for being a department chair: Findings from the MLA's 1989-90 survey of foreign language programs. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25 (3), 107-18.
- Hunnicut, G. G. (1991). An exploratory examination of faculty evaluation and merit compensation systems in Texas colleges and universities. *CUPA Journal*, 42, 13-21.
- Katsinas, S. (1995). George C. Wallace and the founding of Alabama's public two-year colleges. *Journal of Higher Education*, 65 (4), 447-72.
- Kesler, R., Perry, C., & Shay, G. (1996, February). So they are resistant to change? Strategies for moving an immovable object. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 591).
- Kimble, G. A. (1979). *A departmental chairperson's survival manual*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- King, Paul E. (1997). Surviving an appointment as department chair. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, (3), 211-17.



- Kinnick, M. K. (1993, May). What does an academic department chairperson need to know anyway? Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 922).
- Klein, R. B. (1991). Hiring faculty: Broadening the racial and cultural base. *CUPA Journal*, 42 (1), 23-26.
- Lamb, B. (1993, February). Promoting excellent teaching: The chair as academic leader. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 045).
- Litecky, L. (1988). The role of the chair in fostering teaching and learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 987).
- Lucas, A. F. (Ed.). (1989). Motivating faculty to improve the quality of teaching. *The department chairperson's roles in enhancing college teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, (37), 5-15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lucas, A. F. (1990). The department chair as change agent. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education* (pp. 62-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lucas, A. F. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynch, D. M., & Bowker, L. H. (1985, February). Resources available to department chairs. Paper presented at the National Conference for Department Chairs, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 113).

- Marchant, G. J., & Newman, I. (1991, April). Faculty evaluation and reward procedures: Views from education administrators. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 377).
- Mathematics instruction: Program review report. Summative review of the mathematics program in Florida community colleges. (1993, March). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State Board of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 941).
- May, J. R., & McBeath, R. B. "I wanted to be an administrator; now how do I cope with the stress?" In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 36-45). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- McHargue, M. (1996, February). Enhancing academic leadership through local and regional retreats: Adapting the 'great teachers' model for chairs and deans. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Community College Chair Academy, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 562).
- Mellow, G. O. (1996, October). The role of the community college chair in organizational change: Chaos, leadership and the challenge of complexity. Paper presented at the Annual Mid-Atlantic Community College Chair/Dean Conference, Blue Bell, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 970).
- Miller, M. T., & Seagren, A. T. (1995). Providing student services in the community college department: The chair's role. *Michigan Community College Journal: Research & Practice*, 1 (2), 59-65.
- Miller, M. T., & Seagren, A. T. (1997). Community college finance: Department chair perceptions of selected financial issues and responsibilities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21 (1), 37-45.

- Miller, M. T., & Seagren, A. T. (1997). Strategies for coping with job challenges in the community college department: A comparison of chair perceptions by work experience. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21 (5), 493-500.
- Mott, M. C. (1994, February). The hunt for hidden resources: A chair's guide to finding campus support for faculty and staff development. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 411).
- Murray, J. P. (1994, February). The teaching portfolio: The department chairperson's role in creating a climate of teaching excellence. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 410).
- Nathan, P. E. (1994). Who should do faculty development and what should it be? *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72 (5), 508-509. <http://db.texshare.edu/uta/ovidweb>.
- Norton, S. (1980). *Academic department chair tasks and responsibilities*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Palmer, A. D., & Miller, M. T. Academic leaders in Alabama community colleges: Roles and tasks of department chairs. Research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 453 856).
- Pelaton, J. W. (1984). Foreword. In Allan Tucker's *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Peters, G. F. (1994). Institutional responsibility and chair training: The Michigan state model. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25 (3), 99-103.
- Pincus, M. S. (1994). Dealing with the dean. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25 (3), 11-16.

- Rahkonen, C. J., McFerron, R., Bowker, L. H., Lynch, D. M., and Krusec, M. (1993).  
Communication among music faculty, department chairs and deans in American higher  
education. Research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 268).
- Report of the ADE ad hoc committee on assessment. (1996). *ADE Bulletin*, (114), 2-13.
- Roach, J. H. L. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities.  
*Educational Record*, 57 (1), 13-23.
- Roach, K. D. (1991). University department chairs' use of compliance-gaining strategies.  
*Communication Quarterly*, 39, (1) 75-90.
- Roach, R. H. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities.  
*Educational Record*, 57, (1), 13-23.
- Robbins, J. H., Schmidt, D. M., Ehinger, M., & Welliver, M. (1994, February). Who is leading  
us toward quality professional development? Paper presented at the meeting of the American  
Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction  
Service No. ED 367 632).
- Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles,  
responsibilities and challenges*. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher  
Education/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction  
Service No. ED 363 164).
- Seagren, A. T., Wheeler, D. W., Creswell, J. W., Miller, M. T., and VanHorn-Grassmeyer, K.  
(1994). *Academic leadership in community colleges*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska  
Press.

- Seedorf, R. G. (1992, April). The problem solving role of the university department chair. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 636).
- Seedorf, R. G. (1991, April). The transition of the university department chair: What must be left behind? Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 453).
- Seedorf, R. G. (1993). Department level leadership: Where does the time go? *Journal for Higher Education Management*, 9 (1), 53-63.
- Seedorf, R. G., & Gmelch, W. H. (1989, March). The department chair: A descriptive study. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Convention, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 713).
- Seldin, P. (1989). Using student feedback to improve teaching. In A. F. Lucas (Ed.), *The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching* (pp. 89-97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Serpe, R. T. (1990, May). CSU faculty workload study. Long Beach, CA: California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 917).
- Sheldon, W. (1994, February). Who's in the driver's seat, the budget or the strategic plan: Which comes first? Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs and Deans, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 646).
- Shirk, J., & Miller, M. (1994, February). Linking the faculty recognition process to teaching excellence. Proceedings of the National Conference on Successful College Teaching, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390 456)

- Shreeve, W., Brucker, B. W., & Martin, J. J. (1987). University department chairs: "Who are we?" Research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 464).
- Singleton, B. (1987). Sources and consequences of role conflict and role ambiguity among department chairs. *Capstone Journal of Education*, 7 (2), 39-50.
- Smith, A. B., and Stewart, G. (1998, April). The process of role transitioning of new community college department chairs in Texas. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference of the Council of Universities and Colleges, American Association of Community Colleges, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 418 735).
- Smith, A. B., & Stewart, G. (1999). A statewide survey of new department chairs: Their experiences and needs in learning their roles. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 27, 105, pp. 29-36. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 428 812).
- Speech communication association: Advancement of the discipline. (1996, December) Position paper. Annondale, VA. S. L. Becker, Chair of Task Force. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403 614).
- Trask, K. A. (1989). The chairperson and teaching. In A. F. Lucas (Ed.), *The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching* (pp. 99-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1991). The dean and department chairpersons. In *The academic dean: Dove, dragon, and diplomat* (pp. 77-115). New York: American Council on Education-Macmillan, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- Tucker, A. (1984, 1992). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. & 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.

- Vacik, S. M., & Miller, M. T. (1998). Critical incidents impacting the role and development of the academic department chair, 1870-1925. Research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 421 905).
- Warren, C. O. (1990). Chairperson and dean: The essential partnership. In J. B. Bennett & D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 30-35). New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Watts, G. E. (1993, February). Effective strategies in selecting quality faculty. Phoenix, AZ: International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 046).
- Weeks, Kent. (1996). *Managing departments: Chairpersons and the Law*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED xxx xxx).
- Weingartner, R. H. (1993). *Fitting form to function: A primer on the organization of academic institutions*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx. Series on Higher Education.
- Winner, C. N. (1989, May). The role and function of the departmental chairperson at Delaware technical and community college. Paper submitted as Ed.D. requirements at University of Delaware. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 898).
- Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Sarros, J. C., Wolverton, M. L., & Tanewski, G. A. (1997, March). Opening a conversation between department chairs: Possibilities for the United States and Australia. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 407 886).

Wolverton, R. E. (1990). Chairing the small department. In J. B. Bennett and D. J. Figuli (Eds.), *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson* (pp. 8-15). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.