

Research Question 1 (Table 1: Legend)

Research Question 1: How widespread is employee participation in existing in-house (local) leadership development programs, and how are these experiences correlated between faculty members and staff?

Scale:

- (4) Strongly Agree
- (3) Agree
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

Pilot study; 9 colleges; 169 total respondents, from hundreds of faculty/staff. * No significant difference for faculty and staff who participated in a local employee leadership development programs.

Table 1: Participant Responses for In-House Leadership Development Programs (Faculty/Staff)

Q#	Context/Construct Measured	Mean
20	Staff were encouraged to participate in the program	3.292
2	Faculty were encouraged to participate in the program	3.280
1	I would recommend the program to other faculty/staff	3.269
21	Guest speakers were included as part of the IELDP	3.125
10	The program was well organized	3.083
7	College operations were presented to participants	3.080
9	I achieved my goals as a participant of the program	3.042
15	I think the program will positively impact the college	3.042
6	The goals of the leadership program were clearly stated	3.000
11	A variety of leadership development materials were used	3.000
12	Teamwork was practiced throughout the program	3.000
14	The leadership team project was formally presented	2.875
17	I expect to practice my new skills in my job	2.792
16	My leadership style is clearer to me now	2.750
13	A discussion of leadership theories was beneficial	2.708
19	A "steering/other committee" had oversight for the program	2.708
4	External mentors were assigned to the leadership teams	2.652
8	Leadership teams developed solutions for actual problems	2.625
18	"Job shadowing" activities were part of the program	2.500
5	Participants were selected via a nomination process	2.480
3	Non-tenured employees were exempt from participation	2.080

Research Question 2 (Table 2: Legend)

Research Question 2: What are the perceptions of faculty and staff about in-house (local) employee leadership development?

Scale:

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

Pilot study; 9 colleges; 169 total respondents, from hundreds of faculty/staff. * No significant difference for faculty and staff who participated in a local employee leadership development programs.

Table 2: Perceptual Responses for In-House Leadership Development Programs (Faculty/Staff)

Q#	Context/Construct Measured	Mean
21	Good leaders understand the power of motivation	4.378
4	Faculty AND staff are critical leadership assets	4.351
7	ELD programs build collaborative relationships	4.207
19	Employee trust is a key element in effective ELD programs	4.157
6	ELD programs should investigate real college problems	4.144
8	ELD program outcomes impact student achievement	4.100
11	All community colleges should include an ELD program	4.072
2	ELD supports accreditation standards	3.955
15	Two-year colleges should participate in National Leadership Initiatives	3.954
5	New employees should also be eligible for ELD	3.883
12	Every employee has leadership potential	3.464
18	ELD must not interfere with other duties	3.391
1	ELD should be required for all employees	3.324
17	ELD graduates should be offered committee chair assignments	3.082
9	Too many 'leaders' in the organization are unwise	2.847
16	Leaders and managers perform the same job	2.297
10	Employee leadership development is highly overrated	2.248
3	Teamwork and ELD are incompatible	2.209
20	Leadership research has no practical application in ELD programs	2.009
14	Developing leaders in-house is too complex a task	1.845
13	Administrators are exempt from leadership development	1.800

Research Question 3:

Research Question 3: What are the current and future plans of college presidents in initiating, continuing, or improving existing leadership programs? Survey available at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ka_2fSi1ZBgrwAb_LJ8w4yozw_3d_3d

- **Sample Size:** Letters to 32 Community, Technical or Junior College Presidents, 4 in each of 8 states within Southern Association of Schools and Colleges – Commission on Colleges service area. Sample size = Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Mississippi
- One indicated appreciation for inclusion, rejected invitation due to "contract negotiations" and unionized faculty
- One community college had an invalid web site mailing address
- 30 colleges have not responded nor indicated receipt of the letter of request for participation
- Survey Response Rate: 0% at 8 weeks.

Implications & Recommendations (Pilot Data)

1. College presidents and administrators should look at in-house leadership development programs as a highly regarded institutional resource
2. Recognize and reward the contributions of employees at all levels within the institution as though the very survival of the institution depended upon each and every single person, from switchboard operator to design engineer
3. Equate employee leadership development programs to improved levels of student outcomes
4. Within the structure of the employee leadership program, create a forum for open exchange of ideas and information
5. As one respondent noted, "Effective leaders are only as good as the people they surround themselves with." Maximize employee potential in leadership development programs.
6. Are Community Colleges leading the charge in employee leadership development? Yes, but there remains the need to shape the data for further analysis and application.

In Their Own Words...

We need to institute employee leadership development within the colleges in order to emphasize employee ownership of institutional processes and student achievement. Currently, this is sorely lacking and I believe that student achievement is suffering greatly as a result. The current system of executive micro-management is disabling the colleges and leaving the employees feeling disconnected and demoralized. (R13)

In order to have an effective ELD the employees must have confidence in the "Leaders" that are organizing the program and its activities. (R23)

Leadership training or education can come in many forms. On campus leadership initiatives are only one of those forms. To mandate leadership training would be a big mistake. It could become stagnant at best, propaganda at worst, and resented. To encourage, support, and expect all employees to work on leadership skills is important to the vitality of the organization and the individual. To mandate only one form of that undermines trust in the organization and vibrancy and robust nature of the goal or outcome of strong leadership potential in the organization that then influences the community. (R41)

The Leadership [program] is an outstanding program that strengthens the institution's capacity to serve society through teaching and public service. (R87)

Yes, start doing a suggestion/resolution center. As any faculty, or staff find an issue or problem and see a way to resolve it. They present it to a leadership office to have one person or committee to review the suggestion/solution and actually give it some time and support to make it a reality. (R122)

An Example of Poor Leadership at the Local Level: You Make The Call

