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ABSTRACT

THE TRANSFORMATION OF FIVE FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: CONVERTING TO BACCALAUREATE DEGREE-PRODUCING PROGRAMS

Debra Kay Petry

The purpose of this study was to determine what key community college leaders in 5 colleges in Florida viewed as the transformations that occurred in their community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. In addition, this study considered the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs. A survey was administered to 38 executives, developers, and implementers of the community college baccalaureate in the first 5 colleges in Florida to implement such programs. Three primary factors were exposed: need, accountability, and mission. Results showed a high degree of support for the implementation of the baccalaureate degree in community colleges. Two primary reasons for the creation of these transformational programs were (a) student access to the baccalaureate degree and (b) meeting workforce needs. The quantitative survey results were reinforced by 16 qualitative interviews that provided a more in-depth understanding of how and why these programs were created.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Some community colleges in the United States are experiencing transformational changes that directly impact the types of programs they offer, the students they serve, and how to best accommodate local workforce needs. This transformation comes as a result of adding baccalaureate degree-producing programs to the traditional 2-year community college slate of programs. There is evidence that these new programs are surfacing, albeit in a variety of ways, in a number of community colleges throughout the country. The state of Florida finds itself on the leading edge of this transformation (Armstrong, 2001; Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002). The Florida Board of Community Colleges has stated that it believes that the baccalaureate degree represents the natural and logical next step in the evolution of Florida’s community colleges (Walker, 2002b). “Accused of not producing enough bachelor’s degrees, Florida is looking to its community colleges to deliver” (Hirth, 2004, p. 1). Hirth further reports that the Florida legislature wants all of Florida’s community colleges to have the option of offering baccalaureate degrees.

There are 1,200 community and technical colleges throughout the United States that provide high quality, democratized, open-access, postsecondary learning opportunities. A number of students in these colleges do not want or are unable to
transfer to 4-year institutions to complete the requirements for a bachelor’s degree for a variety of reasons. Many desire to continue their work toward a baccalaureate degree at their local community college because of its accessibility, convenient location, and lower costs. These nontraditional students are different from traditional students in that they are older, employed (at least part time), have families, or have limited time and resources with which to travel to 4-year baccalaureate-producing colleges and universities (Walker, 2001).

Local employers’ needs are also changing. They need and want employees who are more knowledgeable and skilled in specific areas of employment (Walker, 2001). Today, rapid changes in technology, economics, society, and communities are directing new era demands (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). Community colleges in the United States are beginning to respond to these demands in unique ways. One of the responses has been the initiation of the Community College Baccalaureate (CCB) degree, with Florida leading the way (Armstrong, 2001).

The community college story is a uniquely successful one. “So successful were these 2-year institutions that demand and support for community colleges grew at exponential rates” (Phelan, 2000, p. 3). Phelan reports that the number has increased from 20 institutions in 1909 to 1,776 public and private institutions in 1997. Today, almost every state has a community college within reasonable commuting distance for its students. Enrollments have spiraled from 16,000 students in 1909 to over 10.2 million in 1997. From all indications, postsecondary education in this country will continue to experience explosive growth in the new century, with more high school graduates demanding specialized vocational training and baccalaureate degree programs.
Demographically, they will reflect the growing ethnic diversity and widening socioeconomic ranges of the overall population. The needs and demands of these ever-increasing numbers of students will require innovative responses. Increasingly, the nation’s community colleges are looking at unique ways to meet these new challenges.

Community colleges must respond to these changing demands for a number of reasons. New, competing education providers are coming to the fore to meet these needs, such as charter colleges, e-colleges, broker colleges, proprietary colleges, as well as private and nonprofit colleges. With changes in student profiles, as stated earlier, potential students are experiencing different demands on their time. Employers’ needs are changing as well. They need more knowledgeable and skilled workers who are capable of thinking critically and solving difficult problems (Walker, 2001).

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) claims that occupations requiring college degrees are the fastest growing segment of the economy. In Florida, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission’s (PEPC) 5-year plan for higher education warns that the state’s current production of baccalaureate degrees is incapable of meeting expected enrollment demands (Walker, 2002a). Florida ranks 3rd in the nation in the number of associate degrees granted but is 47th in the nation in the number of baccalaureate degrees it awards. Legislators in Florida have become concerned about this fact, fearing that the state will not be able to provide the kinds of skilled workers needed to keep the state’s economy rolling and do a better job of educating its citizenry (Evelyn, 2003).

It appears that the necessary incentives for change in community colleges are in place; however, detractors with numerous questions and concerns abound. Some higher
education leaders claim that this paradigm shift toward community colleges offering baccalaureate degrees seriously challenges the traditional mission and role of community colleges. Others argue that this new offering at the community college level could threaten historical and important community college values. There are claims that resources will be transferred from traditional community college programs, and these programs will suffer as a result (Cook, 2000). Still others are concerned that critical, limited resources will be diverted from colleges and universities to community colleges that have not traditionally served this need. Consequently, states such as Florida are experiencing heated debates on these and other issues that will be impacted by this new and uncharted course of action.

Despite these concerns and potentially difficult problems, Florida is proceeding with this paradigm shift. Florida Statute 1007.33 states that it is the intent of the legislature to expand baccalaureate degree access through local community colleges (Florida Statutes, 2003). It specifies that community colleges in Florida may submit proposals for the delivery of specified baccalaureate programs as long as the following are included: (a) demand for the specific program is identified, (b) an unmet need for the program is substantiated, and (c) the community college can show it has the facilities and academic resources to deliver the program (Florida Statutes). As of May 2004, five community colleges in the state of Florida have been renamed as a result of their acceptance to provide baccalaureate degree programs: (a) St. Petersburg College (the first in the state to be accepted), (b) Miami Dade College, (c) Chipola College, (d) Okaloosa-Walton College, and (e) Edison College. Others will certainly follow.
Significance of the Research

“The community college baccalaureate is an idea whose time has come” (Garmon, 2002, p. 1). This degree program has a bright future as a vehicle to provide expanded opportunities in professional and career development, according to Garmon. He believes this innovative initiative is a major step forward into a new 21st century learning environment. It provides solutions that will increase the number of graduates who possess advanced workplace skills. It is the community college, Garmon contends, “that must confront the current ‘degree divide’ that denies access to the baccalaureate for thousands of American citizens” (Garmon, p. 2).

Five community colleges in the state of Florida are on the leading edge of this transformational paradigm shift. These colleges have shifted from providing programs that lead to the associate degrees that enable students to transfer to 4-year institutions where they complete their baccalaureate degrees to institutions that provide the opportunity to achieve the bachelor’s degree without the need to transfer. With the Florida legislature giving its community colleges the opportunity to provide access to the baccalaureate degree in Section 35, Senate Bill 1162, the road has been paved for this paradigm shift in postsecondary educational options at the local level. With the opportunity to provide baccalaureate programs in workforce areas with high-demand needs, community college leaders are beginning to petition the Florida Board of Education for authorization to do just that (Armstrong, 2003a).

With this postsecondary educational innovation, legislators, community college leaders, community leaders, local businesses and industries, and health-care institutions, as well as school districts, are taking a hard look at the issues at hand. A number of these
issues were discovered in the literature review. They are enlightening in terms of establishing the need for this research study. One such issue is the position and vision of legislative and executive branches of state government regarding these new policies (Evelyn, 2002; Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2001; Hirth, 2004; Phelan, 2000). Without legislative and executive authority to proceed with these baccalaureate programs, it would not be possible to do so. Thus, legislative and executive initiatives and decisions must be considered.

In addition, potential conflicts with regard to the mission of community colleges must be addressed (Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Cook, 2000; Evelyn, 2002; Skolnick, 2001; Townsend, 2001). The mission issue has been debated in many of the articles written about these new initiatives. Do these new programs, for example, change the direction and, therefore, the mission of the community college? Will they distract from other programs that community colleges are currently offering? Or do they simply enhance and expand upon the mission that remains fully in place? Other mission questions have been exposed. Do community colleges need to consider new mission statements that address the changing demands of a global economy (Garmon, 2002; Levin, 2000; Walker, 2002b)? Do community colleges need to change their missions to align with the new demands of society (Alfred & Carter, 2000; Ayers, 2002; Campbell & Leverty; Cook; Garmon; Gianini, 1998; Martorana, 1994; Phelan; Skolnick; Walker)? Mission issues are viewed as critical by these writers and must be considered in a study of this nature.

There are also questions about the need to recognize the most appropriate and effective strategies to follow in initiating these programs. Are there any program
transformation models that can be utilized by community colleges that are considering moving in this direction (Alfred & Carter, 2000; Armstrong, 2001; Call, 1997; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 2001)? Other writers who have written on this subject suggest that there needs to be a recognition and understanding of the forces, targets, and tools for transformation (Alfred & Carter; McClenney, 1998; Walker, 2002b). What does it take in order to initiate these transformative changes in a smooth and effective manner?

How can colleges best address the need for baccalaureate degrees in areas that colleges and universities currently are not serving such as workforce development, applied science, and technology (Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Evelyn, 2003; Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002; Futures Policy Commission, 2004; Garmon, 2000a; Lane, 2003; Levin, 2000; Martorana, 1994; Romesburg, 1999; Walker, 2001)? And how do they also address the problem of nursing and teacher shortages in this country (Evelyn, 2002; Hirth, 2004; Lane; Shkodriani, 2004)?

Additional issues have surfaced. Is provision being made for program accountability and are assurances being offered that only high quality programs will be advanced (Evelyn, 2002; Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002; McClenney, 1998; Phelan, 2000; Shkodriani, 2004)? How are problems concerning limited resources and funding being addressed (Brophy, 2000; Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Cook, 2000; Futures Policy Commission, 2004; Garmon, 2000b; Lane, 2003; Shkodriani; Walker, 2002b)?
Questions about the students’ needs and how they are being brought into the equation are being asked. One question deals with the current exclusion of students from baccalaureate programs due to academic background and social circumstances (Borden & Brown, 2004; Brophy, 2000; Phelan, 2000; Romesburg, 1999; Walker, 1999). Other questions deal with finding the best solutions to rising demands, limited access, and increasing costs in postsecondary education (Cook, 2000; Green, n.d.; Phelan, 2000; Walker, 2002b). Still others are looking at a recognition of and response to changing demographics and shifts in student composition (Ayers, 2002; Bryant, 2001; Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002; Walker, 2001, 2002b). Also, there is the need to recognize and respond to the special needs of nontraditional students who cannot or will not commute to 4-year colleges or universities to complete their baccalaureate degrees for a variety of reasons (Ayers; Brophy; Call, 1997; Cook; Garmon, 2002; Green; Hirth, 2004; Lane, 2003; Martorana, 1994; Romesburg; Shkodriani, 2004; Walker, 2001, 2002b). How we can best and most appropriately increase access to a baccalaureate degree for more students is under investigation (Cook; Florida Board of Education; Phelan).

Concerns go beyond student needs. How will the new degree program be viewed, not only by the students, but also by other institutions and employers? Will these new degrees be viewed as second rate (Brophy, 2000; Townsend, 2001)? There are also concerns regarding conflict and competition among community colleges, colleges, and universities as a result of this initiative (Cook, 2000; Evelyn, 2003; Garmon, 2000b; McTarnaghan, 1999; Shkodriani, 2004; Townsend).
Finally, there are numerous policy considerations that must be dealt with such as establishing criteria, requirements and expectations for general education, institutional capacity, resource commitment, and assessment of student learning (North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 2001). Institutional mission, student and community needs, cost, and structure are policy issues that need to be addressed (Cook, 2000). How are program quality issues, quality of faculty, duplication of programs, institutional roles, financial concerns, and other faculty issues being considered (Shkodriani, 2004)?

The Aid to Education’s Commission on National Investment in Higher Education claims, “At a time when the level of education needed for productive employment is increasing, the opportunity to go to college will be denied to millions of Americans unless sweeping changes are made to control costs” (Walker, 2002a, p. 1). In addition, “widespread access to higher education is . . . critical to the economic health and social welfare of the nation” (Walker, p. 1).

In 1998, the Florida State Board of Community Colleges adopted a 5-year strategic plan in light of an increasing employer demand for graduates at the baccalaureate level that were performance ready. The board believed the workforce baccalaureate “represents the natural and logical next evolution of Florida’s community colleges” (Walker, 2000, p. 5). In addressing these issues, policymakers and community college leaders must make informed decisions to meet the needs of the students and communities serviced by community colleges (Cook, 2000).

The 2-year institutional role in providing for the educational needs of students traditionally excluded from 4-year institutions can’t be underestimated (Borden &
Brown, 2004). Few meaningful statistics about the trend exist (Lane, 2003). Little research exists on the CCB movement, and the field is ripe for exploration (Floyd, 2005; Floyd & Skolnik, 2005). It is obvious, given the issues that have been outlined above as a result of the researcher’s review of literature, that this program is in a state of infancy, with numerous questions and problems yet to be resolved. It is the purpose of this research inquiry to begin this process.

The colleges that participated in this study were the five former community colleges that were approved to establish independent baccalaureate degree-producing programs in their institutions and have done so. Community leaders in these institutions who were surveyed included presidents, vice presidents, provosts, deans, college administrators, department heads, faculty, and staff. Individuals who were interviewed in depth by the researcher included the colleges’ presidents or vice presidents, the individuals in charge of their respective baccalaureate programs, and other individuals deemed important to this study. Issues that were utilized in the survey and interview questions were derived from the review of literature.

A mixed-methods approach allowed the researcher to use both the survey and interview methods of data gathering. Multiple forms of data were thus procured using quantitative and qualitative approaches. There were analyses made of both statistical and textual data.

Statement of the Problem

The CCB degree-producing program is a new and innovative solution to increasing access to more students who wish to acquire a bachelor’s degree (Cook, 2000;
Planners believe it will reduce shortages of workers in such critical areas as teaching, nursing, and technology (Evelyn, 2002; Hirth, 2004; Lane, 2003; Shkodriani, 2004). This degree addresses the concerns employers have expressed about their need for specific knowledge and skill development programs for their employees (Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Evelyn, 2003; Florida Board of Education; Futures Policy Commission, 2001; Garmon, 2002; Lane; Levin, 2000; Martorana, 1994; Romesburg, 1999; Walker, 2001). It serves as an “innovative example of community college responsiveness” (Cook, p. 7).

The purpose of this study was to determine what key community college leaders in five colleges in Florida viewed as the transformations that occurred in their community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. In addition, this study considered the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs.

**Research Questions**

During the course of this study, the following research questions were explored:

1. What major factors precipitated the transformation to a baccalaureate degree-producing program in five Florida community colleges?
   a. What were the reasons for the initiative to be considered and implemented?
   b. What critical decisions were made in order for this to occur?
   c. How did the mission of the college change as a result of this transformation?
2. What problems were managed and resolved during the process and what problems remain?

3. What are the perspectives that Florida community college leaders have who experienced this transition, related to the following concepts: program selection, responsiveness to community needs, limited resources and funding, access for students, conflict versus collaboration with colleges and universities, program accountability, and quality?

**Definition of Terms**

*Applied baccalaureate.* Practitioner-oriented degree that incorporates specific competencies required for a specific business environment (Walker & Floyd, 2005).

*Baccalaureate (bachelor’s) degree.* A degree given by a college or university to a person who has completed a 4- or 5-year course of study or its equivalent (Agnes, 1999).

*Community college.* A 2-year institution of higher education, generally public, offering instruction adapted in content, level, and schedule to the needs of the community in which it is located. Offerings usually include a transfer curriculum (credits transferable toward a bachelor’s degree), occupational (or terminal) curricula, general education, and adult education (*What Are Two-Year Colleges?,* 1984).

*Community college baccalaureate (CCB) degree-producing program.* A community college that confers baccalaureate degrees in specific areas (Floyd, 2005).

*Comprehensive.* Offering many types of curricula for a wide range of students (*What Are Two-Year Colleges?,* 1984).
Community-centered. Locally responsive; offering programs for individuals of all ages and educational levels (What Are Two-Year Colleges?, 1984).

Factors. Any of the circumstances, conditions, etcetera, that bring about a result (Agnes, 1999).

Mission. A purpose, a reason for being, often why the organization was first created (Radtke, 1998).

Mission statement. It includes the purpose, business, and values of the organization. It may or may not change. The original mission may be updated, altered, or changed dramatically in order to address new realities (Radtke, 1998).

Paradigm. A concept accepted by most people in an intellectual community as a way of explaining a process, idea, or set of data. An established pattern or model (Agnes, 1999).

Transformation. The process of changing the condition, nature, or function of something (Agnes, 1999).

Workforce (applied) education. Programs developed by community colleges to meet specific needs of businesses and industries. Course content is less theoretical than the traditional bachelor’s degree and involves a significant work-based component (McKee, 2001).

Plan for the Review of Literature

The review of literature begins with a brief historical overview of community colleges in America. The review considers the community colleges’ mission, purpose, values, and culture, and how their missions have evolved since their inception. In the
review, the historical movements are presented that led to the creation of community college baccalaureate-producing programs in the state of Florida. Both the pros and cons of this transformation are considered. The concept of change is discussed, including the need for change, problems associated with change, and market and societal forces requiring change. Legislative initiatives authorizing these programs in the Florida House and Senate are presented. And, finally, there is an overview of the five community colleges in Florida that have received approval, changed their names by removing the word “community,” and currently have independent baccalaureate degree-producing programs in place.

Location

The population of this study includes subjects from the five colleges in Florida that have, as of December 2004, converted from community college to college status as a result of offering programs leading to baccalaureate degrees at their locations. This includes St. Petersburg College (St. Petersburg), Miami Dade College (Miami), Chipola College (Chipola), Okaloosa-Walton College (Niceville) and Edison College (Ft. Meyers). These are the first five colleges in Florida initiating this change. They were all approved by the Florida Board of Education to do so. Additional community colleges in Florida are following suit; however, for the purposes of this study, only these initial five colleges were studied.
Participants

The individuals who received the surveys and provided quantitative data for the study were community college leaders that included presidents and vice presidents, provosts, deans, administrators, department heads, faculty and staff members. The goal was to procure a minimum of seven individuals from each community college to respond to the survey. The goal was accomplished ($N = 38$). One person was designated as the primary administrator responsible for each college’s baccalaureate program. This individual was asked by the researcher to nominate knowledgeable individuals (as outlined above) to respond to the survey.

Individuals from these same five community colleges were utilized in the qualitative interview segment. Three (or more) community college leaders were interviewed from each of the five community colleges ($N = 16$). Issues that were addressed in the survey instrument and interview questions were derived from the review of literature.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature begins with a brief history of community colleges in the U.S. and will provide the reader with an overview of this 100-year-old uniquely American institution. It includes perspectives on how and why community colleges began and how they have evolved through the years and into the 21st century. A discussion ensues of the mission of community colleges, what their purpose is, what they value, and insight into their unique culture.

The role of the American community college in baccalaureate degree attainment is presented, as well as the transformation of American community colleges into becoming baccalaureate-producing institutions. The pros and cons of this transition are discussed. A consideration of change, the need for change, and problems associated with change are then addressed. The market and societal forces that require change in community colleges is also considered.

Finally, a historical perspective on the state of Florida’s movement toward providing baccalaureate degree programs in its community colleges is reviewed. Legislative initiatives are outlined in order to provide a perspective on how and why Florida became a leader in this transformational movement. A review of the five
community colleges that have been approved to provide these programs in their respective locations is found at the conclusion of the chapter.

A Brief History of Community Colleges in America

For over 100 years, community colleges have thrived in America as a result of their resiliency as centers of educational opportunity. In the early years, community colleges focused on general liberal arts studies then, later, offered job training programs to ease unemployment during the Great Depression. After World War II, military industrial work transitioned to consumer-related jobs, and with this economic change, the Government Issue (GI) bill provided for more higher education options (Patton, 2000b). In 1947, the Truman Commission Report, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, led to the creation of a network of public, community-based colleges to serve local needs (Walker, 2005). In the 1960s, community colleges expanded into a national network of over 450 colleges; since that time, they have grown steadily to the 1,166 community colleges currently existing in the United States. Adding branch campuses, the number now totals around 1,600 (Patton).

Today, community colleges educate over half of the country’s undergraduate students. Since the founding of Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901, the oldest existing public 2-year college, over 100 million people have been serviced by community colleges (Patton, 2000b). A report by the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges stated that a milestone was reached in 1998 when 43% of all undergraduates and 51% of all first-time college freshmen were enrolled in community colleges (Organization of American Historians, 1999; Underwood, 1999). Today, there are 1,075
community colleges in the U.S. with enrollments at approximately 5.5 million students (Cohen, 2002).

Community colleges educate 65% of all future health care professionals in the U.S. Today more businesses look to community colleges to train and retrain their employees over any other higher education sector. Community colleges range in size from a few hundred students to over 100,000 at the former Miami Dade Community College (Organization of American Historians, 1999). The increased diversity in U.S. community college students is also significant. This includes, according to the Association of Community Colleges in 1995, an enrollment of just under 170,000 international students and immigrants (Chase & Halder, 2000).

The first junior college was dedicated to providing access to education to the populace, with the goal of serving as a bridge between high schools and 4-year institutions. After the Truman Commission report, the goal was to provide college opportunities within commuting distance for as many students as possible. It then grew from an institution providing not only the first 2 years of a 4-year degree program, but also career and vocational training, continuing education, and community service. Thus began the demand for and growth of community colleges, representing a unique American success story (Phelan, 2000).

Purposes and Missions of Community Colleges

Community colleges are publicly supported institutions offering comprehensive programs of career-related and remedial programs, the first 2 years of a 4-year college program, as well as community services. Characteristically, they are
1. Democratic—by providing low tuitions, open admissions, and geographical and social accessibility.

2. Comprehensive—by offering many types of curricula for a wide range of student interests.

3. Community centered—by being locally responsive and offering programs for all ages and educational levels.

4. Adaptable—by providing for student differences, community needs, and social change.

Community colleges typically offer vocational and occupational programs, transfer and liberal arts programs (leading to an associate degree in science or the arts), noncredit community education, personal interest courses, plus developmental and remedial programs that prepare students to enter degree programs and enable individuals to improve their communication and mathematical skills (What Are Two Year Colleges?, 1984). By traditional definition, the community college is an institution accredited to award an associate degree as its highest diploma (Cohen, 2002), but according to Walker (2005), “The time has come to stop defining the community college as a two-year institution” (p. 22).

Community colleges are unique entities in their own right. They have core values that set them apart, to include being student-centered, open-door institutions focused on teaching, and being adaptive, responsive, and connected to their larger communities (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). According to Vaughn (2003), most community college missions include a commitment to (a) serving all segments of society through an open-access admissions policy that offers equal treatment to all students, (b) providing a
comprehensive educational program, (c) serving the community in a community-based setting, and (d) providing lifelong learning opportunities.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, “Community colleges account for a surprisingly large share of American higher education. Nearly half of all postsecondary undergraduates in the fall of 1997 were enrolled in community colleges, and over the span of any given year, more for-credit undergraduate students enroll in community colleges than in baccalaureate-granting institutions” (as cited in Bailey, 2003, p. 1). The demand for community college services continues to grow. Most community colleges find themselves with multiple missions addressing the needs of multiple constituencies. Their missions include (a) transfers to baccalaureate programs, (b) terminal occupational education, (c) developmental education, (d) adult basic education, (e) English as a second language, (f) education and training for welfare recipients, (g) customized training for specific companies, (h) preparation for certification exams, (i) noncredit instruction in numerous areas, and (j) small business development (Bailey).

Community colleges have expanded their role beyond providing the first 2 years toward a baccalaureate degree. Now workforce preparation and service to the community are provided (Bailey & Averianova, 1999; Bandler, 2002; Cohen, 2002). Community colleges provide a large and fundamentally critical service in the higher education arena.

Since the beginning of community colleges in the early 1900s, extensive shifts have occurred in both purpose and mission. Called junior colleges, their primary focus was to provide an academic education. That mission has expanded considerably, however, and become much more complex (Bailey & Averianova, 1999; Education Commission of the States, 2003; Harbour, 2000). They now offer a much broader
spectrum of programs and services, including not only educational but also social and economic functions (Burrows, 2002). Advocates claim that this expanding mission is a natural evolution for community colleges because of their commitment to the changing needs of their communities. Critics say that community colleges are losing their way; they have abandoned their original mission due to the move toward offering everything to everyone. The current exploration of the changing mission of community colleges is important for a number of reasons, suggest Bailey and Averianova. For one thing, there is a huge public investment in community colleges. When too many goals are being pursued, money may be wasted. With society looking to community colleges to provide a higher education for people with economic and social difficulties, does the proliferation of activities threaten that objective? In addition, technological and economic factors are changing the demand for and supply of educational services. For example, there are a growing number of for-profit educational services springing up that are in direct competition with community colleges. Unfortunately, Bailey and Averianova contend, there is little in the way of empirical data upon which to make rational decisions about competing roles in community colleges. What is needed is a “precise focus and a clear sense of mission” (Bailey & Averianova, p. 2). When new programs are established, others may be lost. Yet, community colleges are strong and resilient and are capable of creating solid foundations for new activities.

Bailey and Morest (2003) categorize community college missions into three sets of activities: (a) core, (b) vertical, and (c) horizontal. The core consists of degree-granting programs such as the academic associate degree, transfer functions, terminal occupational degrees or certificates, and developmental education. Vertical expansion programs are
those that focus on the traditional college-age student within the traditional educational system. Horizontal expansion involves community-oriented activities such as contract training, continuing education, and grant and privately funded programs. It follows that community colleges “will continue to evolve into even more complex institutions that house an expanding number of more or less independent activities” (Bailey & Morest, p. 4).

“All agree on the value of the synergy between education and training that is the core of the comprehensive offerings of the community college” (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001, p. 11). A new balance among community college stakeholders needs to be forged in order to meet the requirements for more education and training, combined with changing demographics. There needs to be more collaborations between higher educational institutions, more support from business organizations, and more incentives by policymakers to encourage higher quality, variety, customization, and innovation (Carnevale & Desrochers).

What student issues shape the community college mission? According to Bryant (2001), “Recent shifts in student composition have shaped and will shape community college missions and policies” (p. 1). The community college student population is diverse. Demographic shifts have changed the face of these colleges. Women, minorities, part-time students, and nontraditional-age groups have swelled in numbers in the past few decades, but projections are showing an expected influx of traditional-age students. Opportunities for disadvantaged students may be threatened. Rising enrollments, declining public interest, and reduced investment in higher education may close the open door that is prevalent in community colleges (Phelan, 2000). These students, traditional
and nontraditional alike, have clear purposes for attending. According to Voorhees and Zhore (as cited in Bryant), 66.4% of their respondents in a recent study indicated that their goal was to earn a certificate or a degree or to transfer to a 4-year institution. In addition, 21% enrolled to improve job skills, and 12% attended for personal interests.

Since the beginning, the community colleges’ existence has been based on identifying and responding to their local community’s needs (Education Commission of the States, 2003). This becomes ever more difficult as a result of the changing nature of social, political, economic, and technological environments (Ayers, 2002; Campbell & Leverty, 1999). Adaptations to these changes are now required, challenging former beliefs and values which become less relevant. As competing perspectives emerge, former remedies are questioned. Community college leaders are challenged with responding to this rapidly changing environment (Ayers; Campbell & Leverty).

In order to be successful, community college leaders must be willing to invest in a renewal within their organizations. They must reevaluate their mission, philosophy, function, and modus operandi (Ayers, 2002; Campbell & Leverty, 1999). Ayers analyzed the content of 102 community college mission statements to provide a current view of community college missions in the southern United States. He emphasized the importance and value of the mission statement; others agree. Ayers explains that mission statements guide decision making, motivate employees toward a common purpose, and create balance among competing interests from a variety of stakeholders. Mission statements are frequently described in terms of their diverse functions to include student services, career education, developmental education, community education, transfer and liberal education, and general education (Cohen & Brawer, 1987). “Key values must be
clarified and communicated clearly in order to align our daily practices with our mission and values” (Campbell & Leverly, p. 2).

From their analysis of the mission statements that they studied, Fountain and Tollefson (as cited in Ayers, 2002) found that mission focus was primarily on formal education, student services, continuing education, community services, attention to students served, and economic development. Vaughn (as cited in Ayers) suggested that the primary focus of community colleges is on formal educational programming. The secondary focus is on the community it serves. It is the tension between these two that produces organizational change and the evolution of mission.

Ayers (2002) states that as new community issues are raised and changed, learner needs materialize, requiring community colleges to change. This forces leaders to make difficult decisions about their mission. He found seven themes relating to mission statements of community colleges in the southern U.S.: (a) access, (b) workforce and economic development, (c) comprehensive programming, (d) quality and excellence, (e) responsiveness to needs, (f) specified service area, and (g) diversity. Ayers also identified important future issues regarding their missions. Those issues included (a) quality versus open access, (b) specified service area versus learning at a distance, (c) comprehensive programming versus the strategic niche, and (d) a shift from collegiate education to career education.

Levin (2000) qualitatively analyzed several community colleges in order to define changes in their missions in the 1990s. He found that mission changes reflected a new, globally oriented vocationalism. Skills training for employment and attention to marketplace demands became the norm. Community colleges began to conform to the
expectations of business and industry. More time was being given to organizational image and status, with more attention to diversity.

Brint and Karabel (1989) have suggested that a major community college institutional transformation occurred in the 1960s with the shift from a liberal arts orientation to a vocational one. Levin’s (2000) research results concur, showing the extension of this transformation in the 1990s when the development of skills and needs of employers were emphasized.

The observation and articulation within community colleges of a globally competitive environment, economic in nature and capitalistic in ideology, opened the doors to more business-oriented practices and a corporate-style of management. The former mission of community colleges, while vibrant in rhetoric, was becoming obsolete. (Levin, p. 12)

In his study, Levin discovered that the new vocationalism (or globalization) encompassed half of the community colleges’ missions. The rest were simply responsive or more traditional in nature.

The Committee on the Impact of the Changing Economy on the Education System (Graham & Stacey, 2002) concur with Levin when they state that the focus in the American postsecondary education system is to prepare workers to meet the demands of more complex workforce requirements. The concern is how to establish a balance between job skills training and broader academic learning. Despite little empirical evidence, discussion has focused on an increased need for technological skills and stronger literacy skills, both written and verbal. Dougherty and Bakia (1999) state that workforce preparation and economic development are not new. It is the type of workforce
education that has changed. More recently, it has evolved into contract training, small
business assistance, and local economic planning, they contend (Dougherty and Bakia).

Politicians and business leaders alike look toward community colleges to attract
manufacturing and high tech jobs to their state and regions. Legislators consider
community colleges to be the first line of defense in tough economic times. It is the local
community college that is the catalyst for economic growth (Law, 2002). Grubb,
Badway, Bell, Bragg, and Russman (1997) call colleges that provide nontraditional
programs in workplace development entrepreneurial colleges. They provide for (a)
workforce development (training for employees of specific firms); (b) economic
development (colleges increase employment); and (c) community development (colleges
promote community well-being in political, social, or cultural arenas). They contend the
factor that has most influenced the development of the entrepreneurial college is the
current emphasis on occupational rather than academic or transfer functions.

The comprehensive nature of community colleges has continued unabated since
the 1970s, but both academics and researchers have condemned the comprehensive
model (Bailey & Morest, 2003). Although there is criticism that community colleges are
attempting to “be all things to all people,” the expansion of activities continues (Bailey &
Morest, p. 1). Activities continue to address the needs and interests of a wide variety of
stakeholders (Bailey, 2003).

Opponents of the comprehensive nature of community colleges include those who
advocate that the primary purpose of the community college is the transfer function
(Bailey & Morest, 2003; Cejda, 1999). Others say it detracts from what they believe the
most distinctive role should be, that of vocational education (Bailey & Morest; Blocker,
Another argument is that community colleges simply cannot do it all well; they must focus on a more limited set of objectives and do those well. According to Breneman and Nelson (as cited in Bailey & Morest),

The most fundamental choice facing community colleges is whether to emphasize . . . adult and continuing education and community services, or to emphasize transfer programs . . . . It may no longer be possible to have it both ways. (p. 1)

Tensions have been created in the comprehensive college. These difficulties include differences in modes of operation, the competitiveness of colleges among each other, allocation of revenues, and conflict over the basic mission and purposes of community colleges (Grubb et al., 1997). Brewer (2000) states that “An alternate view is that the many tasks undertaken by community colleges lead to a lack of clear purpose” resulting in “a less-effective institution that does not serve any group of students as well as it might” (p. 1). He contends that, “organizations need clear goals to be effective, that multiple missions fracture resources and energy” (p. 1). He believes this debate will continue to grow, primarily because of changes in the economy requiring more skill training and changing student demographics that demand more noncredit activities.

A number of studies show a negative impact of vocational education on transfer rates (Bailey & Averianova, 1999). In addition, these authors contend, those who advocate the academic function reduce transfer programs to introductory courses, thus leveling down the critical literacy skills required for degree programs. Vocationalism conflicts with an academic education. New functions may draw resources away from college core activities. Without additional funding, the larger number of activities will lead to a reduction in program quality.
Community colleges must move beyond the confusion by revising their mission (Cain, 1999). Community colleges have overextended themselves, lost direction, and spread themselves too thin. As a result, no one is satisfied. The development of the comprehensive community college has resulted in reduced academic rigor. More focused and limited community colleges with a sense of direction and a well-defined mission are needed in the 21st century (Cain).

When one looks at all of this controversy, the question might be asked why community colleges haven’t taken a more focused approach as opposed to the comprehensive model that is so pervasive (Bailey, 2003). For one thing, political factors create a favorable environment to take on new programs. This generates state and local political support that college leadership finds hard to ignore. Also, new programs can generate alternative sources of revenue that colleges are seeking. In addition, there is no current empirical evidence convincing college leadership of either the positive or the negative effects of the new programs on traditional, in-place activities. Finally, some experts say the variety of offerings is advantageous for communities and community college students because it provides more opportunities for students to pursue their varying needs and interests (Bailey).

Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan told a recent congressional hearing that community colleges boost critical job skills as more workers see the need to upgrade their skills (“Greenspan: Colleges can help solve jobs dilemma,” 2004). Community colleges continue to expand their already incredibly complex functions, generating more arguments over their true role. Although open access to all is a philosophical tenant cherished by most community colleges, new programs offer fiscal
survival options. These multiple options also provide more opportunities for students. In addition, employers are demanding more specialized skills. So the reasons for multiple missions are many, varied, and complex. The willingness of community colleges to provide multiple offerings exposes their flexibility and responsiveness to their communities’ needs (Brewer, 2000).

Bailey and Morest (2003) point out that multiple missions increase enrollments, thus increasing much-needed revenues. They also provide more educational opportunities for more students, generate surpluses, and provide administrators with more flexibility. In addition, they address the interests of influential constituencies. The more focused strategy, conversely, implies reduced students enrollments, revenues, and political support.

Bailey and Averianova (1999) contend that if colleges make the state’s labor force more competitive, state legislatures will be willing to provide more funding. Thus, expanding the mission doesn’t necessarily imply that core activities will lose resources. They further state that additional missions will be successful because they are associated functionally with colleges’ core activities. If community colleges are to maintain currency in today’s economy, they must update and expand their services, certificates, and types of training, otherwise their future will grow narrower. Community colleges must work harder to balance their commitments to their numerous roles and activities (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001). The community college mission must “respond, adapt, and grow in ways appropriate to changing communities. Performing this role is a natural progression in the evolution of the mission of the community college” (Walker, 2005, pp. 15-16).
Gleazer (1980) feels very strongly about the community college mission and the need for change. “Adaptability is one element in mission or process commonly agreed upon. The institution must be able to change as communities change with new conditions, demands, or circumstances” (Gleazer, p. 5). Community colleges need to reach out to those who are not served, especially the students who have roots in their community and who work there. They must work on their own approaches to solving these problems. They must be capable of determining what they believe to be appropriate and needed in given situations. The best community colleges, Gleazer contends, are those that are adaptable and continue to operate with a continued awareness of their community.

College Roles in Baccalaureate Attainment

According to Cejda (1999), there have traditionally been four primary ways that a community college contributes to a baccalaureate education:

1. Two plus two path—the traditional mode in which students enroll first at a community college, normally for 2 years, then transfer to a 4-year institution to complete their baccalaureate degree.

2. Concurrent enrollment—patterns of attendance where a student attends one school then another, or both at the same time.

3. Summer session enrollment—attending a community college for only 1 semester, typically the summer session.

4. Reverse and lateral transfer—moving back and forth between community colleges and 4-year institutions.
Floyd (2005) suggests that the transfer function is a key role of community colleges in baccalaureate attainment. She posits the following four models:

1. Articulation—ensures acceptance of first 2 years by 4-year institutions and is vital to the transfer function.
2. University center—a university confers a degree in partnership with others, including community colleges.
3. University extension—off-campus extension centers that are formally part of the university (unlike #2).
4. Community College Baccalaureate—usually refers to community colleges that confer a baccalaureate degree themselves without partnerships.

Community colleges have been in existence for over 100 years and educate more than half the nation’s undergraduates (Patton, 2000a). “Just as community colleges democratized higher education through their open-door philosophy and associate degrees, so they must now democratize opportunity for higher education through the baccalaureate degree” (Walker, 2005, p. 11). There is currently underway a reexamination of the mission of the community college both in this country and overseas. The world is experiencing a rapid rate of change, technologically, economically, sociologically, and community-wise (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). Changing demographics, economic concerns, and local (community and business) expectations are also impacting this reconsideration. The need for more geographical and financial access to postsecondary education, new demands for technical degrees not currently offered elsewhere, increased interest in job-related degrees, and specific local business and community needs are influencing this review (Cook, 2000). This has led to a consideration of one of the newest
trends--a change in mission from an exclusively 2-year college to a 4-year baccalaureate degree-producing program at the community college level.

While the basic principles and purposes of community colleges in this country will remain the same, an expansion of the mission will include offering the baccalaureate degree to students (Call, 1997; Cook, 2000; Lorenzo, 2001; Martorana, 1994; Puyear, 1997; Rosenfeld & Liston, 2002; Skolnik, 2001; Townsend, 2001; Walker, 2005). This will provide students with more convenient locations, a more student-centered learning environment, and greatly reduced costs. It provides a greater opportunity for students to continue their studies from a 2-year degree plan to a baccalaureate degree, which is often used as a justification for doing so (Martorana). Adult students are the fastest growing segment of the college market and their needs cannot be met in traditional ways. The community college baccalaureate is an “idea whose time has come” (as cited in Call, Burke & Garmon, p. 4). Rosenfeld and Liston maintain that there are two very specific rationales for this movement: (a) access, especially in more rural areas and (b) the need for more advanced, applied technical training, which 4-year universities are not providing. A higher education system responsive to the need for increased access and to rapidly changing workforce needs is what current legislators are seeking. Floyd (2005) and Lorenzo (2005) agree that access and responsiveness to community needs are two goals for community colleges, which the CCB would provide. Shortages in such fields as nursing and teaching could be addressed through these innovations. Increased access by nontraditional students would also become possible (Skolnik & Floyd, 2005). A Community College Week article (Finkel, 2005) stresses that the pressing shortage of teachers is enticing community colleges to provide more teacher education programs.
Finkel contends that community colleges make it possible for students who otherwise would be unable to do so to attend college. Five states were named that currently offer bachelor’s degrees in teacher education, and Florida leads the list.

In the new century, community colleges must continue to expand both their academic and vocational options. Services must be expanded or they will face a narrower future. They must balance not only their social equity goals but also the needs of the community, employers, and students in order to adapt to changing economic and technological realities (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001). As a result of economic global competition, it is markets, not just individual citizens, that become the focus of higher education. This expands the mission of the community college and alters its identity. The CCB represents an expansion of access and a response to economic pressures from state governments, local business, and industry (Levin, 2002; Walker, 2005).

Pressure is being exerted on community colleges to provide the additional mission of granting 4-year baccalaureate degrees, because of changing demographics, economic concerns, and community and business expectations (Cook, 2000; Walker, 2005). The authors contend the rise of place-bound adults and the increasing number of jobs requiring training beyond the associate degree are additional pressures. The 4-year degree is becoming more critical for career access and mobility (Lorenzo, 2005; Walker). According to a U.S. Department of Labor study, employment requiring a bachelor’s degree or higher will increase by 22% by 2010 (Walker & Floyd, 2005). “The community college baccalaureate has a bright future as the primary vehicle to expand professional and career development opportunities for people throughout the U.S.” (Garmon, 2002, p.
1). The American Association of Community Colleges has recognized this new type of degree as an emerging development in higher education (Garmon).

Community colleges can offer baccalaureate degrees and still maintain their mission (Romesburg, 1999; Walker, 2000). Walker (2002a) claims that community colleges have always been responsive to the changing needs of society. Providing this new opportunity will “increase geographical, financial and academic access to higher education” (Walker, p. 2). Walker continues by saying the community college’s mission has been constantly evolving and adapting throughout its 100-year life. Community colleges have made adjustments in an attempt to be responsive to the challenges a globally competitive economy presents. They must be competitive by developing new products and delivery systems. New trends influencing higher education include (a) the international nature of educational systems, (b) the nontraditional nature of the majority of students in higher education, (c) the baccalaureate degree replacing the associate degree as a credential for a good job, and (d) students having more choices. In response to these changes, the CCB will provide additional (a) access to higher education, (b) cost efficiencies, (c) opportunities for upward mobility, (d) completion rates among nontraditional students, (e) commitment to economic and workforce development, and (f) responsiveness to local needs for specialized programs. The mission of the community college, Walker (1999) and Skolnik (2001) believe, must look forward toward responsiveness, adaptation, and growth. As community colleges become more involved in workforce preparation and economic development, public policy needs to bolster their commitment to baccalaureate preparation (Dougherty & Bakia, 1999).
Community colleges should offer 4-year degrees “in response to the needs and desires of their students, communities, local businesses and industries . . . in order to provide . . . access to educational resources otherwise unavailable” (Romesburg, 1999, p. 1). Call (1997) and Bailey and Averianova (1999) agree that the objectives of the initiative include helping students to realize their educational goals and serving local business and industrial needs better. Call further says that the new baccalaureate would allow community colleges to achieve their mission more effectively and efficiently. Romesburg also argues that (a) it’s less expensive for students and taxpayers, (b) quality and personalized attention can be provided, and (c) savings will result from not duplicating facilities. Lorenzo (2005), Garmon (2002), and Walker (2002a) agree that community colleges are capable of solving the problems of rising demand, limited access, and increasing costs. “The baccalaureate degree is a logical solution …” to these problems (Walker, p. 1). Walker also presented a recent report by the Council for Aid to Education’s Commission on National Investment in Higher Education that suggests (a) there is an increasing need for higher education for the workforce, (b) millions will be denied access to college due to cost issues unless sweeping changes are made, and (c) access to higher education is critical to this country’s economic health and social welfare.

According to Dr. Remington, President of the Community College of South Nevada (as cited in Lane, 2003), it’s simply a matter of supply and demand, especially in rural communities. The need for this option is essential, with place-bound students who have families and jobs. Dr. Drumm, at Springfield Technical Community College (Lane), offered another reason by saying that 4-year institutions don’t offer baccalaureate degrees in specific fields like applied science. Evelyn (2003) and Dr. Finney, Vice President of
the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (Lane), suggest that this new provision will help alleviate shortages in the nursing and teaching professions. It’s an excellent example of the ability of community colleges to meet their community’s needs, according to North Campus President, Dr. Vicente, of Miami Dade College (Lane). Community colleges are resolving community and student problems, he says, so they’re part of the solution. There is pressure from local industry and legislators to reduce workforce shortages and increase the pace of change (Evelyn).

Why would students attend a community college rather than a 4-year institution? Green, S. M. (n.d.) and Walker (2005) contend there are many advantages to students. They include the focus on learning, reduced costs, greater interaction with peers and teachers, a wide breadth of offerings, and open access. Policymakers and college presidents have found the community college to be the obvious choice to resolve the increased demand for baccalaureate degrees because of their convenient locations, historically low costs, and their flexibility in meeting community needs (Cook, 2000). In agreement with others mentioned earlier, Cook said the whole question is primarily a function of increased access to postsecondary education and the demand for new technical degrees not offered by 4-year institutions. Call (1997) believes community colleges are in a unique position to tailor the applied baccalaureate education to the needs of the student and employers. “The radical increase in the need for both more education and training in the new knowledge economy, combined with changing demographics, requires the stakeholders in the nation’s community colleges to strike a new balance” (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001, p. 12).
Some feel the baccalaureate degree in community colleges would increase access to education and lifelong learning (Brophy, 2000; Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Garmon, 2002; Lane, 2003; Martorana, 1994; Shkodriani, 2004). Community colleges are unique in that they are responsive to local economic demographic changes. Access to degrees will increase access for minority and disadvantaged students (Finkel, 2005; Lorenzo, 2005; Walker, 2002a). According to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), Walker explains, occupations that require a college degree are the fastest growing in this country. With baby boomers beginning to retire, there will be a smaller workforce; thus, higher education, more generally dispersed, is needed to maintain the economy and a high standard of living.

Garmon (2002) explains that 80% of the adult population in this country do not have a bachelor’s degree. This does not bode well for the U.S. with growing economic global competition; the U.S. must become more competitive in international markets (Garmon; Walker & Floyd, 2005). In addition, American businesses want workers with special workplace knowledge and skills, not traditional liberal arts degrees.

Brophy (2000) agrees with others who point out that the rising demand for advanced skills, the need for access for students with weaker academic skills, the lower cost, and special needs of nontraditional students are all issues that community colleges can address. Townsend (2001) and Call (1997) espouse that community colleges are offering programs that universities don’t offer and, therefore, are not in competition with them. In addition, community colleges provide for several cultural values the U.S. expects of higher education to include equity, efficiency, and choice (Townsend).
According to Schuster, editor of the *East Valley Tribune* (as cited in Community College Baccalaureate Association, 2003), there is no good reason to require students, in general studies or business, to have to transfer to a university. According to Garfield, author of *Peak Performance Trilogy* (as cited in Garmon, 2000b), “Today there is too much change, flux, and fluidity to be rigid, to pretend there is only one right way” (p. 2). According to Lorenzo (2005), “The U.S. educational system . . . has often required bold new visions and innovative concepts. The evolution of the community college is a prime example” (p. 73).

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2004) contends “The community college baccalaureate has developed in response to increased demands for higher education, combined with cost and capacity concerns” (p. 1). More specifically, there are increased demands (a) by nontraditional students for such programs, (b) in fields such as health care and education, (c) in specific geographical areas, (d) for new kinds of degrees in applied and technical fields, (e) on 4-year universities resulting in overcrowding, and (f) to reduce costs. Although partnerships with 4-year institutions are more common than the independent CCB, those that have independent programs have morphed into 4-year institutions as a result of their broader functions. Still, approval of these degrees is limited and specific and is subject to close scrutiny. Although some CCBs are not competitive with 4-year colleges, others could become so. Despite fears of the loss of the traditional community college and the concept of mission creep, the CCB is here to stay, according to this association.

The move toward the CCB degree is not without its detractors. “The community college baccalaureate (CCB) has become the lightening rod for opinions about the future
of the U.S. community college and the nature of the baccalaureate degree” (Townsend, 2005, p. 179). The most prevalent concerns revolve around the impact of such a change on the mission of the community college (Cook, 2000; Education Commission of the States, 2003; Martorana, 1994; Rosenfeld & Liston, 2002; Townsend, 2001; Walker, 2005). According to Floyd and Skolnik (2005), “the fabric of the traditional community college mission is being challenged by the addition of baccalaureate degree programs” (p. 2). The practice, some say, might cause difficulties in defining the proper service area of individual colleges. Others point to concerns about the upward creep of associate degree academic requirements and downward creep of those attached to the baccalaureate degree (Martorana). Still others in opposition contend that resources would be diverted to the higher level courses (Townsend). In addition, there is the fear that this will pit community colleges against universities, which is the opposite of the desired cooperation and collaboration initiatives of the past (Floyd & Skolnik; Townsend). Further, there are those who believe that this might shift community college priorities toward research and publishing, thereby undermining the very aspects about community colleges that make them attractive to students (Rosenfeld & Liston). Skolnik (2001) explains that his research shows a concern about diverting community colleges from their access and equity mission. Change is not an easy thing to accept in the educational community, so it is understandable that there are those who question such a radical departure from the typical mode of operation (Remington & Remington, 2005; Skolnik). Yet it seems that there is enough momentum in this program to insure its successful initiation into many community college settings.
There is growing tension over what the community college’s mission should be in this new century (O’Banion, 1997; Rosenfeld & Liston, 2002). According to some critics the allowance to grant baccalaureate degrees will redirect critical resources used by community colleges for their open door mission (Campbell & Leverty, 1999; Cook, 2000; Lane, 2003; Shkodriani, 2004). Ray Taylor, President of the Association of Community College Trustees said at a 1998 assembly, “This issue will be the equivalent of the civil war for those of us in community colleges . . . it will pit brother against brother, colleague against colleague” (as cited in Campbell & Leverty, p. 3). Others such as James Wattenbarger, recognized as the architect of Florida’s community colleges, believes it will change the essential role of community colleges (Campbell & Leverty). Still others contend that these programs are very expensive and may not be cost effective. Faculty issues are also of concern, such as the two tiers of faculty that some say will become necessary (Brophy, 2000; Cook; Lane).

Will the community college morph into a 4-year institution, thereby losing its identity? Will it compete with other institutions that are offering the same services (Call, 1997; Lane, 2003; Shkodriani, 2004)? “Some people do liken the idea to treason,” says Boggs, President of the American Association of Community Colleges (Evelyn, 2003, p. 1), explaining it will mean community colleges will lose sight of their mission. Others contend it will be the end of the community college as it is now known (Townsend, 2005). Students have expressed concerns as well. Some believe that a community college degree may be viewed as second rate (Brophy, 2000; Townsend, 2001, 2005).

Garmon (2000b) believes the controversy boils down to a money issue, wherein 4-year institutions will be threatened due to funding conflicts. Competition with
universities is an issue but critics also fear that community colleges are forgoing their core values and traditional missions (Skolnik, 2001; Townsend, 2001; Walker, 2001). Dougherty (as cited in Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001) and Lorenzo (2005), on the other hand, claim that community colleges taking on these new functions will work to the advantage of 4-year universities by allowing them to preserve their selectivity.

According to McTarnaghan (1999), changing community colleges to 4-year institutions will change admission standards, library holdings, faculty, governance, tuition, and accreditation requirements. It will also possibly set aside well-crafted transfer policies. Competition for resources is going to be fierce (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001). Before the CCB is even considered, education leaders and legislators must examine the impact on meeting student and community needs, costs, state higher education structures, and institutional mission (Cook, 2000).

Despite the controversies, the move toward establishing CCB degree programs continues to advance. The first community college in the country permitted to offer a baccalaureate degree was Arkansas’ Westark Community College, providing a competency-based contextually integrated B.A. in Manufacturing Technology. It is a self-paced structure integrating general education requirements that relate to the manufacturing environment, with modular components (McKee, 2001). In his dissertation, McKee stated he believes the CCB possibly represents the next major change in the purpose of the community college. Nine CCB degrees have been offered by the Arkansas legislature. In 2001, St. Petersburg College was the first in Florida approved to offer baccalaureate degrees. Primary current offerings are in the fields of education,
health, and technology (Furlong, 2005; Skhodriani, 2004), and more are under consideration.

It seems that this change is escalating. Community colleges in 11 states are now offering baccalaureate degrees in addition to their other programs, and efforts are underway in three more (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2004). An association was formed in 1999 that specifically addresses the issues that are surfacing as a result of this movement. The Community College Baccalaureate Association’s (CCBA, 2003) mission is “To promote the development and acceptance of the community college baccalaureate degree as a means of addressing the national problems of student access, demand, and cost” (p. 1). In addition, its purpose is to share information and provide networking opportunities. It currently has 130 members from 28 states and other areas (Walker, 2005).

Several descriptions of the new CCB degree have been proferred (Cook, 2000; Skolnik & Floyd, 2005). Some are similar to the traditional bachelor’s degree. Others are expanded versions of the Associate in Applied Science degree (AAS), an applied degree that offers specialized, technical training. According to Walker and Floyd (2005), it is this workforce (or applied) degree that many believe is the ultimate reason for providing the CCB. This degree is reinventing the community college in some ways. The U.S. and world economies are requiring new skills and degrees. Real-world requirements are being demanded in the workplace. Workplace education provides both soft skills (such as communication and critical thinking) and hard skills (technical requirements that directly apply to work). “Among all forms of education in the United States, none is more fluid and responsive to the economy than the community college” (Walker & Floyd, p. 95).
The CCB degree is now found at three types of institutions: (a) those that continue to offer the Associate of Arts (AA) but have added a few Bachelor of Arts (BA) programs, (b) those that morphed into 4-year colleges and were renamed (although they still retain their AA degree offerings), and (c) the 4-year institutions that partner with community colleges in offering higher level courses (Shkodriani, 2004). The hybrid nature of these programs makes it difficult to define the CCB and to provide accurate terminologies. The problems are exacerbated by some community colleges being reclassified as colleges when they offer even one baccalaureate degree (Floyd, 2005).

Community colleges need to document their implementation processes in order to adopt a model for others attempting to begin the process. Technical assistance and best practices are needed in the areas of leadership, instructional issues, financial aid, transfer and articulation, funding, marketing, effectiveness, and recruitment (Gonzales, 2000; Remington & Remington, 2005). Upper division collegiate academic courses are already well entrenched in many American communities and state institutions. Attitudes are supportive, which indicates further expansion of the practice (Martorana, 1994).

Where do community colleges stand in the total structure of the American postsecondary educational system? “Some American education analysts have claimed a firm location for community colleges within the total structure, basing their argument primarily upon concepts of differentiation of mission, students served, and approaches to instruction and curriculum development” (Martorana, 1994, p. 1). This report centered on a survey done for the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges as it dealt with the issue of providing upper division courses at the community college level. Results of the study provided information on a variety of issues related to
this topic. One indication was that the practice of acquiring upper division academic credit on community college campuses is widespread. Florida is shown as the state that has incorporated the highest number of policies that exist in practice, with 10 other states showing a strong to high level of policy creation.

A survey of 101 community college presidents in the U.S. was done in 2003 by the Community College Baccalaureate Association (CCBA) to query these individuals about issues relating to the baccalaureate degree including the CCB (Floyd, 2005). It is important because so little research has been done in this arena. The attitudes and beliefs of these presidents follow:

1. Most prefer to partner with universities to deliver baccalaureate degrees.
2. State legislatures were considering this option.
3. The CCB is not fully understood.
4. Interest is greatest in areas where students are place bound (rural areas).
5. Efforts are primarily in business, computer science, criminal justice, education, and nursing.
6. Almost half already offer baccalaureates in some manner.
7. Over one third said 4-year institutions are not meeting degree demands.
8. Over one third said the majority of their students don’t transfer to get a degree because of geographical or financial barriers.
9. Over two thirds agreed 4-year colleges are not providing specific, high-demand career field baccalaureates.
10. One fourth received local employer requests to offer baccalaureates.
11. Over one third said they were interested in the CCB.
12. Half said they were prepared for such a transition.

13. Most have not completed a feasibility study or needs assessment.

Walker (2005) sums up the need for community colleges to provide access to the baccalaureate by describing what they will provide as a result:

1. increased geographical, financial, and academic access to higher education
2. cost efficiencies through existing infrastructure
3. success among nontraditional or returning students through smaller classes, less-rigid sequencing, and greater scheduling options
4. ready matriculation and upward mobility for students with associate degrees
5. community college commitment to economic and workforce development
6. responsiveness to community needs for specialized programs (pp. 16-17).

Change in Community Colleges

Community colleges should and must be equipped to accept and deal with change (Alfred & Carter, 2000; Gleazer, 1980; Levin, Lanigan, & Perkins, 1995; Parsons, 1998b; Walker, 2005). According to Bailey (as cited in Thomas, 2002), in order to remain viable, community colleges must respond to changes in demographics, expectations of students, parents and policymakers, unstable state funding policies, and changes in technology. Organizational changes in community colleges have come as a result of both institutional environment and global forces (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001; Levin, 2002; Mauch, 1998). The baccalaureate degree represents not only an expanding mission but also an alteration of community colleges’ identity and organizational culture (Levin, 2000). This includes the end of the community colleges’ 2-year identity (Levin; Walker, 2002a).
Community colleges have changed as society has changed. Changes have included (a) growing diversity, (b) increased population, (c) the types and numbers of students attending college, (d) workforce needs, (e) demographics, (f) the economy, and (g) market forces (Mauch). Change is necessary to respond to new emerging needs (Duderstadt, 1996; Futures Policy Commission, 2004). Strengthening workforce education in high-demand areas is one of those needed changes (Futures Policy Commission). Community colleges need to keep up with skill changes in the economy (Carnevale & Desrochers; Ignash, 1992; Parsons, 1998a). Already there have been significant changes in community colleges over the past decade (Coate, 1996; Levin).

Gleazer (1980) believes change in community colleges is inevitable and essential. “The basic, inexorable, unmistakable fact and force to deal with is that of CHANGE—unparalleled and unprecedented change” (Gleazer, p. 2). “Clearly the institutions have changed and continue to change” (p. 3). He believes that community colleges are not 2-year colleges, and the terminologies used to define them are outmoded and traditional. “Anytime we can describe the community college in definitive, specific terms, we will destroy it. It has to change. It has to be different in different areas” (p. 5).

There are four primary transformational forces in community colleges, both internally and externally, according to Alfred and Carter (2000): (a) students with changing needs and expectations; (b) new competitors from a variety of sectors including for-profits, corporate universities, and virtual colleges; (c) technology impacting what, how, when, and where students learn; and (d) performance and accountability factors. Community colleges must develop flexible, dynamic, organizational designs to satisfy the needs of numerous customers. Walker (2005) viewed it from another perspective when
he outlined the factors now shaping higher education: (a) international markets and global competition; (b) changing student populations, including part-time and older students; (c) baccalaureates replacing associate degrees as workforce requirements; (d) competition provided by Web providers of higher education courses; and (e) increasing demand for higher education services.

Community colleges must be contradictory in nature, because they are managing tradition and creating revolutionary change at the same time. New programs and services are essential components of this change. New customers must be a new target, including users, purchasers, and influencers. Community colleges must look, therefore, to the future (Alfred & Carter, 2000). Skolnik (2000) agrees when he emphasizes the need for polarity in their goals and functions. It is “history in the making as community colleges continue to change and evolve” (Floyd & Skolnik, 2005, p. 6).

According to McClenney (1998), innovations have served community colleges well for 30 years, but they must move past innovation to transformation. The forces at work are (a) markets (who the students are, what they want, and the competition); (b) technology (so rising demand for services can be met); and (c) performance and accountability. These transformations will call for more convenience and responsiveness, with flexibility and fundamental changes in mission and core functions. “It means addressing values, expectations, priorities, sacred cows, the very identities of people and institutions” (McClenney, p. 6).

Community colleges now face changes in state funding policies, expectations of stakeholders, and new demographic trends. New types of educational institutions are growing, thus altering the role of community colleges (Bailey, 2003). Profound changes
have impacted the economy in the last quarter century. The focus now is on how higher education can prepare workers to meet new demands of businesses whose job requirements are increasingly complex and fluid. Changes focus mostly on technological skills (Graham & Stacey, 2002; Parsons, 1998b; Swail, 2002).

These changes are placing more demands on community college leadership (Boggs, 2002; Newman, 2002). They include providing learning on a 24/7 timeframe, adaptability, accountability, competition, and learning redefined. It is the leadership of community colleges, claim Hirschhorn and May (2000), that must get everyone’s attention and active help. According to Patton (2000b) and Newman, technology is the driving force for change. It has led to increased enrollment, technological innovations, and skill changes. Patton (2000a) contends, “The flexibility of community colleges will be tested in the future as never before” (p. 6). Kozeracki (1998) discovered two recurrent themes regarding community college change in her review of several resources; one was an acceleration of change in the external environment and the second was that organizational change can either be initiated internally or imposed externally.

Since change is inevitable, colleges must look beyond tradition in order to see the new realities to come. Change must be mission driven, sometimes requiring redefinition along with restructuring. It must be owned by all the stakeholders and requires flexibility and constant revision (Parsons, 1998b). Eddy (2003) reported on a study done with community college administrators about initiating change applying Kotter’s model. Those stages were “establishing a sense of urgency, creating a guiding committee, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering broad-
based action, generating short-term wins, and anchoring new approaches to culture” (Eddy, p. 9).

Eckel, Hill, and Green (as cited in Keup, Walker, Astin, & Lindholm, 2001) state that institutional transformation “alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution; is intentional and occurs over time” (p. 3). According to Alfred (2003b),

It takes more than an expressed interest in change to build a high-performing institution. It takes the will and the commitment to change, a deep understanding of the institution’s culture and its capacity, and a strategic perspective about its future. (p. 18)

Coate (1996) believes the tremendous growth in community colleges, fueled by demographics, economic prosperity, and increased access, has triggered the need for change. Change must focus on the stakeholders’ needs, such as students, faculty, taxpayers, parents, legislators, and citizens. Because of demographic and socioeconomic changes in our society, change is required to include a more diverse student body and changes in workforce educational requirements (Barr, 1993). As we head toward the future, a critical task for community colleges will be to change their current mental model (Parsons, 1998b). A national study conducted by Rouche and Rouche (as cited in Parsons), showed that community college personnel must totally support a growing, ever-changing community with courage, commitment, and confidence in the change.

Today we have tighter funding sources, increased competition, and major technological advances, forcing community college leaders to review their purpose,
identity, and vision. New directions are needed, along with commitment from stakeholders (Watwood, Frank, & Rocks, 1997). Customer needs are changing and technology continues to open up new markets. If community colleges don’t respond to this, they will fail, and the reason for that is security, self-satisfaction, and resistance to change (Alfred, 2003a). “The concepts of transformational and cultural leadership serve us well when we consider the need to change . . . in order to survive external pressure” (Baker, 1998, p. 5).

According to Duderstadt (1996), there are several transformation process features that should be recognized:

1. The biggest challenge in initiating change is cultural, not financial, or organizational.
2. Participation by the key players in design and implementation is essential.
3. The use of an external group can add credibility.
4. Often a crisis is required to consider the transformation.
5. The organization’s head must take a leadership role as leader and educator in designing, implementing and selling the process.

Transformation must address issues such as college mission, financial restructuring, organization and governance, general characteristics of the college, intellectual change, relations within external constituencies, and cultural change.

Taking a different tack, Mauch (1998) suggests the following strategies for change:

1. An emphasis on quality, with concern for competition and an understanding of the client.
2. Transforming colleges to make them more flexible, more innovative, and more responsive.

3. Understanding globalization and its impact on economics, the curriculum, and the college itself.

4. Focusing on technology, knowledge production, and availability.

5. A corporate presence in education.

Singer (2001) and Taylor and Maas (1995) have specific ideas about the future of community colleges in a changing social, economic, and occupational environment. They believe community colleges should become primary centers for workforce training, with widespread contractual arrangements with business and industry, and should assume a greater leadership role within the community. Strategic transformation, with these considerations, strengthens an organization and is essential for survival (Parsons, 1998b).

Dr. David Pierce, past president of the American Association of Community Colleges, in an interview with Barnett (2002) claims that the economy, the nature of work, and the nature of business and industry have changed. The major driver is information technology. There is a greater need for more education and knowledge. A new type of degree is needed, called applied baccalaureate, with general education and more technical education. However, he contends, if a community college offers many different baccalaureate degrees, it has morphed into a university structure. The path to a baccalaureate is not smooth and there is no one single approach to its procurement. To insure open-access, extended opportunities, and lifelong learning, there should be multiple routes toward acquiring a college degree (Cohen, 2003).
Community colleges will be forced to adapt to changes in societal needs within the decade. They will be required to provide additional services using nontraditional means. The CCB will be offered, including the applied technology degree (Puyear, 1997). Stetson (2002) believes this is the way change should occur. Rather than focusing on problem solving, change should be positive and life enhancing. Levin (1996) categorizes four kinds of organizational change, three of which are applicable for our purposes: (a) organization paradigm change, where assumptions about the organization are altered by participants; (b) mission and purpose changes, which are an alteration to the rationale for the organization’s existence; and (c) culture change, where changes in beliefs, values, and norms are accepted and acted upon.

In a study done by Quinley and Quinley (n.d.), it was discovered that the mission of community colleges has changed through the years to accommodate their communities’ educational needs. In this study 6 out of 10 respondents suggested that community colleges should expand their programs. According to Alfred (2003a), “Organizations that fill needs invariably will grow, but insidiously at work within them are forces that subvert growth by limiting their capacity for change” (p. 18).

There are new demands in the information economy for a more knowledge-based workforce. Workforce development programs must meet the changing needs of students and employers. Competition for these consumers is growing, new careers require baccalaureate degrees, and student learners are becoming more heterogeneous (Thomas, 2002). “Innovation will be necessary to position the community college properly to meet the demands of the 21st century” (Baker, 1998, p. 7).
Carter and Alfred (1996) wrote three documents for the Consortium for Community College Development. In the first, they state that, “Adopting an attitude which predicts forthcoming change is a key to transformation” (p. 1). They contend that community colleges are becoming involved in transformation but it is contradictory in nature. There are three universal drivers for community college change: (a) technology, (b) accountability, and (c) competition. When community colleges become involved in novel ways of organizing services, they intrigue clients and distinguish themselves from others as they seek resources. Leaders must look at community colleges in new ways, freed from the constraints of past experiences. In the second, Carter and Alfred (1997) contend that, “Change is no longer the exception, it is the rule” (p. 4). Advancing technology, intensified customer needs, and creative competitors are shifting success parameters. “Framebreaking strategies” (p. 9) must be developed to create the future. In their third document, Carter and Alfred (1998) say that the fundamental strengths of community colleges that should not change are the colleges’ focus on learning, access, core values, and the community as their base. “An organizational development plan, based on a thorough analysis of the college’s current capacity to respond to its markets, establishes the umbrella for change initiatives and budget priorities” (Carter & Alfred, 1998, p. 16). As far as Carter and Alfred are concerned, a successful design for change involves “understanding the fundamentals; forging a strategy; identifying champions; supporting innovation; communicating; and celebrating success” (p. 27).

Change has an effect on employees, but it can be initiated without confusion and uncertainty and with minimal conflict (Coate, 1996). Carter and Alfred (1998) believe there are five themes that contribute to resistance to change: (a) “history, tradition, and
norms; (b) bureaucratic processes; (c) false dichotomies; (d) inexperience and fear; and (e) time and resource shortages” (p. 24).

Even the best change efforts cause resistance (Baker, 1998; Ellsworth, 2000). There are eight key tensions challenging community colleges undergoing change: (a) organizational structure, (b) training, (c) learning, (d) students, (e) technology, (f) collaborations, (g) staff roles, and (h) core competencies (Carter & Alfred, 1997). It is very difficult to initiate change within an organization with which people are comfortable (Alfred, 2003a; Remington & Remington, 2005). Structures, systems, and people do not easily adapt to change. However, community colleges must embrace the numerous dimensions of change in order to find success (Carter & Alfred, 1996). If they do not, they will lose market share (Alfred & Carter, 2000). Where a student chooses to enroll will determine market demand for services from a variety of higher education options (“An Integral Part,” 2003). Despite the need for change, the debate continues about the balance between job skills training and broader academic learning (Graham & Stacey, 2002). A college needs to reconsider its mission, think about its future, reassess standards and outcomes, develop new programs and curricula, and create a new culture (Remington & Remington).

Florida Statutes and Provisions for Community College Baccalaureate Degrees

According to Section 240.301 of the Florida Statues from the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA, 2002),

The primary mission of the community college system is to respond to community needs for postsecondary academic and vocation education by
providing instruction for the first two years for students going on to universities to
collapse their education, workforce training programs, student services such as
assessment, counseling and remediation, and by promoting economic
development through specialized job training programs. (p. 2)

There are 28 independent institutions in Florida in the community college system at over
135 different locations. They receive systemwide coordination by the newly created
Florida Board of Education in Tallahassee, but are under the direct control of local boards
of trustees (OPPAGA).

The Division of Community Colleges of the Florida Department of Education
implements responsibilities assigned to the Board by statutes and rules. Florida’s
community colleges offer a number of different degree and certificate programs to
include instruction and student support services. Instruction can lead to an Associate in
Arts degree (the vast majority of students are in this area), Associate in Science degree,
College Preparatory, Adult Vocational Certificate, Continuing Workforce Education, and
Adult General Education (literacy and general equivalency diploma [GED]). Florida
community colleges have an open door admissions policy, allowing anyone with a high
school diploma or GED to enroll. They service a wide variety of students, including
nontraditional students. Many students are part time (OPPAGA, 2002).

Florida is 47th out of the 50 states in producing baccalaureates and has one of the
lowest percentages of its adult population holding bachelor’s degrees (Florida Board of
Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002). Its economy has changed from
agriculture and services to technology and health care, among others. Florida faces
projected shortages in nursing-related health care professions and teaching. In order to
move to more knowledgeable and skilled workers and address shortages, the production of bachelor’s degrees must increase (Florida Board of Education). By 2009, there will be close to a million and a half job openings in Florida requiring a bachelor’s degree or higher, and Florida is not currently graduating enough students to fulfill its expected workforce needs. Targeted workforce areas are those listed above as well as information technology and engineering (Armstrong, 2003b). A number of options have been established to resolve the problems, one of which is the limited, high-demand offering of the CCB. “Opinions vary widely on some of the options and they are rooted in history, culture, and competitive environment of higher education systems and institutions” (Florida Board of Education, p. 3).

In 1998, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC), now known as the Council for Education Policy Research and Improvement (CEPRI), identified baccalaureate access to Florida students as a major concern in its Postsecondary Education Master Plan (Armstrong, 2003a). CEPRI established a goal of increasing baccalaureate graduates by 150,000, utilizing community colleges to reach that goal. One of the workforce demands in Florida was a severe teacher shortage. There is a need for 16,000 teachers in this decade and universities currently produce only 6,000 new teacher graduates per year, 40% of whom are not pursuing teaching careers (Roberts, 2003). Later, in a supplement to the master plan, the recommendation was made to authorize community colleges to offer selected baccalaureate degrees to meet future higher education access needs in Florida. In The Strategic Plan for the Millennium: 1998-2003, the State Board of Community Colleges recommended that community colleges be authorized to do just that (Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges,
2002). Then in 1999, the Florida legislature passed legislation that allowed community colleges to seek approval to grant baccalaureate degrees in high-demand areas where universities could not provide such programs (Armstrong). Two years earlier, in 1997, the Florida Council of Community College Presidents had voted to endorse community colleges offering baccalaureate degrees (Walker, 2005).

“Increasing access to postsecondary education for all of Florida’s citizens is a main priority of the new K-20 Florida education system, adopted in 2000 by the Florida legislature” (Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002, p. 6). Goals of this new system are (a) high student achievement, (b) seamless articulation and maximum access, (c) workforce and economic development, and (d) quality and efficient services. In 2001, the Florida legislature adopted a site-determined baccalaureate option, providing community colleges with two avenues for delivering specific baccalaureate degree programs: (a) a cooperative agreement with a state university and (b) the community college itself delivering specified baccalaureate degree programs (Horne, 2002a). He reported that three pieces of information must be addressed in community college proposals:

1. Demand for such a program is identifiable through workforce development boards, local business and industry, local chambers of commerce, and potential students.
2. The need for graduates in the proposed degree program must be substantiated.
3. The community college has the facilities and resources necessary to deliver the program.
The law also specified that the primary mission of the community college continue to be providing associate degrees (Florida Statutes, 2003; Walker, 2005).

The law, Sec. 1007.33 (Florida Statutes, 2003), requires CEPRI to evaluate each community college proposal and the Florida Board of Education to authorize the program. CEPRI (2002) adopted a matrix of criteria to evaluate each proposal. Criteria are as follows:

1. Need (verifiable and important enough to justify change).
2. Potential impact (sufficient academic quality and addressing needs).
3. Use of resources (most effective use).
4. Implementation (timely and effective).
5. Accountability (complies with time-to-degree, articulation, and access statutory requirements).
6. Cost effectiveness (most cost effective use of resources to meet an identifiable workforce need).

The State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) 1998-2003 Strategic Plan (Florida Board of Education, Division of Community Colleges, 2002) agreed with the need to increase the number of degrees granted in the state and that community colleges were well positioned to do so. However, the SBCC emphatically stated that these colleges should not seek to alter their mission by becoming 4-year institutions (Florida Board of Education).

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) conducted a national survey of key individuals in 2- and 4-year colleges in 2000 to identify barriers to a baccalaureate
education and to expose practices that remove the barriers. The major obstacle was the reluctance of 4-year institutions to accept associate degree coursework completed at community colleges. Other key problems focused on the special needs of nontraditional students such as daycare, flexible class times, financial aid, and advisory support. Nontraditional students frequently cannot relocate to a 4-year institution and cost differentials exist. Recommendations for improvement included technology-based initiatives and community colleges offering baccalaureate degrees when senior institutions could not meet the demand, such as those found in Florida. This resolves both geographical and cost issues. Concurrent-use programs were also shown to be successful in increasing access to the 4-year degree in Florida. Twenty-seven of Florida’s community colleges currently offer upper level courses through concurrent-use or joint-use partnerships in education, business, criminal justice, technology, psychology, nursing, and engineering. These programs have provided access to 57 different baccalaureate programs at community colleges or joint campuses (Access to the Baccalaureate, 2003).

“Access to postsecondary education for those who can benefit from continued education is a primary goal of the American system of public education and has historically been a priority in Florida” (PEPC, 1995, p. 27). The report states that although Florida is recognized as a model for access to postsecondary education, concern has heightened regarding access to a baccalaureate education. New realities must be addressed and new strategies provided, PEPC contended. Even earlier than this report, Florida’s PEPC addressed three key challenges Florida’s higher education programs face in the 21st century (PEPC, 1993):
1. Improved use of educational resources to increase production and educate more students, with consideration for quality, access, and institutional interdependence.

2. Challenge of keeping Florida competitive in the new world economy as well as the need to address Florida’s diverse population.

3. Need for cost reductions, resource allocations, and revenue enhancements.

Employers, in a study conducted for the Florida PEPC by the Education Commission of the States (2000), said that many of the most difficult-to-fill jobs require a bachelor’s degree in these areas: business management, computer science, education (teacher preparation), engineering, and health professions. Baccalaureate opportunities need to be expanded in these areas (Education Commission of the States). PEPC (1999) focused its attention on access with emphasis on accommodating a growing student demand and improving undergraduate degree attainment. PEPC recommended that systemic, institutional, or geographic barriers to postsecondary educational opportunities be eliminated. In addition, PEPC supported the increase of joint or concurrent use facilities. PEPC also agreed with expanding the ability of students to obtain a baccalaureate degree at various locations, including authorizing community colleges to offer selected baccalaureate degrees.

J. David Armstrong, Jr. (2004), Chancellor of Florida’s Community Colleges and Workforce Education, summarized the priorities of the Florida Department of Education by saying,

The preferred way to address bachelor’s degree needs in the state is through collaboration and partnership between colleges and universities, but if other
options are not available, community colleges should address specific, limited, unmet needs by approving bachelor’s degrees. (pp. 1-2)

Two current bills that would maintain the existing authority for community colleges to seek approval from the Florida State Board of Education to grant specific bachelor’s degrees and to strengthen its review and approval process are HB 303 by Representative Mayfield and SB2388 by Senator Pruitt (Armstrong).

Burrows (2002) conducted an Interactive Qualitative Analysis (IQA) focus group that included 10 community college leaders. As a result of this research, she outlined “categories of affinities” (p. 73) that became eight themes of the baccalaureate movement among community colleges in Florida. According to Burrows, the primary drivers were

1. Access: “Florida citizens need more access to upper division educational opportunities” (p. 101).
2. Resources: Includes facilities, instructional capabilities, and money.
3. Collaboration: Partnerships between colleges to provide more educational opportunities for students.
4. Campus climate: Faculty and staff attitudes towards programs and initiatives.
5. Responsiveness: How colleges respond to state and local education and workforce needs.
6. Delivery modes: The who, how, and where of program offerings.
8. Mission fit: Whether or not the baccalaureate degree at the community college level fits within its traditional mission.
Five Florida Community College Baccalaureate Programs

Community college officials say “Florida is leading the way in the nationwide trend being driven by the need for more teachers and public service workers with bachelor’s degrees” (“College’s Changes Include Its Name,” 2005, p. B3). In 1999, the Florida legislature unanimously passed a bill allowing Florida’s community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees under certain conditions. The move was an attempt to increase students’ access to advanced courses without the financial burden of building new campuses. At that time the colleges were precluded from offering baccalaureate degrees on their own (except in the case where no 4-year public or private universities in the state were willing to form a partnership). In addition, a clear need for such a program had to be established (Access to the Baccalaureate, 2003).

That all changed shortly thereafter when the Florida legislature approved a new governance structure in 2001 that created one coordinating board for all educational institutions in the state, alleviating the concern about a duplication of programs between two educational sectors. That led to the approval to allow community colleges in the state to offer bachelor’s degrees (Evelyn, 2003). That year the Florida Senate gave initial approval for legislation allowing St. Petersburg Junior College to become the first Florida community college to award baccalaureate degrees in teaching, nursing, and technology management. Its name was changed to St. Petersburg College. The bill also allowed additional community colleges to pursue similar programs in fields that were in high demand (Armstrong, 2003a).

After St. Petersburg College received authority to offer baccalaureate degrees, three additional community colleges pursued the same authority: (a) Chipola Junior
College, (b) Edison Community College, and (c) Miami Dade Community College (Armstrong, 2003a). The CEPRI Board did not recommend approval for any of the proposals because they found no compelling need for such programs and the education governance reorganization was in transition and needed time to consider any significant institutional changes, such as those found in these requests (Morgaman, 2002). Despite their recommendation for disapproval, they stated that they believed allowing community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees should be kept as an option. They also recommended that local needs analyses be conducted and submitted to CEPRI, and funding be authorized by the legislature in order to provide such programs.

In May 2002, the Secretary of Education (now Education Commissioner) Jim Horne (2002a) recommended the following:

1. Chipola Junior College be awarded a 5-year provisional approval to grant baccalaureate degrees in Business Administration, Nursing, and Secondary Education.

2. Edison Community College be granted funding for a partnership between them and Florida Gulf Coast University to provide baccalaureate degrees in Computer Technology and Public Administration (to begin January 2003).

3. Miami Dade Community College be approved to grant baccalaureate degrees in Exceptional Student Education and Secondary Education (to begin August 2003) with reconsideration of Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education baccalaureate degrees in the future.

In a subsequent memo, Horne (2002b) supported Chipola’s partnerships in Business Administration and Nursing (to begin August 2002) and recommended it move forward
in offering the baccalaureate in secondary education (to begin in August 2003). In that memo, Horne also reported that the Florida Board of Education approved these programs.

In April 2003, Okaloosa-Walton Community College was also granted the authority to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science in Project and Acquisitions Management, especially designed for the area’s military program, to begin fall of 2004. It was authorized to provide a 4-year degree program in Nursing in conjunction with The University of West Florida, also to begin the fall of 2004 (Armstrong, 2003a).

Furlong (2005) reported that St. Petersburg College (SPC) is accredited to offer 4-year degrees in four fields: (a) Education (B.S. degrees in Elementary Education, Exceptional Student Education, Secondary Education Mathematics, and Secondary Education Biology); (b) Nursing; (c) Applied Science in Dental Hygiene; and (d) Applied Science in Technology Management. SPC was found to be one of the first community colleges in the country to offer the baccalaureate degree and to be one of the most innovative in establishing such programs. SPC said that important factors in developing such programs included (a) identifying areas of critical needs, (b) working with local institutions and organizations to make it positive and nonthreatening, (c) knowing and accommodating local community needs, and (d) informing and cooperating with all who are involved or impacted (Burkhart, 2002; Furlong). Also factors in making SPC successful in its pioneering efforts were (a) strong partnership agreements, (b) maintaining a “single college” (Furlong, p. 111) approach, (c) insuring program quality by following State University System (SUS) policies, (d) following a responsible process during the creation of it, and (e) establishing a workable finance formula.
Edison Community College’s name was changed to Edison College (EC) in the final session of the 2004 legislative session, which officials said would allow them to provide joint academic programs with other institutions (Peltier & Wendt-Kellar, 2004). The college began to provide an independent bachelor’s degree in 2005 after full approval in April (“Edison College Receives Bachelor’s Degree Approval,” 2005).

Chipola Junior College was authorized by the Florida Board of Education to provide B.S. degrees in Secondary Mathematics Education and Secondary Science Education in June 2002. In August, their name was changed to Chipola College (CC) and January 2004 the new baccalaureate program began (Prough, 2004). The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), upon approving Chipola College’s accreditation as a SACS Level II baccalaureate degree-granting institution, suggested the college review its mission statement in light of the changes, and study colleges in other states that have gone through similar substantive changes. It predicted that extensive changes in the institution’s culture would ensue (SACS Approves Chipola's Four-Year Programs, 2004).

Miami Dade College (MDC) began offering baccalaureate degrees beginning the Fall Term 2003 in Secondary Science, Mathematics, and Exceptional Education (Miami Dade College, 2003a). The college has stated that it will continue to offer a full range of associate’s degrees and professional certificates. “More than ever, the college is determined to fulfill its mission of responding to the needs of the community. The addition of 4-year degrees represents our commitment to meet the critical need for teachers in the public schools in south Florida,” stated MDC President, Eduardo J. Padron (Miami Dade College, 2003b, p. 1). Miami Dade officials say the college offers special opportunities to a different market than 4-year institutions. It is currently offering
education degrees to meet a teacher shortage but later plans to offer a bachelor’s degree in nursing (Evelyn, 2003). The president of the college says, “We’re only fulfilling the community college mission by responding to our community’s work-force needs. Right now, that’s teachers and health care workers” (Miami Dade College, p. 3).

Okaloosa Walton Community College (OWCC) won state approval to offer bachelor’s degrees in April 2003 in Project and Acquisitions Management and provide upper division coursework in Nursing in partnership with UWF (“OWCC Wins,” 2003). “It will take OWCC to a whole new level in higher education and expand the opportunities we can offer area citizens,” said Bob Richburg, college president (“OWCC Wins,” p. 1). Dr. Richburg found strong commitment by community and business leaders to develop high-demand degree programs. According to Richburg, “this is the biggest change in the mission and scope of this institution since OWJC was created 40 years ago” (“OWCC Accredited,” 2004, p. 2). On July 1, 2004, OWCC changed its name from OWCC to Okaloosa Walton College (OWC) reflecting the college’s ability to grant bachelor’s degrees (OWC Name Change, 2004). The Project and Acquisitions Management degree program has far exceeded its student interest estimate of 50 for the first year. Over 100 students have applied to the program’s first term (Anderson, 2004). Although four colleges with baccalaureate programs approved new names, OWC, CC, EC, and MDC, an attempt to establish a process in statute for additional community colleges in Florida to offer baccalaureate degrees languished sine die, effectively killing the bill (Talley, 2004).

“Authorizing community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees improves the state’s ability to meet workforce needs and gives students more choices” (OPPAGA,
2005, p. 1). OPPAGA, in its Report #05-20, states that Florida is the fourth most populous state and has the seventh highest enrollment in baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. Yet Florida ranks 20th in the number of these institutions. Florida provides less geographical access to the baccalaureate degree, less opportunity for meeting local workforce needs, and less of a chance for students to obtain their bachelor’s degree. OPPAGA therefore recommended that partnerships with other colleges be encouraged (22 out of 28 Florida community colleges have partnerships, enabling them to offer the baccalaureate degree). Six colleges currently provide independent bachelor’s degrees. Benefits of the latter include low tuition, the ability to meet local workforce needs, and improved retention and graduation rates. Problems include costs of becoming accredited and associated with low enrollments and high start-up costs, as well as the possibility of mission creep, which OPPAGA says is not evident in the current Florida programs. Still, OPPAGA contends, “The primary mission and responsibility of community colleges must be to remain responsive to community needs for lower division undergraduate instruction” (OPPAGA, p. 5). Florida has its problems in providing bachelor’s degrees, whatever the manner in which they are provided: (a) the state provides limited financial incentives to establish partnerships; (b) community college programs may not be cost effective, even long term, and (c) there is limited coordination of degree requirements related to the Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) programs. OPPAGA recommends strengthening the review and approval process, supporting and empowering community colleges to provide baccalaureate degrees that meet local workforce needs in the most efficient manner, and at the same time limiting their ability to offer these programs. They
feel that transformations should be slow and should focus on teaching. In addition, a process to coordinate degree requirements for the BAS is needed.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Research Design

The researcher used a concurrent mixed methods project strategy wherein both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. The purpose of the quantitative analyses was to provide numeric trends that measured relationships between different groups being surveyed and among the survey questions as well. Concurrently the research problem was explored qualitatively, using interviews of experts, in their own college setting, who have experienced the research problem issues firsthand. The rationale for combining these two sources of data was to understand the research problem by converging the numeric data produced in the quantitative analysis with the findings uncovered in the qualitative review, providing a more expansive, in-depth exploration of the issues (Creswell, 2003; Rogelberg, 2004).

The quantitative approach incorporated use of a descriptive closed-question survey, with a Likert-type scale. The study was cross-sectional, wherein respondents came from all five of the Florida community colleges that have experienced the transition from exclusively 2-year programs to baccalaureate-producing programs. The qualitative approach was descriptive in nature, utilizing both a structured and an open-ended interview format to inductively obtain an understanding of the views, attitudes, and ideas
community college leaders have constructed about the transformation of their respective community colleges (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). The researcher, as the single interviewer in a fieldwork scenario, was the only individual responsible for data collection and analysis. Comparisons of data with emerging categories (factors) were made via a sampling within these five groups, which exposed similarities and differences in responses garnered. Information was procured at times consecutively and concurrently. The researcher eventually converged the quantitative and qualitative data for a more comprehensive analysis of the research problem (Creswell, 2003).

The mixed methods approach allowed the researcher to use both predetermined (survey with close-ended questions and structured interview questions) and emerging (open-ended interview questions) methods. This provided for multiple forms of data input in consideration of the problem. Both statistical and textual analysis procedures were used. The nonexperimental quantitative research conducted in this project enabled the researcher to investigate relationships among the variables, and were expressed in bivariate correlations, showing how one variable related to another. The correlation was either positive or negative. The size of the correlation was also considered in interpreting results (McMillan & Wergin, 1998). The researcher used a chi-square analysis, which is a nonparametric test of statistical significance for bivariate tabular analysis. It gave the researcher an estimate of confidence in understanding the relationship between the variables (Connor-Linton, n.d.). It compared actual frequencies with those expected to occur by chance alone, enabling the researcher to determine significance (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The qualitative interview results were categorized using a manual lexical
analysis. This allowed the researcher to categorize the interview text by defining the inputs according to established factors.

Sample

The researcher used expert sampling involving persons with known or demonstratable experience and expertise in the area researched (Trochim, 2001). This is, essentially, a subcase of purposive sampling, where sampling was done with a specific purpose in mind (Trochim).

The survey was distributed to community college leaders within five former 2-year community colleges in Florida that have converted to colleges that provide 4-year baccalaureate-producing programs, resulting in the removal of the word community from their official names. The college leaders included presidents and vice presidents, deans, provosts, college administrators, department heads, and staff and faculty members who worked as individuals, in a committee, or on a team whose purpose was to develop their college’s baccalaureate degree-producing program. All of these individuals were perceived to be experts for sampling purposes because they were directly involved in the process of establishing or developing a baccalaureate degree program in their respective colleges in Florida. The colleges studied were St. Petersburg College (St. Petersburg), Miami Dade College (Miami), Chipola College (Chipola), Okaloosa-Walton College (Niceville), and Edison College (Fort Myers). An attempt was made to procure a minimum of 7 individuals from each college to respond to the survey. This was successful. One person who was designated as the responsible administrator for the
college’s baccalaureate program was contacted by the researcher to request knowledgeable individuals (as outlined above) to respond to the survey.

The qualitative interview segment utilized individuals from these same five colleges. At least 3 college leaders directly involved in creating, developing, or implementing their respective programs were interviewed from each of the five colleges \((n = 16)\). Issues that were addressed in the survey and interview instruments were those that were derived from the review of literature.

Procedure

The researcher traveled to all five college locations in order to procure survey results and conduct the interviews that were deemed necessary by the researcher. All participants were contacted, in advance, by the researcher or a local contact person selected by the researcher. Telephonic confirmations of the schedule were obtained.

All participants were asked to review and sign an informed consent form, and additional verbal consents were received of interviewees whose interviews were taped. All surveys and interviews were anonymously documented in the research report although their positions as executives, developers, or implementers were exposed. It was the goal of the researcher to include, as one of the interviewees, the college president. In addition, individuals directly involved in the creation or development of the program at their respective colleges were interview prospects. Participants were informed that their respective colleges would receive the results of the research effort, if they so requested.
Instruments

Both the survey instrument and the interview questions were constructed by the researcher, based on the review of literature. The survey instrument initially consisted of 66 questions, using a Likert-type scale. Such a survey type helps to ensure the validity of the survey. Ultimately, 50 questions were selected for survey use, and 5 more were removed to enhance the Chronbach’s alpha results. The structured interview questions initially consisted of 30 predetermined questions with an open-ended question format at the end. Ultimately, a total of 12 questions were used. Interviews were tape recorded at approximately 60 minutes each.

All questions were developed utilizing issues extracted from the review of literature in order to enhance validity. Many survey questions were extracted from criteria established by the Council for Education Policy Research & Improvement (CEPRI, 2002) in their “Community College Baccalaureate Degree Proposal Evaluation” document. Most of the interview questions were extracted from the “Evaluation Criteria for Baccalaureate Degree Programs at the UCCSN Community Colleges” (Building Nevada’s Future, 2002). Both instruments included questions of a demographic nature, enabling the researcher to make comparisons between groups based on individuals’ specific college positions. A preliminary draft of the survey instrument was administered to a group of 30 UWF doctoral students, after which the Cronbach-alpha analysis was accomplished to provide reliability. With an alpha of .884, reliability was ensured.
Researcher Bias

There was researcher bias in the selection of the topic itself, due to an interest in this transformational change in community colleges. The researcher has a bias toward providing baccalaureate degree-producing programs in community colleges, as long as they are based on specific circumstances that warrant such programs.

The researcher is employed as an associate instructor at Okaloosa Walton College (OWC) that was included in the survey and interview process. However, she was not, in any way, included in the creation, development, or implementation of the program at OWC or at any other college.

List of Appendixes

The following appendixes are provided to give the reader additional information:

A. The 2003 Florida Statutes: Community Colleges: Definition, Mission, and Responsibilities. Provides the mission and responsibilities for community colleges. (Florida Senate, 2003a)

B. Florida Department of Education Community Colleges, OPPAGA. Defines the purpose of the community college system, what services are provided, how policy is determined, who is served, how many are served, how they are funded, and current issues. (Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, 2005)

C. 2003 Florida Statutes: Site-determined baccalaureate degree access. How community colleges are considered for providing specified baccalaureate degrees. (Florida Senate, 2003b)
D. Memorandum from Jim Horne to Florida Board of Education: The law with regard to site-determined baccalaureate degree access legislation. J. Horne (personal communication, May 8, 2002)


F. Mission Statements: The mission and purpose statements of five Florida community colleges that became baccalaureate-producing colleges. (Chipola College, 2004b; Edison College, 2005; Miami Dade College, 2005; Okaloosa-Walton College, 2005; St. Petersburg College, 2003b)

G. Survey Instrument and Demographics: Given to individuals in each of five Florida colleges who had knowledge of the creation, development, or implementation of the baccalaureate degree programs in their respective colleges.

H. Interview Questions: Questions that were asked of individuals at each of the five colleges who were most involved in the creation, development, and implementation of the community college baccalaureate degree program in their respective colleges.

I. Informed Consent Form: Form used to inform participants about the survey and interview and their rights as participants.
J. Letter to Survey Participants and Letter to Key Baccalaureate Program Contact. Letters informing participants of what the researcher was requesting of them.

K. Letter to College Presidents from Dr. Richburg and the Researcher. Letters requested support from college presidents and informed them of the research.


M. Research Design Matrix: Research questions, source of data and instruments, survey and interview items, literature sources, and method of analysis.

N. Content Validity: Survey Questions & References: Survey questions tied to the literature review resources in order to provide content validity.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter 4 consists of nine sections, beginning with a statement of the problem and a review of the research questions. A description of the methods of analysis, including instrumentation and analysis procedures are provided. A brief description of the colleges studied includes college descriptors and how the colleges were selected for the study. There is also a description of participants in the study and how they were selected for both surveys and interviews. A review of the survey and interview participants’ demographics provides participants’ college positions, educational levels, and years worked at the community college level and at the college where they are currently employed. How these individuals were classified into three separate managerial levels is also included. Also included is a description of the survey results received from Community College Baccalaureate Association (CCBA) members who attended an association meeting in January 2005, a brief on where these participants are located, and the reasons for procuring CCBA results.

In chapter 4, an explanation is provided of the quantitative analysis used as well as a brief summary on the results of the factor analysis. The chi-square test of independence results are presented in order to provide quantitative input from the
surveys. A qualitative analysis of the interview results is outlined, using a manual lexical analysis system. A response to the dissertation questions is provided and an alignment of quantitative and qualitative results presented.

Problem and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine what key community college leaders in Florida viewed as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs and to consider the important factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs.

The first research question focused on the critical factors that were involved in the transformation to baccalaureate degree-producing programs in five Florida community colleges. This section includes the reasons the initiative was considered and implemented, the critical decisions that were made in order for this to occur, whether the mission of the college changed, and how.

The second research question asked what problems were managed and resolved during the process and what problems remain.

The third research question dealt with the perspectives that Florida community college leaders have who experienced this transition with regard to (a) program selection, (b) responsiveness to community needs, (c) limited resources and funding, (d) access for students, (e) conflict versus collaboration with other colleges and universities, and (f) program accountability and quality.
Methods of Analysis

Instrumentation

After a pilot study was conducted to establish reliability, a final survey instrument was created with 50 questions using a Likert-type scale. Survey questions were based on the research questions. A Cronbach’s alpha, conducted on the final instrument, resulted in a reliability alpha of .852. Five questions had been eliminated from the survey to enhance reliability. The survey instrument was given to 38 leaders in five community colleges in the state of Florida, four of which had begun baccalaureate degree programs in their community colleges and one that was in the process of implementation. Thirty-eight (100%) surveys were returned for analysis. These individuals were divided into three groups: (a) executives ($n = 12$), (b) developers ($n = 13$), and (c) implementers ($n = 13$). Executives were college presidents or vice presidents. Developers were individuals who were deemed critical by the individual colleges to the development of their baccalaureate programs from the beginning. Implementers were individuals who were directors and managers of the programs themselves. Interviews at the five colleges were conducted for the qualitative portion of the research. Of the 16 total interviews from the five colleges, 5 participants were executives, 8 were developers, and 3 were implementers. Twelve interview questions were created by the researcher with an eye toward (a) extracting the most important aspects of these new programs and (b) enhancing and elucidating the answers to the research questions.

In addition, surveys were sent to 85 individuals who attended the CCBA meeting in New York City in January 2005. Thirty surveys were returned from 12 states in the
U.S. and from Canada. These individuals were at various stages in the development of baccalaureate programs in their respective colleges.

**Analyses**

*Factor analysis.* A factor analysis of the survey responses was conducted in order to identify the most significant inquiry areas of interest. Factor analysis was deemed a valuable analysis tool by the researcher. It “services the cause of scientific parsimony” (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000, p. 826). It is viewed as a powerful research method, and many researchers refer to it as “the queen of analytic methods . . . due to its power, elegance, and closeness to the core of scientific purpose” (Kerlinger & Lee, p. 825). Three major factors emerged in this study upon completion of the analysis. They were need, accountability, and mission. Need accounts for whether or not there was a need for the new programs, how need was determined, and who the key players were in determining need. Accountability dealt with issues such as how and to whom colleges were accountable during the initiation and development stages of the programs and program evaluation. Mission issues explored whether and how the community college mission changed as a result of the addition of these new programs, the degree to which it changed or is changing, and the acceptability of these changes.

*Quantitative statistical analysis (chi-square).* The chi-square test was used to determine whether differences between frequencies that were observed and expected were statistically significant (Nicol & Pexman, 1999). More specifically, the chi-square test of independence was used to determine whether two variables that were measured on a nominal scale were in any way related or associated (Harris, 1998). It, therefore, was used to measure association or difference, as a result of comparing the levels of one
variable with the levels of another variable, and to ensure that the proportions of one variable do not differ significantly from the proportions of another. The first cross-tab analysis was conducted comparing the responses of the three Florida groups (executives, developers, and implementers), as they responded to 45 Likert scale survey questions. The Likert scale provided five options, *strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree,* and *strongly disagree.* A second analysis considered a comparison of the three Florida groups using the three derived factor categories of need, accountability, and mission. A third analysis considered differences between the Florida group and the CCBA group as they viewed need, accountability, and mission.

*Qualitative analysis (lexical categories).* A qualitative analysis was conducted using 16 interviews with leaders from five community colleges in Florida. These leaders were directly involved in the creation, development, and implementation of the baccalaureate degree in their respective colleges and, therefore, had integral and special knowledge of their programs. A lexical coding system that identifies key words and phrases was used to find similarities and differences in the 16 responses to each of the 11 interview questions. Additional topics the interviewee wanted to add were discussed at the end of the interview. Information was organized using three factors--need, accountability, and mission. An alignment of information received in the quantitative and qualitative responses was completed.
Five Florida Colleges

Selection Criteria

Five colleges were selected in the state of Florida for this study. St. Petersburg College, Miami Dade College, Chipola College, and Okaloosa-Walton College were the first four community colleges in the state to be approved to provide a baccalaureate degree, and Edison College, the fifth, was expected to receive approval before the study was completed (which occurred in April 2005). The researcher considered the state of Florida and these five colleges to be pioneers in this arena. No other state has more community colleges providing such programs. It was, therefore, considered by the researcher to be a prime target for research at the critical beginning stages of development. All five colleges are accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

College Descriptions

St. Petersburg College. Opening in September 1927, St. Petersburg Junior College (SPJC) became Florida’s first 2-year college (St. Petersburg College, 2003a). In June 2001, SPJC became a 4-year institution and changed its name to St. Petersburg College (SPC). It was the first 2-year college in Florida to do so, and remains the only college to have baccalaureate degree-granting authority based on statute. In August 2002, SPC began offering fully accredited baccalaureate programs. It now provides bachelor’s degrees in Education (Elementary, Exceptional Student, Secondary Mathematics, and Secondary Science), Nursing, Technology Management, and Dental Hygiene. Four-year
degree programs in Veterinary Technology, Public Safety Administration, and Orthotics and Prosthetics began in 2005. Through the University Partnership Center (UPC), the college offers 40 additional bachelor’s degrees and 20 master’s degrees from 13 Florida universities and colleges and The George Washington University. SPC has five traditional campuses.

*Miami Dade College.* In 1960, Miami Dade College (MDC, 2004) opened its doors to students. By 1967, the college was the largest institution of higher education in the state of Florida, enrolling 23,341 students. Miami Dade College became the fastest growing junior college in the nation. In the fall of 2003, MDC’s School of Education began offering bachelor’s degree programs leading to teacher certification in Secondary Mathematics (6-12); Secondary Science (6-12), with concentrations in biology, chemistry, earth/space science, and physics; and Exceptional Student Education (K-12). There are six campuses and additional centers, with over 160,000 students enrolled yearly. MDC awards more associate’s degrees than any other school in the nation and graduates the highest number of minority students.

*Chipola College.* Chipola College (CC) opened its doors as a junior college in 1946, making it the third oldest of Florida’s 28 community colleges (CC, 2004a). CC was granted permission to offer baccalaureate degrees in December 2003. In January 2004, Chipola enrolled its first students in the Teacher Education Program, offering a Bachelor of Science Degree in Secondary Education with emphasis in mathematics or science. The University Center at Chipola (Chipola College, 2004c) offers partnership programs with three universities in Nursing, Criminal Justice, Special/Elementary Education, Social Work, Counseling and Psychology, and Education Leadership in Administration as well
as Curriculum and Instruction. The college serves over 3,000 students in its degree and certificate programs and over 2,500 continuing education and public service training students.

*Okaloosa-Walton College.* Okaloosa-Walton College (OWC) first opened its doors in August of 1964, and currently services more than 15,000 students annually at the college’s six campuses and centers (OWC, 2004). In December 2003, Okaloosa-Walton Community College was accredited as a baccalaureate degree-granting institution and its name was changed to OWC. It currently offers a Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Project and Acquisitions Management. A Bachelor of Science in Nursing program is provided jointly by OWC and The University of West Florida (UWF). A Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Humanities, as a joint effort between OWC and UWF, provides an Associate of Arts to Bachelor of Arts opportunity.

*Edison College.* Edison College (EC) is the most recent of the five studied to offer a bachelor’s degree, receiving approval in April 2005 (*Edison College Receives*, 2005). The degree designation is a Bachelor of Applied Science in Public Safety Management. Since 2001, the program has been jointly offered under a cooperative agreement with Florida Gulf Coast University. Edison Junior College was established in the fall of 1962, and has four campus and center locations. It serves over 15,000 students annually. Edison Community College became Edison College when, in a 2004 legislative session, state officials allowed it to provide joint academic programs with other institutions. Dr. Kenneth P. Walker, current Edison College President, is the founding President of the CCBA, established in August 1991 (Edison College, 2004).
Study Participants

Procurement of Participants

The researcher contacted the key individual most responsible for the new baccalaureate degree programs at each of the five colleges studied. She asked that person to provide the names of at least seven individuals involved in the creation, development, and implementation of the college’s baccalaureate degree program for survey purposes and the top three (to include the college president) who were the most involved for the interview process. A package of surveys was sent to the key person at each college for distribution and a request for interviews made. Surveys were distributed and returned in February and March 2005, and interviews were conducted by the researcher at the various campuses in March and April. Receipt of all research surveys and completion of all interviews occurred on April 14. All surveys were returned, providing a 100% return rate \( (N = 38) \). All but three interview requests were honored \( (N = 16) \). The high success rate was the result of a letter sent to four college presidents by the OWC president, Dr. Bob Richburg, in support of the researcher’s efforts, as well as rigorous follow-up efforts by the researcher to acquire the desired number of surveys and procure interviews.

Demographics of Florida Participants

Surveys. In Table 1, the demographics are enhanced by showing total numbers and percentages in each category. Demographic characteristics show college position, highest education level completed, years of involvement at the community college level and at the college where they currently work, time devoted to the baccalaureate program, and categorizations for research purposes. It should be noted that the percentage of time
currently devoted to the baccalaureate program will continue to vary depending upon the
state of program development and the position of the individual at the college.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice president or provost</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or division chair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (coordinator, director, associate vice president)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest education level completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of involvement at community college level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of involvement at current college</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time currently devoted to baccalaureate program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorizations for research purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interviews.* Of the 16 interview participants, 5 were college or campus presidents or vice presidents, 2 were deans, 3 were department or division chairs, and 6 were directors or coordinators. For research tabulation purposes, interview participants were categorized into the following groups: (a) executives ($n = 5$), (b) developers ($n = 8$), and (c) implementers ($n = 3$).

*CCBA Participants*

Community College Baccalaureate Association 2005 conference attendees were asked to provide survey responses as a result of their membership in the CCBA. These individuals were either involved in a baccalaureate degree program at their colleges, were in various stages of its development at their colleges, or were extremely interested in the concept. The researcher wanted to procure these surveys from individuals outside of the five colleges in Florida being studied in order to compare responses with the Florida participants to see if there were significant differences between the two. Of the 85 survey
packages mailed out, 23 were returned from 12 states in the U.S. and 7 returned from Canada ($n = 30$).

Statistical Analyses

Mixed Method Analysis

The researcher selected the mixed method approach that bases “knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds” which, in this case, is “consequence-oriented, problem-centered and pluralistic” in nature (Creswell, 2003, p. 18). It involves collecting both quantitative data, which is numeric, via instrumental results, as well as textual information, based on on-site interviews. “The researcher bases the inquiry on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data best provides an understanding of a research problem” (Creswell, p. 21).

This project is descriptive research, the purpose of which is to describe or report data on a number of variables. A cross-tab analysis enables the researcher to study the relationship between variables. It is a numerical tabular data presentation that provides both frequencies and percentages (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

Pilot Study

Survey questions were created by the researcher, based on the review of literature. Refinement of the survey questions was conducted with the help of a community college leader who was familiar with baccalaureate degree programs at community colleges. A group of doctoral-level graduate students was then given the survey. A Cronbach’s alpha
reliability rating of .884 (N = 30) was produced. Based upon the feedback, further revisions were completed, and a decision made to continue with the survey.

Reliability

After all survey results were tabulated, another Cronbach’s alpha was conducted resulting in a reliability of .795 (N = 38). Further tests ensued, resulting in the elimination of five survey questions, establishing a new reliability rating of .852 (N = 38), which was satisfactory to the researcher and recognized as statistically valid for research use. The final instrument, therefore, included a total of 45 survey items using a Likert-type scale.

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis was conducted using SPSS. Factor analysis allows the researcher to identify the general dimensions or factors behind a measure (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). “A factor is a construct, a hypothetical entity, a latent variable that is assumed to underlie tests, scales, items, and indeed, measures of almost any kind” (Kerlinger & Lee, p. 826). According to a number of researchers, factor analysis is “the queen of analytic methods . . . due to its power, elegance, and closeness to the core of scientific purpose” (Kerlinger & Lee, p. 825). The researcher viewed it, therefore, as a powerful method, worthy of incorporation into the study at hand. It can show if validity is evident in the study.

Two stages of the factor analysis were conducted. The first stage, factor extraction, enabled the researcher to determine that there were three primary factors underlying the survey questions (Green & Salkind, 2003). A principal components
analysis (a type of factor analysis) was used to make this decision. The second stage, factor rotation, provided the researcher with the tools to make the factors more interpretable. Factors were named by considering the largest values linking the factor to measured variables in a rotated factor matrix.

The factor extraction produced a Scree plot of eigenvalues (Figure 1) illustrating the amount of variance in variables that are accounted for by a factor (Green & Salkind, 2003). Upon further scrutiny, the researcher determined that the three factors that were most evident as key areas of interest in the study were (a) need, (b) accountability, and (c) mission. The researcher then conducted a cross-tab analysis of these factors as they related to three demographic identifications of managerial levels among the college leaders who were surveyed and interviewed. Those three demographics were (a) executives, (b) developers, and (c) implementers.

![Figure 1. The scree plot for factor analysis exposes three factors.](image-url)
Chi-Square Analysis

A chi-square test of independence was conducted in order to determine the level of departure of obtained frequencies from frequencies expected by chance. This test is a nonparametric statistical procedure that determines whether or not two qualitative variables that are at the nominal level are related or if they are independent (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). It is viewed as a “useful statistical test” (Kerlinger & Lee, p. 229). Since the chi-square test is nonparametric, generalizations can occur only for the sample itself, which is appropriate for this study.

The chi-square analysis was conducted on each survey item using a 1 x 5 test of independence on the Florida surveys \( (N = 38) \) and 1 x 5 test of independence on the CCBA surveys \( (N = 30) \). The independent variables were (a) the participants from the five community colleges in Florida that were surveyed and (b) the CCBA participants from other states and Canada. They were each compared to five Likert-type categories from strongly agree on one end to strongly disagree on the other. The values that were obtained from these groups were compared to expected values and then correlated. The assumption that each group was independent was made.

Reverse scoring was conducted on six survey items (13, 15, 17, 26, 27, and 48) where high scores represented low scores on the underlying construct (Green & Salkind, 2003). Scores were reverse-scaled because the questions were worded in the negative.

Need. A one-sample chi-square test was conducted to assess whether Florida participants strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed, or were undecided about the need factor in the community college baccalaureate (CCB) programs at their colleges. Of the 12 questions, 8 were significant below the .001 level, 2 below the .01
level, and 2 below the .05 level. In Item 1, 28 (74%) strongly agreed about the need for the new college baccalaureate programs, 8 (21%) agreed, and 2 (5%) were undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 29.263, p < .001$. In Item 2, 31 (82%) strongly agreed that a local workforce assessment was essential before initiating new programs and 7 (18%) agreed. The results were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 15.158, p < .001$. In Item 3, agreement and disagreement were more evenly distributed. Four (11%) strongly agreed, whereas 1 (3%) strongly disagreed that the need for these programs was related to the nature of the delivery system, 12 (32%) agreed, 11 (29%) disagreed, and 8 (21%) were undecided. Two individuals did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 36) = 12.056, p < .05$. In Item 4, there was strong agreement about the shortage of trained individuals in the new program areas. Twenty-seven (71%) strongly agreed, 9 (24%) agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 38) = 47.474, p < .001$. In Item 5, there was almost equal agreement and disagreement. Nine (24%) strongly agreed that the need for these new programs was due to articulation problems, 7 (18%) agreed, 15 (40%) disagreed, and 2 (5%) strongly disagreed. Three (8%) were undecided and 2 did not answer the question. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 36) = 15.111, p < .01$. In Item 6, there was mostly agreement that the need for these new programs was driven by student demand. Twenty (53%) strongly agreed, 14 (37%) agreed, and 3 (8%) disagreed. One did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 37) = 12.054, p < .01$. In Item 7, there was mostly agreement that program enrollments met or exceeded expected student enrollments. Nineteen (50%) strongly agreed, 11 (29%) agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed, and 5 (13%) were undecided. Two did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 36) = 20.444, p < .001$. In Item 8,
again there was strong agreement. Twenty-six (68%) strongly agreed and 12 (32%) agreed that student needs assessments were essential before initiating new programs. There was no disagreement and no one was undecided on this question. The results were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 5.158, p < .05$.

Item 9 also indicated agreement, with 29 (76%) strongly agreeing and 8 (21%) agreeing that a needs analysis or study documented that there was a demand for graduates in the new programs before implementation. One (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 33.526, p < .001$. There was decided agreement on Item 10. Twenty-seven (71%) strongly agreed and 10 (26%) agreed that the issue of student access to the baccalaureate degree led to the implementation of these new programs at their colleges. One was undecided (3%). The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 27.526, p < .001$. In Item 11, 32 (84%) strongly agreed and 6 (16%) agreed that the new programs would contribute significantly to meeting workforce needs in the service area provided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 17.789, p < .001$. In Item 20, 15 (40%) strongly agreed and 21 (55%) agreed that the new programs would significantly reduce the gap between supply and demand for baccalaureate graduates in these new service areas. One disagreed (3%) and one was undecided (3%). The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 38) = 32.316, p < .001$.

Accountability. A one-sample chi-square test was conducted to assess whether Florida participants strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed or were undecided about the accountability factor in the CCB programs at their colleges. Of the 19 questions, 15 were significant at or below the .001 level, 3 were at or below the .01 level, and 1 was below the .05 level. Item 16 exposed some questions regarding whether
or not Florida’s legislative and executive branches shared the college’s vision for the future as far as the CCB degree programs are concerned. Strong agreement came from only 5 (13%), with 12 (32%) agreeing, 6 (16%) disagreeing, 1 (3%) strongly disagreeing, 13 (34%) undecided, and 1 not answering. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 37) = 13.676, p < .01$.

In Item 21, 15 (40%) agreed, with 4 (11%) strongly agreeing, 6 (16%) disagreeing, 8 (21%) strongly disagreeing, 3 (8%) undecided and 2 (5%) not answering that the structure of the new programs is the same or very similar to the traditional baccalaureate degree. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 36) = 12.611, p < .05$. Item 27 focused on the question of whether or not adverse relationships between upper division and lower division faculty members had surfaced in this process. Most respondents agreed that this was not a problem that had surfaced in the process, with 18 (47%) strongly agreeing and 11 (29%) agreeing. Only 1 (3%) said that such problems had surfaced (disagreed), and 4 (11%) were undecided. Four (11%) did not answer the question. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 34) = 20.353, p < .001$. Item 33 asked whether current faculty members raised concerns that needed to be resolved upon initiation of the new programs. Fifteen (40%) agreed that concerns were raised, 16 (42%) disagreed, and 2 (5%) strongly disagreed. Four (11%) were undecided on this issue, and 1 (3%) did not answer. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 37) = 17.162, p = .001$. There was strong agreement in Item 36 about internal assurances regarding capable and qualified personnel being in place before new programs were initiated. Eighteen (47%) strongly agreed, 18 (47%) agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 38) = 30.421, p < .001$. 
There was total agreement on Item 37 where 29 (76%) strongly agreed and 9 (24%) agreed that program quality issues received high priority in the development of the new programs. The results were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 10.526$, $p = .001$. There was agreement on Item 38 where participants felt that accreditation standards should allow for programs that respond to specific and unique institutional circumstances. Twenty (53%) agreed, 10 strongly agreed (26%), only 3 (8%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) strongly disagreed. Four (11%) were undecided on this issue. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 38) = 31.211$, $p < .001$. Agreement was also evident on Item 39 where 22 (58%) agreed, 14 (37%) strongly agreed, and only 2 (5%) disagreed that there must be a clear provision for the compilation and reporting of performance data for accountability and evaluation before these programs are implemented. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 16.000$, $p < .001$. High agreement levels were evident on Item 40 where 18 (47%) strongly agreed, 19 (50%) agreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided about the requirement that new programs be supported by clearly established lines of accountability and responsibility before implementation. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 16.158$, $p < .001$. There was also agreement on Item 41 where 26 (68%) strongly agreed and 11 (29%) agreed that new programs must comply with common prerequisites and other applicable state articulation agreements. One (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 20.000$, $p < .001$.

On Item 42, regarding whether current accreditation standards were flexible enough to allow for establishing new programs in their colleges, 18 (47%) agreed, 15 (40%) strongly agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) strongly disagreed. Three (8%) were undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 38) = 35.684$, $p < .001$. Internal
assurances regarding structure and facility must be in place before initiating new programs was the issue in Item 43. There was agreement from 20 (53%) participants, strong agreement from 16 (42%), with 2 (5%) undecided. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(2, N = 38) = 14.105, p = .001 \). Item 45 stated that community colleges must provide for performance standards, including outcomes assessments, before implementing new programs. Twenty-two (58%) agreed, 14 (37%) strongly agreed, 1 (3%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(3, N = 38) = 33.789, p < .001 \). There was slight disagreement on Item 46, which said that community colleges must do more to reach beyond state funding resources to other sources of funding. Nineteen (50%) agreed, 4 (11%) strongly agreed, 5 (13%) disagreed, and 3 (8%) strongly disagreed. Six (16%) were undecided and 1 (3%) did not respond. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(4, N = 37) = 23.405, p < .001 \). There was strong agreement about whether these new programs were cost efficient for the state in Item 47. Twenty-three (61%) strongly agreed, 14 (37%) agreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(2, N = 38) = 19.316, p < .001 \). Item 48 concerned itself with costs rising at community colleges for traditional programs where baccalaureate programs had been established. Thirteen (34%) strongly agreed that costs would not rise, with 18 (47%) agreeing. One (3%) disagreed and 6 (16%) were undecided. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(3, N = 38) = 17.789, p < .001 \). Fourteen (37%) strongly agreed and 14 (37%) agreed in Item 49 that incremental costs to establish these new programs (including capital outlay) to the state are less than other available options. Two (5%) disagreed and 7 (18%) were undecided. One (3%) did not respond. The results were significant, \( \chi^2(3, N = 37) = 11.108, p = .01 \). There was strong agreement that the costs to students in these new baccalaureate programs were less than
other available alternatives in Item 50. Twenty-five strongly agreed (66%), 12 (32%) agreed, and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 22.789$, $p < .001$.

**Mission.** The final factor reviewed was mission. A one-sample chi-square test was conducted to assess whether Florida participants strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed or were undecided about the mission factor in the CCB programs at their colleges. Of the 11 questions, 9 were significant at or below the .001 level and 2 were at or below the .01 level. Item 13 dealt with whether or not the community college mission had been expanded too far. Unless undecided (4 at 11%), there was strong agreement that it had not. Twenty-three (61%) said they strongly agreed that the mission had not been expanded too far, and 11 (29%) agreed. No one disagreed. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 38) = 14.579$, $p = .001$. Eighteen (47%) agreed and 9 (24%) strongly agreed that the new programs had changed or expanded the former stated mission of their college in Item 14. Five (13%) disagreed and 4 (11%) strongly disagreed. One (3%) was undecided about this question and one (3%) did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 37) = 23.405$, $p = .001$. Item 15 looked at whether or not the new programs reduced student access to traditional community college programs. There was strong agreement, 31 (82%), that it did not. In addition, 5 (13%) agreed with this. Only 1 disagreed (3%) and 1 (3%) was undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 38) = 66.000$, $p < .001$. Item 17 looked at whether or not community colleges were moving from a comprehensive (multiple) mission approach to one that focuses on particular niches. Eighteen (47%) agreed and 10 (26%) strongly agreed that it was not moving in that direction. Three (8%) disagreed with this position and 1 (3%) strongly disagreed.
Five (13%) were undecided and 1 did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 37) = 25.027, p < .001$.

Item 19 asked if the new baccalaureate programs represented a transformational change for community colleges. Twenty-five (66%) agreed, 5 (13%) strongly agreed, two (5%) disagreed and two (5%) strongly disagreed. Three (8%) were undecided and 1 (3%) did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 37) = 53.135, p < .001$. There was only agreement with Item 22 where participants strongly agreed, 32 (84%), or agreed, 6 (16%) that the new programs did not terminate any associate in arts or science degrees as a result of their implementation. The results were significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 38) = 17.789, p < .001$. Twenty-one (55%) strongly agreed and 12 (32%) agreed with Item 23 that the new programs did not have a significantly adverse impact on established programs in existing public or private institutions within the service area. Two (5%) disagreed, 1 (3%) was undecided, and 2 (5%) did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 36) = 29.556, p < .001$.

Item 29 had a fairly even distribution between those who agreed and disagreed. It stated that new programs should not duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance. Fourteen (37%) agreed and 3 (8%) strongly agreed. Eleven (29%) disagreed and 3 (8%) strongly disagreed. Six (16%) were undecided on this issue and 1 (3%) did not answer. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 37) = 13.135, p = .01$. Item 30 stated that cooperative programs with other colleges and universities worked well for their college. Seventeen (45%) agreed, 13 (34%) strongly agreed, 2 (5%) disagreed, and 6 (16%) were undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 38) = 14.421, p < .01$. Item 31 asked if new distance learning programs should not
duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance. Twenty (53%) disagreed with this position and 4 (11%) strongly disagreed. Only 6 (16%) agreed and 1 (3%) strongly agreed. Six (16%) were undecided. One chose not to answer. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 37) = 29.081, p < .001$. Item 32 asked if community colleges should consider collaboration with other institutions before taking an independent road to baccalaureate degrees. Twenty (53%) agreed, 3 (8%) strongly agreed, 11 (29%) disagreed, and 1 (3%) strongly disagreed. Three (8%) were undecided. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 38) = 33.053, p < .001$.

Other. There were three items that did not readily fall into one of the three factor analysis categories, but they are worthy of report. Item 25 asked if programs that are autonomous and self-sufficient are more efficient than partnerships (cooperative programs). Seven (18%) strongly agreed, 6 (16%) agreed, 7 (18%) disagreed, and 2 (5%) strongly disagreed. Fourteen (37%) were undecided on this issue and 2 (5%) did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 36) = 10.389, p < .05$. Item 26 asked if the demands of serving upper division students burdened current student service personnel and faculty members in different ways beyond former requirements. Fifteen (40%) agreed and 5 (13%) strongly agreed that it did not. Nine (24%) disagreed and 1 (3%) strongly disagreed, meaning they believed the new demands were more burdensome. Six (16%) were undecided and 2 (5%) did not respond. The results were significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 36) = 15.111, p < .01$. Item 28 asking if there was a cooperative program with a 4-year institution currently in place at their college, was not significant, $x^2(1, N = 37) = 2.189, p > .05$. The Florida community college chi-square results can be found in Table 2.
Table 2

Chi-Square Analysis of Florida Community College Baccalaureate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>1 Need for community college baccalaureate programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Local workforce needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Delivery system</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Shortage of trained individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Articulation problems led to need</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Student demand led to need</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Program enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Student needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Needs analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Student access</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Meeting workforce needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Gap between supply and demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Florida’s government shares vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Same structure as traditional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Relationships among faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Faculty concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Traditional baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 Qualified personnel essential</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 Program quality issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 Unique institutional circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Reporting performance data</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Lines of accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Prerequisites and articulation agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Flexible accreditation standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Structure and facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Funding resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Cost efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Costs rising</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>New program costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Student costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multiple mission of community colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mission changed</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student access reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mission changing to particular niches</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Transformational change</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Associate programs intact</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adverse impact on other institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Duplication of programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cooperative programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Distance learning programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Collaboration over independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Partnership efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Burden on staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cooperatives in place</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Survey Response: Means and Divergence

It is of value in this research to consider the items that had the most and least divergence from the mean. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) suggest that “measures of central tendency and variability are the most important tools of behavioral data analysis,” with the mean being “the most used average in research” (p. 202). Therefore, both the means ($M$) and standard deviations ($SD$) are provided for the items that were the most and the least divergent for all Florida participants ($N = 38$). Items with a $SD$ of 1.0 or more were considered to have a high level of divergence in their responses. Items with a $SD$ of .5 or less were considered to have a low level of divergence. In Table 3, means with the lowest and highest standard deviations are provided.
Table 3

*Mean and Standard Deviations for Lowest and Highest Deviations for Florida Participants (N = 38)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lowest deviation</th>
<th>Highest deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey Response by Group and Factor*

Each of the three groups of participants, (executives, developers, and implementers) by the three factors, (need, accountability, and mission) are shown in Table 4. With regard to need, the smallest amount of divergence was in the executive group and the largest amount was in the group of implementers. In the accountability factor, the smallest amount of divergence was with implementers and the largest number
of divergent responses was with executives and developers. Implementers had the smallest amount of divergence with regard to mission items and executives and developers had the largest divergence within this factor.

Table 4

*Divergence in Survey Responses by Group and Factor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Small divergence</th>
<th>Large divergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of Likert scores among executives, developers, and implementers in the need category is shown in figure 2. The Likert scores represent the following: 1 = *strongly agree*, 2 = *agree*, 3 = *undecided*, 4 = *disagree*, and 5 = *strongly disagree*. A high degree of agreement among all three groups in the need factor is shown.
A comparison of Likert scores among executives, developers, and implementers in the accountability category is shown in Figure 3. The Likert scores represent the following: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = undecided, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. The most agreement between executives and developers and the most disagreement between implementers and the two groups of executives and developers are shown in Figure 3. Still, the agreement among all three is substantial.
A comparison of Likert scores among executives, developers, and implementers in the mission category is shown in Figure 4. The Likert scores represent the following: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = undecided, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. Substantial agreement among all three groups in the mission factor is depicted in Figure 4.

Figure 3. Likert score survey responses of the accountability factor.
Figure 4. Likert score survey responses of the mission factor.

**Distribution of Responses on the Likert Scale by Group**

The frequency distribution of responses on the Likert scale by group is shown in Table 5. Combining *strongly agree* and *agree* responses, executives and implementers had the highest amount of agreement on survey questions (41%), and all four groups had similar amounts of disagreement (both *strongly disagree* and *disagree* categories) with the questions (7%). The implementer group had the most *undecided* responses. The CCBA group, in comparison, had 39% in both *agree* categories and 5% in both *disagree* categories.
Table 5

*Frequency Distribution of Responses on Likert Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Likert value</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBA</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CCBA = Community College Baccalaureate Association.
A Likert score comparison among the four groups, executives, developers, implementers, and CCBA respondents is shown in Figure 5. The Likert scores represent the following: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = undecided, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. The chart shows the strongest agreement on Likert scale choices between executives and developers and the least agreement between CCBA and the Florida groups.

Figure 5. Likert score survey response comparison of Florida and CCBA groups.
CCBA and Florida Mean Differentials

The means of the CCBA group and Florida group are compared in Table 6. There was a high degree of similarity in means between the CCBA and Florida groups on 41 questions. On four questions, there was more difference between means: Items 16, 27, 33, and 50. Item 16 dealt with whether or not governmental branches of government should share the college’s vision for the future regarding the CCB degree program(s). The CCBA group ($M = 4.57$) felt more strongly that they should than the Florida group ($M = 3.38$). Item 27 dealt with adverse relationships between upper division and lower division faculty members surfacing. Here CCBA’s mean was lower ($M = 2.80$) than Florida’s ($M = 4.35$). Item 33 indicated that faculty members have some concerns that need to be resolved. CCBA responded more highly that they would ($M = 3.93$). Florida indicated that this did not actually happen ($M = 2.79$). Item 50 had to do with costs to students being less than other available alternatives. Florida had a higher mean on this question ($M = 4.63$) than CCBA ($M = 3.69$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>CCBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Florida M</td>
<td>Florida SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Items 12, 18, 24, 34, and 44 were removed for a higher reliability rating.
Interviews

Qualitative research assumes the view that “reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds. Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). It deals with the experience of the individual who has lived it and who has opinions and thoughts about it. Therefore, this researcher deemed it important to this project. Each interview question was analyzed according to the three established factors and other elements of the CCB that were viewed as important.

Interviews ($N = 16$) were conducted with the individuals who were most involved in their baccalaureate program in their respective Florida community college. There were 5 executives, 8 developers, and 3 implementers interviewed. Each interviewee had a number of responses to each question, all of which were considered. The answers to each question were analyzed from the perspective of these individuals, based on their experience and position. A lexical word analysis was used to determine similarities and differences. The factor analysis topics were utilized to help with categorization of responses under the factors that were established, those being need, accountability, and mission. Individual responses that were particularly characteristic of a number of responses and special perspectives are presented. The qualitative analysis provides depth to the perspectives exposed in this study.

*Interview Question 1: Need—Driving Forces in Initiating This Change*

The top reason, with 9 responses, was student access to the baccalaureate degree. Close behind at 8 each was meeting community and workforce needs. Seven responses
dealt with the need for nurses and teachers (especially minority teachers, several added). Five mentioned vision and leadership and five opportunity. Four explained that many recognized the need for more baccalaureate degrees in Florida. Four discussed the special needs of the nontraditional student. The need to use available resources, affordability, and community college credibility were each mentioned by one participant.

*Interview Question 2: Need—How Critical Needs Were Identified*

Ten respondents received input from various community sources through various means. Nine reported using surveys among various student groups. Six discussed understanding local unmet needs and market trends. Three said the legislature identified specific needs in the state and 1 said institutional strengths pointed toward specific programs.

*Interview Question 5: Accountability—Community College Baccalaureate Compared to the Traditional 4-Year Baccalaureate*

Seven felt that what the public or community thought of the program was the most important attitude in this regard. Six indicated they believe that universities intimate that it’s an inferior degree. Six reflected that these programs were the same because of the same accreditation standards. Six said respect will come and it will be earned. Five stated that the CCB was as good a degree as from any other institution. Four believed it may be a better program than currently offered by 4-year universities. Two said the name change is the first step in the equalization process. Two indicated they felt the reputation of the
college was more important and one said that not all college degrees are equal, even at
the university level.

*Interview Question 7: Accountability—Difficulties or Conflicts Encountered in the
Process*

Respondents had much to say on this topic, and the responses were varied. Six
stated that change was hard and the transformations were substantial. Six indicated that
acceptance of the change was the most difficult part. Six responded that there were few if
any internal problems; 5 said that communication was critical, especially with faculty, in
order to get “buy-in.” Five said the problems encountered were numerous. Five stated
that universities felt their turf was being invaded. Five felt the Council for Education
Policy Research and Improvement (CEPRI) was adversarial, viewing their role as
wanting to “stop the process.” Five found that there was a tremendous amount of work to
be done in order to initiate the change, 2 saying it took more time to get tasks done than
they had expected. Four felt frustration with not being provided the opportunity to offer
what their local communities needed. Three indicated that when conflict surfaced, issues
became political, and that was hard to deal with. Three found funding to be a problem but
one said financial contributions were up. Three said it was not possible to do this without
serious community support. One viewed this as a transformational change, another that it
was simply transitional. One stated that the legislature supported it but didn’t really
understand it. One stated that staffing was the biggest internal problem. One said
changing the college name was difficult because they still view themselves as a
community college; another said they remain a community college despite the name
change. One stated that leadership support at the top was essential to avoid conflict. One felt the transition was easier due to already having sufficient resources to make it work.

*Interview Question 9: Accountability—How Program Quality is Ensured*

Faculty qualifications and experience were the most important program quality issues according to 7 respondents. Six said state scrutiny ensured quality. Six indicated that student evaluations and completion rates prove that quality is there. Five list constant internal evaluations as a way of ensuring high quality. Accreditation requirements by SACS were named by 4. Curriculum planning using experts was advanced by 4. External (employer) evaluations that show high quality in these programs were pointed out by 4. Four named commitment to excellence by their schools as a critical factor. Two indicated that unique courses upgraded the programs, and 2 said they were cost effective. Two indicated looking at similar successful programs was helpful, and 1 said that high involvement working with students ensured quality in their programs.

*Interview Question 10: Accountability—Cost Differentials Between Community College Baccalaureate and Traditional Baccalaureate Degrees*

There was a high degree of continuity in answering this question. Seven said it costs less for the state and 6 said it costs less for the students. Six stated that traditional 4-year programs at universities cost more because of the research component. Six said that the faculty teach more courses at the community college level, lowering costs. Five felt that community colleges were more efficient.
Interview Question 11: Accountability—Competition for Enrollments and Allocation of State Funds

Six said that there was little, if any, competition for enrollments, whereas 1 said this was an issue. Five said that the answer to this remains to be seen. Five indicated that there was no systematic approach to funding, 5 said finances at their school was a problem, and 2 said private funding was needed. Three indicated that there were funding problems because these new programs make these colleges hybrids and it’s unclear where to put them into the system. One indicated that these were hot political issues and there is debate even among community college presidents. Two suggested that their school does not wish to be competitive because that is counterproductive. One said more students in these new programs will increase costs, but that is what the legislature has asked for.

Interview Question 3: Mission—Impact Issues With Other Academic Institutions

There was a spread of comments on this issue. Eight felt strongly that they were not competing with other academic institutions, and they need to understand this. Five relayed that it was important to maintain good communication with other nearby institutions. Four said that a negative impact with other academic institutions was negligible. Four said that partnerships helped negate any possible negative impacts. Three said turf issues have caused problems with other institutions. Three suggested that they are still community colleges and their missions have not changed, but 2 said some view these new programs as a threat to the community college mission. Two thought there were problems as a result of a perceived competition for funding while 2 said there was competition about enrollments. Two stated that everyone’s intentions needed to be clear
and solidified. One said it was a political issue. Two indicated that the new programs have actually helped their fellow university neighbors, increasing their enrollments and eventually providing a need for follow-on programs at the master’s level.

*Interview Question 4: Mission—Compromise and Change in Community College Mission*

A strong 12 said these new programs are a natural, logical extension, expansion and progression of the community college mission. Eleven wanted to make the point that they were still *community* colleges even though their name change involved removing the word “community.” Nine stated that community colleges always have been and always must be responsive to their own community’s needs. Six stated that there has been no compromise; this new endeavor is consistent with the community college mission. Six said they must be responsive to workforce demands, whatever they may be. One commented that they had the resources and wherewithal to fill the need. One said their mission statement accommodates change. Another pointed out that, historically, community colleges have changed over the years. Four said that those who are opposed to these new programs consider it mission creep.

*Interview Question 6: Special—Make-up of the Planning Group*

Answers to this question varied radically, but some general points can be made here. Six indicated that this was a process that required a progression of involvement by various people. Three said setting these programs up was extensive, with one stating “it took a village.” Three indicated that it was important to involve all stakeholders, both internal and external. Two made the comment that some individuals were constant
throughout the process while others had specific assignments. Two each said faculty must be involved, community must be included, academic deans are critical, and the top echelons at the college are essential in the process from the beginning.

Interview Question 8: Special—What Lessons Were Learned as a Result of Implementing This New Program and What Recommendations Can Be Made to Others?

According to the researcher, the answers to this question were considered to be a gold mine of information for community colleges interested in initiating such a program in their institutions. The amount of detail in the responses precludes answering this question in the same manner as the previous interview questions. Responses by individuals who are deemed to be the most insightful and valuable by the researcher are provided here.

Executive #1: People interested in this baccalaureate program need to study the research, review the literature, read the book, and use the consulting services of those who have been through it. They should join CCBA. “Some will start with a resolution, a President’s Council vote, and getting into the state plan. Others . . . will go straight to the legislature.”

Executive #2: The first big lesson is that the ground rules have changed every step of the way because it’s a new process. The process needs to be systematized. The pioneers are bound up in the process with no systematic plan for doing it. This is a highly politicized process. The proposal must be supported by their
public servants. They must find out “how to satisfy unmet needs and prepare citizens for future jobs and services.”

Executive #3: The political side is important. Council of Presidents in community colleges is important. All must be together. There is a lot of work with staffers to be done; they make recommendations to legislators. They need buy-in with the department of education and legislature. A lot of time is spent explaining and re-explaining. Don’t be defensive; explanations are important. “We have nothing to apologize for. Give them the logic and keep doing it.” “This is the right thing to do” so keep at it. Even after approval, it’s not secure. It’s a never-ending battle. Look at current internal resources, write grants, use a foundation. There’s no system for doing it now; no program codes. It’s a struggle for everyone at all levels. Even how these students get counted and reported is not settled.

Executive #4: The most important thing we did was the upfront planning, involving all key players from the beginning. “Never underestimate the power of the proposal and who’s going to read it with a fine tooth comb.” It’s like writing a dissertation; do the homework. “Assume that you will set the standard as a model for all future individuals who plan to go in that direction.” It’s the college’s face to the public, so it
must be of high quality and unassailable. They will view the college the way they view the proposal. Consider it a model for all others to follow. Those involved in the accreditation will say that you know what you’re doing, because your proposal is of such high quality. Those who evaluate for accreditation will make recommendations about deficiencies. A name change will be required. Take nothing for granted during the visit. Make sure of compliance all the way around. Many apply, and few are approved. It is a “testimony to underestimating the importance of all of these processes.”

Executive #5: The college must have statutory authority. A college can’t just decide to do this on their own. Resistance to maintain the status quo is serious. CEPRI presented problems. A surprise is the resistance of fellow community college colleagues toward this. The President’s Council of Community Colleges is split down the middle. Some see it as taking away from their programs and call it mission creep. It will be interesting to see if some move in the direction of becoming state colleges and away from being community colleges. We need to have the baccalaureate authority in statute. Now we’re authorized but not by statute, so the system is unstable. An amendment has been added to the senate version of the baccalaureate bill that says if a college is approved to offer a
baccalaureate degree, only a local board of trustees is needed to approve future degrees. This is gold. The dynamics are wild. The senate is angry with universities. Must programs only be technical or can we add other programs, such as teacher education? Best not to go through the “horrendous state approval process again.” A local decision capability would resolve that problem. Still, there needs to be state control over local boards or people can get carried away. In Florida, policy and politics are combined.

Developer #1: Know the local job and student situation. Know what is needed. Do an outline for a feasibility study. Employer input is essential. Consider partnering with someone. It takes lots of time and lots of detail work. They will “need a cookbook for each program.” There are loads of student issues. Work with faculty and students to put it together. Be prepared with the necessary resources and materials. Communication is critical. Required to deal with other higher education institutions and the legislature. Key personnel must be able to juggle a lot of things. Know who to talk to. The states have criteria for programs so standards are required. Flexibility is required to look at things differently. Project needs with faculty, employers, and students. Develop a business plan. Design the project presentations. Advisory members must be
involved. Consider new skills and competencies. Community involvement and “buy-in” are critical. Develop a curriculum through them. Ask them “What do you need for your job?” Come up with 15-20 items. Decide what is needed to add to those things from an educational perspective, then strengthen what they suggest. If education, talk with the school district. Expose students to the classroom. Understanding the challenges is essential.

Developer #2: Find any potential objections to the program. The president must work with other nearby college and university presidents to counter potential objections. Ultimately the nearby university felt this wasn’t a good fit for them, so it took a lot of work. It was a square peg in a round hole. It’s a struggle for a university to do things differently. They must realize this new niche doesn’t pose a threat to their programs or their normal way of doing things. A lot of time and money is wasted trying to force fits that can’t work. It would be good to have an acceptable “blanket approach”; then you won’t see these “forced marriages.” You need broad appeal versus a more localized approach. Universities serve a broad-based population, whereas community colleges “serve a very targeted, focused, local group.”
Developer #3: It must be right for the students and the institution must be ready for it. It’s a lot of work and requires lots of collaboration. Flexibility and readiness for change are essential. Be committed and believe in the need to do it. Build on the success of others. Get their advice.

Developer #4: Data is your best friend. Capture what community colleges do. Remain focused on what this is. Respond to workforce needs; that’s what we do. Hold on to the mission. This involves no identity crisis. “We like who we are.” Get allies together in critical places. Get people lined up, such as legislators, aides, etc. It’s political in nature. You will “have to go there.”

Developer #5: “We couldn’t have done anything without the legislature behind us.” It’s too big of a battle. It must be approved first. Someone needs to make the case that the capability to handle these programs is there. One must have physical facilities available and educators that can be used more efficiently. One must “get the mindset.” Think and talk about it enough and they will see the merit to it. People must be convinced. We are currently turning away students we could and should serve.

Developer #6: Persevere. The college has to really want it. Community and faculty support are critical. It’s so much work. “It’s a huge
thing to take on.” One must have a passion to serve students and the area; otherwise it’s not worth it. We have to provide our students with so much.

Developer #7: “Most important is to look at whatever program you’re considering. It must be right in line with your mission.” This should not be a stretch. Consider the local community. Our degrees are clearly and directly in response to employers’ needs in our area. Have good, sound curricular planning behind it all. It’s fundamental. One must have a good educational product directly in the area of need. Programs must be “crafted appropriately” and be workforce oriented. The more excited the community is about the program, the easier the transition. Have a high level of faculty before you go into a program. Use the same credentials so current people at various levels can be used. Faculty enthusiasm is essential. Do the things needed to maintain stability; student enrollments are an issue.

Implementer #1: “It’s a lot more work than one realizes; it affects more areas of the college than expected.” Every area of the college needs to be revisited because all aspects of the college from student services to admissions to course offerings, faculty loads, recruiting, activities, clubs, who is responsible for what, and outside testing requirements are different. Colleges are
different. Some get money; others don’t. Our program was “built on the backs of people already doing full-time work.” It’s very difficult and requires a lot from your people. There’s a big difference between programs and colleges. Some have trouble getting program approval for a variety of reasons. Use those who have already done it to help. In-service programs are needed. Link up with a successful program; it saves a lot of time. One can’t think of everything when starting a program. The implementers are left to work out the problems and details. It involves change. “It’s a transformation. Think university. Think professional development.” Stick to what can best be done. Focus on teaching. Do a start-to-finish job. Provide a better product.

Implementer #2: “Make no assumptions.” If you have a partnership, how they approach a program makes a difference. There are lots of meetings. Get all decisions in writing. There must be a total commitment to make this work, from the top on down. Identify champions for the cause. Everyone must be informed. Talk and be open. Involve key stakeholders. Having the financial resources to make it happen is essential. Top-notch instructors are critical; faculty credentials are important. Develop mutual respect for partners. Don’t encourage rivalry; equal footing is important. Find a good
negociator. Hone negotiation skills if it’s a partnership. Do the homework well. A clear student base is important; know what the community wants. Things take more time than realized; time to plan is essential. Have backup/monies to continue the program. “Be good stewards” and have proper oversight for the project.

Implementer #3: First determine what is needed to deliver the programs. Sufficient enrollments are a minimum. Consider how the 2-year programs will relate to the 4-year programs. Consider how to articulate. There needs to be a seamless transition. Look at everyone. Consider accreditation issues. “You’re creating a whole new infrastructure on top of what you already had.” It might be helpful to have one V.P. who oversees learning for both programs. Don’t hurt the 2-year mission in any way. Legislative support is essential.

Interview Question 12: Additions

Most of what was added at the end served to emphasize what had been stated earlier or to include something new that hadn’t yet been said: (a) Community, student access, mission, and accountability are the critical issues, (b) community colleges and communities are different, with unique organizational cultures, (c) it may be better to initiate partnerships than independent degrees, (d) colleges must meet employers’ needs, (e) community colleges going in this direction can enhance other college and university
programs, (f) college leadership is of inestimable value, (g) unused resources can and should be used at community colleges, (h) more research is needed in this arena, (i) start-up programs can learn from the pioneers, (j) there should be one college, not many like a university, (k) more autonomy is needed because community colleges know what their communities and students need, (l) if colleges prove they can do a good job they may not have to go through the full approval process again, and (m) the politics involved can either hurt or help new programs tremendously.

Alignment of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

In this next section, agreement means a combination of strongly agree and agree. If disagreement is indicated, this represents a combination of strongly disagree and disagree.

Need: Need for Community College Baccalaureate

Survey results indicated strong agreement about the need for new CCB programs (95%). They also showed strong agreement about the shortage of trained individuals in the new program areas (95%). Ninety percent agreed that the need for these new programs was driven by student demand. Showing that student demand was indeed high, 79% agreed that program enrollments met or exceeded expected student enrollments. Student access to the baccalaureate degree led to the implementation of these new programs, according to a strong 97% positive response. Meeting workforce needs was an important contribution of the programs according to every respondent (100%). A gap
between supply and demand for graduates in these service areas would be reduced according to 95% of the survey respondents.

Interview results strongly aligned with survey results when asked for the driving forces in initiating this transformational change, the top reason (9 out of 15) being student access to the baccalaureate degree. A high number (8 each) also said meeting community and workforce needs was an important reason for the program. Seven specifically identified the need for nurses and teachers. Four suggested that there was a recognized need in the state of Florida for more baccalaureate degrees. The needs of the nontraditional student (a student access issue) were mentioned by 4. When asked how critical needs were identified, only 42% of the survey respondents said the primary need was due to articulation problems. This was not mentioned by any interview respondent. All of those surveyed (100%) said student needs assessments were conducted in order to determine student need. Nine out of 13 interviewees said surveys among student groups were conducted. According to a strong 97%, workforce demand, documented through a needs analysis or study, was important. Ten interviewees (out of 13) indicated that input from the community was used and 6 discussed the need for understanding local unmet needs and market trends. We can, therefore, conclude that there was strong agreement in the need category among those surveyed and interviewed.

Accountability: How Viewed

When considering how the CCB is viewed compared to the traditional 4-year degree, half (51%) of survey respondents said the structure of the new programs was the same or very similar to the traditional baccalaureate degree, whereas 37% indicated it
was different, so they were split on this issue. Interviewees felt the two were different, with varying responses. Seven said they thought the attitude differential was due to the local college community’s attitude about it. Six felt that universities tend to intimate that the CCB is inferior, whereas 6 said respect for a college is earned. Six said both programs were the same due to accreditation standards. Four believed the CCB to be better than the traditional 4-year programs. Two felt the reputation of the individual institution was most important, not its degree status. Therefore, like survey respondents, interviewees’ attitudes on this issue varied.

Accountability: Problems Encountered

When considering difficulties encountered upon initiation of the programs, most of those surveyed thought adverse relationships between upper division and lower division faculty had not surfaced (76%). They were equally divided (40% agreed, 42% disagreed) on faculty members raising concerns when the new programs began. Fifty-three percent of those surveyed felt faculty and staff were not burdened beyond former requirements whereas 27% felt they were. Internal assurances regarding structure and facility needed to be in place before new programs were initiated according to 95% of those surveyed. Also, according to 94% of those surveyed, internal assurances regarding capable and qualified personnel need to be in place before a new program startup. Six interviewees indicated that there were few, if any, internal problems, but 5 said that communication was a critical component in order to get “buy-in.” Other problems encountered in the process seemed more generally encumbering than faculty problems.
Accountability: Program Quality

All survey respondents (100%) agreed that program quality issues received high priority when new programs were developed. Ninety-five percent believed there needed to be a clear provision for the compilation and reporting of performance data for accountability and evaluation. Strong agreement (97%) also occurred with regard to new programs supporting clearly established lines of accountability and responsibility before implementation. The same was true for new programs complying with common prerequisites and other applicable state articulation agreements (97%). Performance standards must be provided including outcomes assessments (95%). The vast majority also found it appropriate that accreditation standards allow for programs that must respond to unique institutional circumstances (79%).

Interviewees agreed that program quality issues were of prime importance in establishing these programs. Their comments aligned, primarily along the lines of what they did to ensure that program quality was evident. Seven interviewees said faculty qualifications and experience were most important in order to ensure program quality, whereas 6 said state scrutiny, 6 said student evaluations and completion rates, 5 said frequent internal evaluations, 4 said accreditation requirements, 4 said curriculum planning using experts, and 4 said external (employer) evaluations. It was obvious, in interviews, that program quality was of utmost concern to these community college leaders, and they used a variety of modes to ensure their new programs were excellent in every respect.
Accountability: Cost Differentials

Those surveyed had strong agreement that their new programs were more cost effective for the state (98%). Costs to establish these programs (including capital outlays) were less than other available options according to 74% of survey respondents. Costs to students are less at community colleges, according to 98%. Costs would not rise for traditional programs where baccalaureate programs are established according to 81% of respondents. Interview responses were in strong agreement that it would cost less for the state (7) and less for students (6). Six stated that 4-year colleges cost more because of the research component and 6 indicated that faculty teach more courses at the community college. Five felt the efficiencies of the community college system decreased their costs.

Accountability: Competition for Enrollments and Funds

There was fairly even disagreement on surveys between those who felt that new programs should not duplicate existing programs at other institutions within commuting distance (45% agreed, 37% disagreed). In the interviews, 6 stated that competition for enrollments was limited and 5 others weren’t sure as yet. Funding seemed to be more of a problem than enrollments (5). Five saw no systematic approach to funding as yet, 5 said this was a problem, and 2 said private funding was needed. The survey indicated a stronger response regarding the need for other sources of funding beyond the state. Sixty-one percent said this was necessary and only 21% said it was not.
Mission: Changed or Compromised

Twelve interviewees felt strongly that the new programs were a natural, logical extension, expansion and progression of the community college mission. Eleven wanted the point to be made that they remain community colleges. Nine said community colleges have always been responsive to their community’s needs, and 6 stated that the change was consistent with the community college mission, saying they were responsive to workforce demands. Four claimed that those who oppose the CCB call it “mission creep” because they don’t truly understand the nature of the new programs or the mission of community colleges.

There was strong agreement in the surveys with each one of these interview comments. Ninety percent felt the community college mission had not been expanded too far. Not as strong, but still significant, 71% believed the community college mission has been changed or expanded. Traditional mission commitments have not been reduced (95%). All said traditional associate degree programs have not been terminated (100%). In addition, the majority of survey participants (73%) said community colleges were not moving from a comprehensive (multiple) mission approach to one that focuses on particular niches. A strong majority (79%) said this represents a transformational change for community colleges.

Mission: Impact on Others

Eight interviewees felt they were not competing with other academic institutions, and 4 said the impact was negligible. Five felt it was important to maintain good communication with others so they wouldn’t construe it as competitive. Four stated that
partnerships can help with this potential problem. Three said turf problems were an issue. Three felt the community college mission remains the same and is, therefore, not competitive. Two recognized that some viewed these new programs as a threat to their mission. There was agreement with those surveyed. They felt the new programs didn’t have a significantly adverse impact on established programs within the service area (87%). As with interviewees, those surveyed indicated there was some disagreement among themselves about whether or not new programs should duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance (45% agreed, 37% disagreed). Those surveyed felt more strongly about offering distance learning programs that duplicated programs offered by other institutions within community distance. Sixty-four percent said this should not be a problem. Seventy-nine percent of those surveyed said partnerships worked well. In fact, a majority felt community colleges should consider collaboration with other institutions before taking an independent road to the baccalaureate. Interviewees did not suggest this as a possibility.

Response to Research Questions

The research questions were answered using responses to the survey and interview questions. The numbers and letters after each statement represent whether it was a survey (S) or interview (I) response preceded by the specific item number from the survey or interview. For example, “#3 S” means the third survey question was used to answer the research question it follows. Answers to the research questions include both specific responses given to survey and interview questions by participants as well as interpretations of responses by the researcher. The answers to the research questions
apply only to the participants in the surveys and interviews and the colleges they represent. They do not necessarily apply to other community college leaders or other community colleges.

**Problem Statement**

The purpose of this study was to determine what key community college leaders in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. In addition, the researcher considered the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of such programs.

**Research Questions**

Each of the research questions was answered by various survey and interview questions as shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Interview question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Reasons for consideration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Critical decisions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Mission change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problems managed and resolved</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Program selection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Community needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Limited resources and funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Access for students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Conflict versus collaboration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>Accountability and quality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions with Survey and Interview Responses

1. What major factors precipitated the transformation to a baccalaureate degree-producing program in five Florida community colleges?

   a. What were the reasons for the initiative to be considered and implemented?

      (1) There’s a need for the new college baccalaureate programs (#1 S, #1 I, #2 I).

      (2) Local workforce assessments showed need and direction (#2 S, #1 I).

      (3) There is a shortage of trained individuals in areas served by new programs (#4 S, #2 I).

      (4) The need for these programs was driven by student demand (#36 S, #2 I).

      (5) Enrollments met or exceeded expected student enrollments (#7 S).

      (6) Student needs assessments were completed, showing interest and need (#8 S, #2 I).

      (7) A needs analysis (or study) documented the demand for graduates in these programs (#9 S, #1 I).

      (8) Student access to the baccalaureate was a major reason for implementation (#10 S, #1 I).

      (9) The new programs would contribute significantly to meeting workforce needs in the service area provided (#11 S, #1 I, #2 I).
(10) The new programs would significantly reduce the gap between supply and demand for graduates in these new areas (#20 S, #1 I, #2 I).

(11) Accreditation standards were flexible enough to allow for establishing new programs (#42 S).

(12) New programs were cost effective for the state (#47 S).

(13) Incremental costs to the state to establish these new programs were less than other available options (#49 S).

(14) Costs to students in the new baccalaureate programs were less than other available alternatives (#50 S, #1 I).

(15) A specific need for more nurses and teachers in the state was indicated (#1 I).

(16) Vision and leadership opened doors to these new opportunities (#1 I).

(17) The opportunity was provided by the legislature (#1 I).

(18) The special needs of the nontraditional student can be accommodated through these programs (#1 I).

(19) Use of available resources and community college credibility make it possible (#1 I, #2 I).

(20) The legislature identified specific needs in Florida (#2 I).

b. What critical decisions were made in order for this to occur?

(1) The structure would be the same or very similar to the traditional baccalaureate degree (#21 S).
(2) New programs would not terminate any associate in arts or science degrees (#22 S).

(3) New programs would not significantly impact established programs in existing institutions within service areas in an adverse way (#23 S).

(4) It might be possible to duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance with distance learning programs (#31 S).

(5) Collaboration with other institutions should be considered in providing programs (#32 S).

(6) Decisions made about specific programs to be offered should be based on community input, local workforce needs, student needs, market trends, legislative agendas, and institutional resources and strengths (#2 I).

(7) Communication should be initiated and continued with all players and those impacted by the programs (#3 I, #7 I).

(8) Whether or not to partnership with other institutions on specific programs should be considered (#3 I).

(9) How to resolve funding problems is an issue (#3 I).

(10) The make-up of the planning group was decided early, requiring a progression of involvement by various people (#6 I).

(11) Involvement of all stakeholders (internal and external) was critical (#6 I).
(12) Faculty, community, deans, top college personnel need to be involved from the beginning (#6 I).

(13) How to work with others outside the college in order to resolve conflicts should be considered (#7 I).

(14) Decisions need to be made about faculty, staff, and resources in order to work the problem (#7 I).

(15) Decisions need to be made about how to provide an outstanding, successful program from planning stages on (#8 I).

c. How did the mission of the college change as a result of this transformation?

(1) The community college mission has not been expanded too far as a result of this new initiative (#13 S, #4 I).

(2) These new programs have changed/expanded the community college mission (#13 S, #4 I).

(3) Student access to traditional community college programs has not been reduced (#15 S).

(4) New programs do not represent a termination of traditional programs in community colleges like associate degrees (#22 S).

(5) Community colleges are not moving away from their comprehensive (multiple) mission approach to one that focuses on particular niches (#17 S).

(6) The new baccalaureate programs represent a transformational change for community colleges (#19 S).
(7) The new baccalaureate programs are a natural and logical extension and expansion of the community college mission, representing progress and responsiveness to students and communities (#4 S).

(8) Community colleges, despite the name change, are still community colleges in that they are still an important part of the community and responsive to its needs and local workforce needs (#4 I).

(9) The provision for the community college baccalaureate has not been a compromise for community colleges; it is consistent with their mission (#4 I).

(10) Community colleges that initiate this change have the resources necessary to successfully implement the program (#4 I).

(11) Community colleges have changed historically; community college change is nothing new (#4 I).

2. What problems were managed and resolved during the process and what problems remain?

(1) Providing new baccalaureate programs that the state, students, and the community said they need (#1 S, #6 S).

(2) Providing new programs that meet an unmet need for trained individuals in specific fields (#4 S).

(3) The demand for graduates in specific areas is being addressed through these new programs (#9 S).
(4) The gap between supply and demand is being reduced in areas where community colleges are able to provide new programs (#20 S).

(5) Programs in existing institutions within the service area are not being negatively impacted as a result of these new programs being provided (#23 S).

(6) Potentially adverse relationships among upper and lower division faculty members were addressed and resolved (#27 S).

(7) Faculty concerns have been raised and resolved (#33 S).

(8) In some cases, duplicating existing programs on other campuses is acceptable and in others it is not (#29 S).

(9) Internal assurances regarding readiness of structure, facility, resources, and faculty must be forthcoming before the new programs are initiated (#43 S, #7 I).

(10) Being responsible caretakers of limited funds enables programs that are underfunded to begin (#46 S).

(11) Good communication with all involved parties helps resolve problems (#3 I).

(12) Partnerships can help resolve competitive conflicts between institutions (#3 I).

(13) Having a respected, successful program can alleviate negative attitudes about such programs (#5 I).
(14) Equal accreditation requirements help alleviate concerns that the CCB is not equal to the university baccalaureate (#5 I).

(15) The name change can be difficult, but it resolves a number of problems, including equalization (#5 I, #7 I).

(16) Changes were substantial and change is difficult to manage, but it can be done (#7 I).

(17) Acceptance by those outside the community college attempting these changes can be difficult but it is beginning to happen (#7 I).

(18) Internal problems are more easily resolved than external problems (#7 I).

(19) Communication helps leaders manage and resolve problems (#7 I).

(20) Many problems were encountered and resolved during the process (#7 I).

(21) CEPRI was initially adversarial and wanted to stop the movement. That attitude is changing (#7 I).

(22) If one gets community support, many problems can be worked out (#7 I).

(23) Strong, supportive college leadership is essential for resolving problems and conflicts as they arise (#7 I).

(24) In some situations, added faculty and staff burdens have been resolved, yet some still remain (#26 S).
(25) Funding issues remain and still are not totally resolved (#46 S, #7 I).

(26) Other academic institutions need to understand that community colleges are not competing with them and in fact can actually help their programs (#3 I).

(27) Turf issues with other institutions remain at some colleges (#3 I, #7 I).

(28) Some still consider the community college baccalaureate to be a threat to the community college mission (#3 I).

(29) Some universities continue to view the CCB as an inferior program to what they can provide (#5 I).

(30) Numerous problems continue on a variety of fronts (#7 I).

(31) Not being able to provide programs that local college officials would like to offer remains a problem (#7 I).

(32) When conflicts surface, it will get very political (#7 I).

(33) Outsiders understanding what community colleges are trying to do with these new programs remains a problem (#7 I).

3. What are the perspectives that Florida community college leaders have who experienced this transition related to the following concepts?

   a. Program selection

      (1) In order to select appropriate programs to provide, it is necessary to complete a local workforce assessment (#2 S, #11 S, #2 I),
student needs evaluation (#8 S, #6 S, #2 I), community needs analysis (#9 S, #2 I), and market trends analysis (#2 I).

(2) It is important to know what areas present a shortage of trained individuals in order to decide what programs to provide (#4 S, #20 S).

(3) A college must be capable of adhering to accreditation standards for specific program requirements (#38 S).

(4) A college must be capable of adhering to common prerequisites and other applicable state articulation agreements for specific programs selected (#41 S).

(5) Legislative requests for specific programs should be considered when selecting programs to deliver (#2 I).

(6) Institutional resources and strengths should be part of the selection criteria (#2 I, #8 I).

(7) Partnerships should be considered when planning what programs to provide (#3 I).

b. Responsiveness to community needs

(1) Formal and informal assessments are valuable in helping a community college understand the needs of the community (#2 S, #4 S, #9 S, #11 S, #20 S, #2 I, #5 I).

(2) Responding to community needs is and always has been part of the community college mission (#4 I).
(3) It isn’t possible to have effective community college programs without the support of the community (#7 I).

(4) Community members are stakeholders in community college programs and must be included in planning stages (#6 I).

c. Limited resources and funding

(1) When promoting programs it is helpful to know these programs are cost effective for the state (#47 S, #10 I), less costly to establish and run than other available options (#49 S, #10 I), and less expensive for students (#50 S, #10 I).

(2) It is not expected that costs will rise for traditional programs at community colleges where baccalaureate programs are established (#48 S).

(3) Community colleges have proven to be very cost efficient in comparison to other colleges and universities (#10 I).

(4) Funding is always a problem and must be considered, especially start-up costs (#11 I).

(5) In the initial stages of creating new programs, funding issues are not yet resolved (#11 I).

(6) Community colleges must reach beyond state funding to other funding resources (#46 S, #11 I).

(7) Attitudes among colleges and universities may be negative about these new programs because of funding competition (#11 I).
d. Access for students

(1) Student access to the baccalaureate degree led to the implementation of these new programs at community colleges in Florida (#10 S, #1 I).

(2) With shortages in specific areas, access to these programs locally is important (#4 S, #1 I).

(3) In some cases articulation problems may provide proof of need for specific local programs, although this is not a problem everywhere (#5 S).

(4) Traditional and nontraditional students are demanding access to local baccalaureate degree programs (#6 S, #1 I, #2 I).

(5) Enrollments exceeding expected enrollments shows a high student demand for these programs (#7 S).

(6) Student access to traditional programs is not reduced as a result of adding baccalaureate programs (#15 S).

e. Conflict versus collaboration with colleges and universities

(1) New programs do not have a significantly adverse impact on established programs in institutions within service areas (#23 S, #3 I).

(2) The jury is still out with regard to whether or not programs that are autonomous and self-sufficient are more efficient than partnerships or cooperative programs (#25 S).
(3) Cooperative programs are working well between community colleges, and colleges and universities (#30 S).

(4) New distance learning programs may be provided even if they duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance (#31 S).

(5) Community colleges might consider collaborating with other institutions before taking an independent road to the baccalaureate degree (#32 S, #3 I).

(6) New programs must comply with common prerequisites and other applicable state articulation agreements (#41 S).

(7) Communication is extremely important in maintaining good relationships with other institutions (#3 I).

(8) Competition for enrollments is less of an issue than competition for funding (#3 I).

(9) It should be noted that the community college baccalaureate can actually increase enrollments in certain programs at other colleges and universities (#3 I).

f. Program accountability and quality

(1) Program quality issues are extremely important and should receive high priority when establishing and developing new programs (#37 S).

(2) There must be internal assurances that capable/qualified personnel are in place before new programs are initiated (#36 S).
(3) There must be a clear provision for the compilation and reporting of performance data for accountability and evaluation before implementing programs (#39 S).

(4) New programs should have clearly established lines of accountability and responsibility before implementation (#40 S).

(5) New programs must comply with common prerequisites and applicable state articulation agreements (#41 S).

(6) Current accreditation standards are reasonable and must be met (#42 S).

(7) Assurances regarding structure and facility must be in place before initiating new programs (#43 S).

(8) Community colleges must have performance standards, including outcomes assessments, in place before implementing new programs (#45 S).

(9) Faculty qualifications and experience are critical as quality issues when establishing these programs (#9 I).

(10) State scrutiny and accreditation requirements help insure program quality (#9 I).

(11) Student evaluations need to be conducted and completion rates established in order to show program quality (#9 I).

(12) Frequent internal evaluations are important to insure constant quality and enable executives, developers, and implementers to make program adjustments as necessary (#9 I).
(13) Curriculum planning by experts is important to insure a high caliber program (#9 I).

(14) Schools with a commitment to excellence make quality programs the norm (#9 I).

(15) Creating unique programs and classes enhances the quality of the program (#9 I).

(16) Those who are creating quality programs need to seek out similar successful programs to help guide the way (#9 I).

(17) A high involvement level with student interns in the field can enhance program quality (#9 I).

Chapter Summary

The research data collection phase began January 2005 and ended in April 2005. Surveys were sent to 38 leaders in five community colleges in Florida who had experience in creating, developing, and implementing the CCB at their respective colleges. All 38 surveys were returned. The researcher visited all five of the community colleges and interviewed top leaders in these programs. Sixteen interviews (of 19 requested) were conducted. The samples were obtained from specifically selected sources who had special involvement (as an executor, developer, or implementer) with the CCB. The sample was one of convenience and was not selected randomly. It, therefore, cannot be applied to the general population of community college leaders either in the state of Florida or in the country. Surveys were also sent to 85 members of the Community
College Baccalaureate Association who attended a CCBA conference in January 2005. Thirty surveys were collected from this group and were used for comparison purposes.

Overall, using a chi-square analysis, results were statistically significant. In addition, three factors were exposed via a factor analysis of the survey questions. The factors were (a) need, (b) accountability, and (c) mission. There was a high degree of agreement that the CCB was needed, and the primary reason was student access. Responsiveness to local community and workforce needs was also very important. Respondents expressed the importance of program accountability and quality issues, which were viewed as top priorities when establishing the program. Lower cost was viewed as an important reason for establishing these programs in a community college since costs to the state and students were less than costs found at colleges and universities. Community college mission was a very important consideration to respondents. Most viewed the CCB as a natural, logical extension, expansion, and progression of the community college mission.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In 2001, the Florida legislature authorized community colleges in the state of Florida to offer baccalaureate degrees in very specific areas and under well-defined conditions and circumstances. With Florida ranking 47th in the nation in the production of baccalaureate degrees, the pressure was on to provide more student access to the baccalaureate degree, especially in high-need fields such as nursing and teaching. Five Florida community colleges, St. Petersburg, Miami Dade, Chipola, Okaloosa-Walton, and Edison, pioneered this movement in Florida and are currently providing such programs. The purpose of this study was to determine what key community college leaders in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs and to consider the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of such programs.

The focus of this study was on key leaders at each of the five community colleges in Florida who were involved, at various levels and to various degrees, in the creation, development, and implementation of these programs. These leaders were divided into three groups, executives, developers, and implementers. Attitudes and beliefs about these new programs, both in general and specifically experienced at the individual institutions,
were solicited via a survey and interviews. Both a quantitative analysis using chi-square and a qualitative analysis using a lexical coding system were done after a factor analysis was conducted on the survey.

The study was nonparametric in nature. The goal was to provide a descriptive report that drew upon the expertise and experiences of the most highly involved individuals in these programs at each of the five Florida colleges studied. There was a high correlation between quantitative and qualitative inputs, providing confidence in the results. It is hoped that the information provided will contribute to the knowledge base that has only just begun in this fledgling endeavor. The field is new and the efforts of the leaders in these colleges are of a pioneering nature. The individuals interviewed viewed their efforts this same way.

In an attempt to culminate this study with some final thoughts and inputs, the researcher provided a review of the research questions asked and a summary of the findings. Five sections are included in chapter 5. First there is a summary of results produced, both quantitatively and qualitatively, based on the three research questions that were presented. A comparison of the study’s results with the review of literature is depicted in order to provide a tie-in with the body of knowledge heretofore established on this topic. Recommendations to community college leaders who are considering providing baccalaureate degree programs in their own institutions are outlined. Finally, recommendations for further research are suggested and final conclusions presented.
Summary of Results

There were three primary research questions with sub-questions under two.

*Research Question 1*

What major factors precipitated the transformation to a baccalaureate degree-producing program in five Florida community colleges?

a. What were the reasons for the initiative to be considered and implemented?

The Florida legislature provided the opportunity when they voted to authorize the creation of such programs at community colleges because they wanted to increase the production of baccalaureate degrees in the state. The colleges chose to provide these programs because the new degrees provided more access to students (especially nontraditional students) to the baccalaureate degree. In addition, responding to the needs of the local workforce and local communities requesting that these programs be offered were incentives.

b. What critical decisions were made in order for this to occur? Primary decisions included what specific programs to provide and how to best go about providing them. Program quality and accountability were critical concerns from the outset so development and implementation decisions revolved around these issues. Collaborations with other institutions are and should be considered when setting up these new programs. Conflict should be avoided or reduced through partnerships and rigorous communication efforts. Funding issues must be considered. All stakeholders should be involved in the process.

c. How did the mission of the college change as a result of this transformation?

Providing the community college baccalaureate (CCB) was a natural progression and
evolution of its mission. The mission of the community college includes meeting the needs of the local students and community. The CCB does this.

Research Question 2

(a) What problems were managed and resolved during the process and (b) what problems remain? Numerous problems present themselves during such a process. The primary problem of providing more baccalaureate programs for students in the state is alleviated through these new programs. The problems of meeting local workforce needs and reducing educational gaps are addressed. Problems with other institutions can be managed through partnerships, communication, and mutual understanding. Internal problems can be readily managed and resolved. External problems are more difficult to manage. Problems that remain have to do with funding issues and attitudinal problems on the part of other institutions. Questions remain about the mission of the community college by those who have not initiated such programs. The need to provide additional specific programs that meet local needs remains an issue.

Research Question 3

What are the perspectives that Florida community college leaders have who experienced this transition related to the following concepts: (a) program selection, (b) responsiveness to community needs, (c) limited resources and funding, (d) access for students, (e) conflict versus collaboration with colleges and universities, and (f) program accountability and quality?
Program selection. Local workforce, community, and student needs led the way to program selection. Capability to provide an accredited, accepted, quality program is essential. What to partner and what to provide independently are considerations.

Responsiveness to community needs. This is one of the primary missions of the community college. Assessments to determine needs are important. Community support of programs is essential. Community members are stakeholders in the process.

Limited resources and funding. The new programs are cost effective for students and the state. Funding is a persistent problem. Funding competition is an issue.

Access for students. Access to the baccalaureate is one of the primary reasons for establishing such programs. Shortages of workers in specific fields (such as nursing and teaching) make access to these programs important.

Conflict versus collaboration. The new programs have not significantly impacted neighboring institutions adversely. Cooperative programs work well and should be considered. Communication is critical in order to reduce conflict. Competition for funding can be an issue.

Program accountability and quality. Program quality issues are a high priority to community college leaders, state evaluators, and accreditation agencies looking at these programs. Program quality issues must be considered from the beginning, before new programs start. Programs must be accountable for results. Faculty qualifications represent one of the primary quality issues. Performance standards are important. Frequent internal evaluations are valuable.
Findings Compared to Literature

Most of the findings in this study aligned with the literature review. The literature that specifically related to the CCB was somewhat limited due to the fact that it is a new and emerging concept. Only one book has been published on this topic to date, *The Community College Baccalaureate* by Floyd, Skolnik, and Walker (2005). More literature is surfacing in community college journals and association newsletters as the number of community colleges entering this arena expands. In this section, the findings in the study merge with the literature that deals with the study’s content.

Need

Study findings uncovered strong agreement about the need for new CCB programs. Walker (2005) agrees. He states the importance of “the need for a baccalaureate educated workforce” (p. 13) and that entry requirements into many workforce jobs have increased to the baccalaureate degree level. In addition, he says the need is there because of certain social and economic concerns such as “rising demand of employers and students, rising costs of universities, and limited programs and access to meet these demands” (p. 14). The CCB was created because of increasing demands for higher education as well as cost and capacity concerns (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2004). This includes (a) increased demand by nontraditional students, (b) more demand for specialized fields in the labor market, (c) increased demand in specific geographical regions, (d) increased requirements for applied and technical baccalaureate degrees, (e) overcrowding at universities, (f) limited higher
education resources, and (g) pressure to reduce the costs associated with baccalaureate
degrees.

Agreement about the shortage of trained individuals in specific work fields was
pointed out in the study findings. The literature showed serious shortages of personnel
especially in the fields of teaching and nursing. The article “Community Colleges Ready
to Battle the Teacher Shortage” (Finkel, 2005) emphasized that dramatic teacher
shortages will only worsen. It is stated in the article that three community colleges in
Florida already currently offer teacher education degrees. Large urban areas and smaller,
rural communities are experiencing severe teacher shortages according to the Education
Commission of the States (2003). Student access to the baccalaureate degree led to the
implementation of these programs, according to the study. Finkel stated that access for
students was most critical. Geography, time, cost, and preparation factors were problems
for nontraditional students. Walker (2005) agrees that access is the primary reason for the
implementation of the CCB.

Another major reason for the introduction of these programs is meeting workforce
needs. “One might argue that a major reason for approval of community colleges’
proposals to confer baccalaureate degrees is that the degrees proposed meet an identified
workforce need” (Walker & Floyd, 2005, p. 99). The Office of Program Policy Analysis
and Government Accountability (OPPAGA, 2005) agrees that authorizing baccalaureate
degrees in community colleges improves the state’s ability to meet workforce needs.
Accountability

Findings in the study showed strong need for (a) high quality in the CCB programs established in the participants’ colleges, (b) excellence in these new programs, and (c) rigorous program evaluations that prove excellence. It was also pointed out that formal processes for creating, developing, and evaluating these programs are not, as yet, established. There is little evidence in the literature that shows research that has been done proving excellence in these programs. They are still too new for this data to be available. The OPPAGA (2005) report agrees with the study, however, that the states’ system for establishing these new degree programs has its limitations. It contends that the current review process does not ensure that programs will be cost effective over the long haul and that there is an inadequate coordination of degree requirements of community college Bachelor of Applied Science programs. They recommend strengthening the review and approval processes for the CCB. In that report, it is also suggested that community college expenditures are currently higher than those of state universities due to low initial enrollments and high start-up costs. In our study, the results showed the opposite—that it costs less than state university programs over the long run. In an appendix of the OPPAGA report (2005) and in support of the study, John Winn, Commissioner of Education, FDOE, states that it is too early to evaluate program costs but that projections point to the CCB being very cost effective for the state.
Mission

Findings of the study indicate that Florida community college leaders believe that the CCB programs are a natural, logical extension, expansion, and progression of the community college mission. They feel strongly that the mission of the community college is to support the needs of the local community. They believe that the mission has changed but has not been compromised. They admit there were those who view these programs as mission creep, but they disagree with the negative connotations associated with that terminology. Gleazer (1980) states that educational institutions have changed, will continue to change, and are, indeed, instigators of change. He feels educational institutions must change because their communities “change with new conditions, demands, or circumstances” (p. 5). He states, “Beyond any doubt, the colleges are changing what they do” (p. 12), and he believes that this change aligns with the community college mission. The mission, says Walker (2005), should “respond, adapt, and grow in ways appropriate to changing communities” (p. 15). There are contrarians, however, who contend the CCB smacks of mission creep (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2004; OPPAGA, 2005; Townsend, 2005).

There was a high correlation between what was found in the review of literature and the study results, both generally and specifically. However, it should be noted that, due to the infancy of these new programs, the jury is still out on many of these issues, and the field requires much extensive research as the programs mature.
Recommendations to Community College Leaders

The primary recommendations to those community college leaders in the country who are considering establishing such programs in their own colleges were extracted from responses to one interview question that dealt specifically with this issue. The question follows: What lessons have been learned and what recommendations do you have for community college leaders seeking to establish the baccalaureate in their colleges? The following responses could be titled, “Twenty things you must know and do when considering beginning this new initiative:”

1. Do the necessary homework. Study the programs that are successful, the research being conducted, and the book on the subject. Use the data that are available and produce it as needed.

2. The process is not systematized yet; it is at a pioneering stage. It is still unstable. There are no program codes. It’s a continuing struggle to work it through.

3. The state legislature must authorize or at least support such initiatives. The whole effort, at this stage, is highly politicized. Policy and politics are combined. Statutory authority is best and should be sought. The state approval process is tough.

4. The primary concern should be how to satisfy unmet workforce needs of the local community.

5. This process requires a lot of upfront effort. Think through what it will take to convince others that these new programs should be provided. Buy-in from
the FDOE and legislature is essential. They need the logic and the
reasoning. It’s the right thing to do, so persist in all necessary efforts.

6. The battles never end. It’s never a secure program.

7. Look at the current resources and capitalize on them. Show how to do it
better and cheaper. The capability to provide the programs must be there.

8. Upfront planning, involving all the key players, is critical. The proposals
and requests must be outstanding. All documents produced must be of the
highest caliber. The face to the public must be of top-notch quality. Make it
a model program. Take nothing for granted when submitting documents or
preparing for a visit. Ensure compliance at all levels. The capability to do
what is proposed must be proven.

9. There will be resistance from a variety of fronts. Many problems will
surface. Even some fellow community college colleagues will not be
supportive. There are many objections to these programs. Often neighboring
schools object because they see it as competition for enrollments and funds.
People must be convinced this is the right thing.

10. Educational institutions are conservative in nature and they don’t like to
change. It’s a struggle to do things differently, especially for universities.
They must be convinced these new programs are not a threat but, in fact,
they can be an enhancement to their own programs. They must understand
the missions of the two institutions are different. Forced fits waste time and
money.
11. Figure out what programs are needed and which ones can be provided. Know the local student population and the community’s needs. Get employer input. Collaboration is essential. Be flexible and ready for change.

12. Consider partnering with other colleges. This presents problems of its own, but they are workable. Sometimes this solves more problems than it creates.

13. The whole process requires a tremendous amount of time and effort. Each program is different and must be dealt with differently. There’s a lot to juggle at the same time.

14. Communication with a variety of people is essential, including the faculty and staff, community members, employers, students, legislators, state officials, accreditation agencies, neighboring institutional officials, fellow community college colleagues. Know the key players and stakeholders. Seek their input and listen to them.

15. Look at things differently. Consider new skills and competencies that may be required in the local workforce. Design creative, innovative programs that meet local needs.

16. Don’t do anything without community involvement. What are their needs and problems? How can they be resolved through educational programs? Programs must be in direct response to employers’ needs and must be workforce oriented.

17. Have a commitment to excellence. Faculty must be of the highest caliber and must have credentials. Current faculty must be supportive. Don’t use a two-tier faculty system; this is divisive.
18. Colleges are all different. One’s approach must be specific to needs, the local situation, the college, one’s capabilities, and resources. Focus on teaching. Provide an excellent, unassailable product.

19. Funding can be a problem; ensure future stability despite this. Have back-up resources; seek additional funding. Steward the resources well in order to continue, with proper oversight procedures.

20. This is a huge undertaking. It is hard. Have a belief in what is being done and a total commitment to it. Hold on to the mission. Have the mindset and will to do this. It is a lot more work and impacts more areas of the college than one realizes. Persevere, and students will reap the rewards.

Recommendations for Further Research

The CCB field is ripe for further research. The CCB degree is in its infancy. Pioneering efforts are different from those that have evolved into accepted, standardized, mature programs. It will be interesting to see what happens to these programs, degrees, and colleges 5 to 10 years down the road. One thing is for sure. They will have changed in some way.

As has been suggested, this field is wide open in terms of research needs and opportunities. The researcher, as a result of her own study and her review of the literature, suggests that the following research efforts would be useful in order to expand the body of knowledge in this arena:

1. This study was exclusively related to the first five community colleges in Florida that have initiated the CCB. Studies of what other states are doing in
this regard would be enlightening. A comparison of other programs to the ones being established in Florida would be useful. What similarities and differences are evident? What are the reasons for the differences and which programs are models for the country?

2. There are a number of community colleges in Florida that have chosen not to pursue the CCB. A study comparing those who chose to pursue this transformational change and those who did not would be interesting. Why does one college choose to initiate such a major change and another choose not to follow that path?

3. Since change is inevitable and since we are in the early stages of the creation, development, and implementation of the CCB degree, follow-on studies similar to what was pursued here would be valuable 5 to 10 years down the road. What was learned, what was maintained, what was changed? Which programs are the most successful and why? Have these programs become models for other community colleges that are following in their path?

4. It would be interesting to see a comparison of attitudes and beliefs about the CCB between college personnel (leaders, faculty, staff, trustees) and others outside the institution such as students, employers, community leaders, legislators, and other college and university personnel. Are the attitudes about these programs and their value the same or are they different? How might these programs be improved upon receiving the results of such a pervasive evaluation?
5. The question of the difference between the workforce baccalaureate and traditional baccalaureate degrees must be addressed. How are they different? What are the similarities? How are these degrees viewed by employers and universities?

6. Current programs are enduring the “pioneering effort” pains and difficulties. A review of how the processes and products are being standardized in order to move beyond the infancy stages where nothing is yet fully developed or established would be valuable. What frameworks are being established in order to standardize or systematize the acceptance, creation, development, and implementation of such programs? How is the new hybrid program being defined and viewed?

7. An in-depth study of the different and varied workforce baccalaureate degrees needs to be conducted. What programs have been produced and how are they being developed and implemented? How do these programs differ from the traditional baccalaureate degree?

8. The community college mission seems to be of primary importance to most individuals who are a part of this discussion. It would be of worth to tackle a review of the history of the mission of community colleges since their inception. What remains the same, what has changed, and why? Have traditional community college values and purposes been maintained or changed, and does this represent a disintegration of the community college as it has come to be known? Does the transformation of the college’s programs also represent a transformation in its goals, purposes, and values?
9. Once CCB graduates are in the field and working, what are their attitudes about the programs they experienced? Did they value them and find them useful? Did they learn what they needed to learn and develop the skills they needed in order to become productive employees? What attitudes did their employers have about their degrees and their readiness to work? Were they well prepared for the “real world” scenario? Student outcomes and evaluations as well as completion rates should be studied. Longitudinal studies on the impact of these programs on graduates and their careers would be useful.

10. After the CCB is implemented in more institutions, a study on how other traditional programs at the community college were impacted would be of interest. Were other programs created as a result? Were others sacrificed? What was gained or lost?

11. True funding impacts of established CCB programs needs to be explored. How was the funding divided by the state? Were other programs or institutions impacted positively or negatively? What additional funding resources have been utilized by community colleges in order to provide these programs? Were programs jeopardized or curtailed due to funding issues? How were the funding problems resolved?

12. There is a claim that this new scenario provides an opportunity for more creative and innovative educational programs. How different are these CCB programs compared to traditional programs? What flexibility is available to “think outside the box” in creating and developing these programs? What
accreditation and program requirements at state, regional, and local levels restrict or impact the development of these programs?

13. Community college leaders say that no one knows better what a local community needs than the local community. Who should be the authorizing agencies for these programs? Beyond legislative authorization, is it possible for other state agencies or even local boards of trustees to provide authorization for new programs? A study of who the authorizing agencies are in each state would be useful and how this changes through the years once these programs become more acceptable.

14. Where does the opportunity to provide any number of programs at the community college level start and stop? This is a very political process say many. Should community colleges be allowed to compete with universities for baccalaureate degrees in traditional fields such as education? Should they also be allowed to venture into traditional university arenas such as liberal arts degrees? Are community colleges being restricted to specific workforce fields such as applied technologies, and should they be?

The CCB is a new, developing program in progress. It is suffering from birthing and growing pains. Indeed, it will change as it grows. Just how it will change will be left to researchers of the future. This research is essential to the understanding, evaluation, and perfection of these programs.
Conclusions

“There is little research published about the specifics of national and state policies and practices related to the community college baccalaureate” (Floyd, 2005, p. 40). This study attempted to do just that. The purpose of the study was to determine what key community college leaders in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. In addition, the study considered the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of such programs.

The study was conducted using participants from five community colleges in Florida that transitioned to college status: St. Petersburg, Miami Dade, Chipola, Okaloosa-Walton, and Edison. Four were providing baccalaureate programs during the study, the fifth (Edison) became accepted as an independent baccalaureate-producing program in April 2005. Individuals who were community college leaders in the baccalaureate programs at their individual schools were specifically selected for survey and interview purposes. There were 38 surveys received and 16 interviews conducted. Individuals were categorized as college executives, program developers, and program implementers.

A factor analysis was conducted in order to determine the primary factors that were evident in the survey tool and could be applied to the interview questions. Three factors emerged: (a) need, (b) accountability, and (c) mission. A chi-square analysis was used to determine the significance of the item responses. All questions except one were statistically significant and could be used for the purposes of the study. There was strong agreement on a number of issues. There appeared to be a need for new CCB programs.
The need was primarily due to the issue of student access to baccalaureate degrees. Community colleges also must respond to the needs of their local communities by providing educational programs for the local workforce. The special needs of nontraditional students were emphasized, as well as the serious shortage of teachers and nurses. With Florida ranking 47th in the nation for producing baccalaureate degrees, the need for increasing the number of baccalaureate programs is clearly evident. In addition, “Florida is the fourth most populous state with the seventh highest enrollment in public baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, but ranks 20th in the number of those institutions” (OPPAGA, 2005, p. 1). According to that report, for example, Florida only has 11 public baccalaureate-granting institutions compared to 16 in Alabama and 21 in Georgia.

It was also pointed out in the study that community college leaders in the five colleges studied believed accountability and quality to be extremely important issues in the creation, development, and implementation of these programs. Accountability issues included program excellence, the need for rigorous evaluation procedures both internally and externally, and providing for local community workforce needs while at the same time communicating with neighboring institutions in order to decrease potential conflicts. Also included were issues associated with funding and costs, and the need for systematizing the processes involved in the creation, development, and evaluation of these programs. Participants believed that costs to the state and to students were lower at community colleges than other state educational institutions.

In the study it was also pointed out that Florida community college leaders believed that the CCB programs were natural and logical extensions of the community
college mission and that expansion and progression of the mission was essential if community colleges are to be responsive to their local communities and their changing workforce needs. The mission has changed because community’s needs have changed. There was strong sentiment that although community colleges in Florida that are now providing their own baccalaureate degrees are now called colleges, they are still ultimately community colleges, and always will be.

There is a significant amount of work ahead as the need and opportunities for research in this fledgling arena abound. It is yet to be seen whether or not these programs will succeed and expand. If Florida community college leaders have input on this, their response will be that there is no question that this indeed will happen.
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Appendix A

The 2003 Florida Statutes

Community Colleges: Definition, Mission, and Responsibilities
1004.65 Community colleges; definition, mission, and responsibilities...

(1) Community colleges shall consist of all public educational institutions operated by community college district boards of trustees under statutory authority and rules of the State Board of Education.

(2) Each community college district authorized by law and the Department of Education is an independent, separate, legal entity created for the operation of a community college.

(3) A community college may provide adult education services, including adult basic education, adult general education, adult secondary education, and General Educational Development test instruction.

(4) The community colleges are locally based and governed entities with statutory and funding ties to state government. As such, the community colleges' mission reflects a commitment to be responsive to local educational needs and challenges. In achieving this mission, the community colleges strive to maintain sufficient local authority and flexibility while preserving appropriate legal accountability to the state.

(5) As comprehensive institutions, the community colleges shall provide high-quality, affordable education and training opportunities, shall foster a climate of excellence, and shall provide opportunities to all while combining high standards with an open-door admission policy. The community colleges shall, as comprehensive institutions, serve all who can benefit, without regard to age, race, gender, creed, or ethnic or economic background, while emphasizing the achievement of social and educational equity so that all can be prepared for full participation in society.

(6) The primary mission and responsibility of community colleges is responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and technical degree education. This mission and responsibility includes being responsible for:

(a) Providing lower level undergraduate instruction and awarding associate degrees.

(b) Preparing students directly for vocations requiring less than baccalaureate degrees. This may include preparing for job entry, supplementing of skills and knowledge, and responding to needs in new areas of technology. Career and technical education in the community college shall consist of technical certificates, credit courses leading to associate in science degrees and associate in applied science degrees, and other programs in fields requiring substantial academic work, background, or qualifications. A community college may offer career and technical education programs in fields having lesser academic or technical requirements.

(c) Providing student development services, including assessment, student tracking, support for disabled students, advisement, counseling, financial aid, career development, and remedial and tutorial services, to ensure student success.

(d) Promoting economic development for the state within each community college district through the provision of special programs, including, but not limited to, the:
1. Enterprise Florida-related programs.

2. Technology transfer centers.

3. Economic development centers.

4. Workforce literacy programs.

(e) Providing dual enrollment instruction.

(7) A separate and secondary role for community colleges includes:

(a) Providing upper level instruction and awarding baccalaureate degrees as specifically authorized by law.

(b) The offering of programs in:

1. Community services that are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement.

2. Adult general education.

3. Recreational and leisure services.

(8) Funding for community colleges shall reflect their mission as follows:

(a) Postsecondary academic and career and technical education programs and adult general education programs shall have first priority in community college funding.

(b) Community service programs shall be presented to the Legislature with rationale for state funding. The Legislature may identify priority areas for use of these funds.

(9) Community colleges are authorized to offer such programs and courses as are necessary to fulfill their mission and are authorized to grant associate in arts degrees, associate in science degrees, associate in applied science degrees, certificates, awards, and diplomas. Each community college is also authorized to make provisions for the General Educational Development test. Each community college may provide access to baccalaureate degrees in accordance with law.

History.--s. 215, ch. 2002-387.
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Florida Department of Education Community Colleges:

Purpose, Number, Services, Policy, Funding, Issues
# Department of Education

## Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the purpose of the community college system?</th>
<th>The purpose of the community college system is to respond to community needs for postsecondary academic and career education. It does this by providing instruction for the first two years for students who may be going on to colleges and universities, who may be entering workforce training programs, for student services such as assessment, counseling and remediation, and by promoting economic development through specialized training programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many community colleges are there?</td>
<td>There are 28 community colleges in Florida’s community college system with over 135 locations statewide. The institutions in the state’s community college system are Brevard, Broward, Central Florida, Chipola, Daytona Beach, Edison, FCC, Jacksonville, Florida Keys, Gulf Coast, Hillsborough, Indian River, Lake City, Lake Sumter, Manatee, Miami-Dade, North Florida, Okaloosa-Walton, Palm Beach, Pasco-Hernando, Pensacola, Polk, St. Johns River, St. Petersburg, Santa Fe, Seminole, South Florida, Tallahassee, and Valencia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What services are provided?</td>
<td>The program provides:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liberal arts curriculum and instruction that leads to an Associate in Arts degree or an Associate in Sciences degree, qualifying students to enter a state university to complete the last two years of a baccalaureate degree. Florida had more Associate in Arts graduates in 2002-2003 than any of the other southern states and had several Community Colleges that topped the list nationally for producing Associate in Arts degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College preparatory instruction to assure those students who do not qualify for placement into college-level courses that they will have an opportunity to bring their academic skills to the appropriate level and proceed in the community college system. When they have successfully completed the community college AA or AS college program, they may enroll at a four-year institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Career-related instruction (adult vocational certificate programs for example), which is intended to prepare students for the workforce emphasizing development of qualities such as critical thinking, problem solving abilities, and effective communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting economic development for the state by supplying business industry with well-educated and trained employees by aligning workforce education programs with identified business sector needs, establishing industry-recognized credentials in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/profiles/2100/print.asp

1/23/2005
| How is community college policy determined? | Each institution is under the direct control of a local community college board of trustees which coordinates with the State Board of Education. |
| Who is served by community colleges? | Florida community colleges have an open door admissions policy allowing any person with a Florida high school diploma or GED to enroll. Community colleges serve a large number of non-traditional students; that is, students other than those who have just graduated from high school. A high proportion of students are commuter and/or part-time students who also have full or part-time jobs. |
| How many are served? | The fall headcount enrollment for 2003-2004, was 375,293 students statewide (16,439 more than last year); this does not include students in adult education, continuing workforce education, or GED preparation. The total enrollment (headcount) for 2002-2003 was 880,064 and shows a decline of 7,771 from last year; there was a large reduction in the numbers enrolled in recreation and leisure courses that would account for that decline. |
| Are students who start in the College Prep courses, and then get an AA degree, generally successful in the university system? | The results from FY 2002-2003 showed that 73% of AA degree transfers to the State University System (SUS) who started in College Prep course earned at least a 2.5 grade point average in the SUS after one year. That 73% outcome was the Legislature-approved performance standard for FY 2004-2005 and has been requested as the standard for FY 2005-2006 as well. |
| How are community colleges funded? | Community colleges are funded largely through legislative appropriation. The operating budget for community colleges saw an increase for 2004-2005 that included $852 million in general revenue and $99 million in lottery funds. Community colleges receive additional funds from student tuition and matriculation fees, which totaled approximately $433 million in Fiscal Year 2003-04, an increase of $44 million in fees paid by students over the previous year. |
| Current issues | Limited educational funding nationally has prompted lively discussions |

http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/profiles/2100/print.asp  
1/23/2005
about the access to higher education as the student population increases. In Florida, the Legislature is reviewing a number of potential options that would offer more access to baccalaureate degrees to non-traditional and place-bound students. The option of using community colleges to provide baccalaureate degrees, particularly in areas of the state with limited access and shortages in critical-needs fields like nursing, is being assessed. This important issue draws to it questions regarding the efficacy of baccalaureate study in a traditionally two-year program structure, the actual student demand for various baccalaureate programs, the nature of such a community college program (stand alone baccalaureate programs or 2+2 arrangements with other public or private institutions), access costs for students, and recurring state requirements among other questions.
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The 2003 Florida Statutes:

Site-Determined Baccalaureate Degree Access
The 2003 Florida Statutes

Title XLVIII Chapter 1007

K-20 EDUCATION CODE ARTICULATION AND ACCESS

1007.33 Site-determined baccalaureate degree access.--

(1) The Legislature recognizes that public and private postsecondary educational institutions play essential roles in improving the quality of life and economic well-being of the state and its residents. The Legislature also recognizes that economic development needs and the educational needs of place-bound, nontraditional students have increased the demand for local access to baccalaureate degree programs. In some, but not all, geographic regions, baccalaureate degree programs are being delivered successfully at the local community college through agreements between the community college and 4-year postsecondary institutions within or outside of the state. It is therefore the intent of the Legislature to further expand access to baccalaureate degree programs through the use of community colleges.

(2) A community college may enter into a formal agreement pursuant to the provisions of s. 1007.22 for the delivery of specified baccalaureate degree programs.

(3) A community college may develop a proposal to deliver specified baccalaureate degree programs in its district to meet local workforce needs. The proposal must be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval. The community college’s proposal must include the following information:

(a) Demand for the baccalaureate degree program is identified by the workforce development board, local businesses and industry, local chambers of commerce, and potential students.

(b) Unmet need for graduates of the proposed degree program is substantiated.

(c) The community college has the facilities and academic resources to deliver the program.

The proposal must be submitted to the Council for Education Policy Research and Improvement for review and comment. Upon approval of the State Board of Education for the specific degree program or programs, the community college shall pursue regional accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Any additional baccalaureate degree programs the community college wishes to offer must be approved by the State Board of Education.

(4) A community college may not terminate its associate in arts or associate in science degree programs as a result of the authorization provided in subsection (3). The Legislature intends that the primary mission of a community college, including a community college that offers baccalaureate degree programs, continues to be the provision of associate degrees that provide access to a university.

History.--s. 363, ch. 2002-387.

Disclaimer: The information on this system is unverified. The journals or printed bills of the respective chambers should be consulted for official purposes. Copyright © 2000-2004 State of Florida.
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Memo from Jim Horne to Florida Board of Education

Subject: Community College Baccalaureate Degrees
May 8, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Florida Board of Education  FROM: Jim Horne

SUBJECT: Community College Baccalaureate Degrees – Recommendation

Per discussions of the Florida Board of Education at the April 16, 2002, meeting, I am pleased to present you with my recommendations related to the community college baccalaureate degree proposals of Chipola Junior College, Edison Community College, and Miami-Dade Community College.

As administrators of the law, the task of the Florida Board of Education and thus the Department of Education is to evaluate the proposals along the specific criteria established in statute. Other information related to cost, student population, and academic accountability adds context to the discussion but should not be used as a reason alone to approve or not approve a proposal. Final grant award amounts will be negotiated upon approval of any specific proposal.

The Law

The site-determined baccalaureate degree access legislation adopted by the 2001 Florida Legislature (s. 240.3836, F.S.) provides two avenues for a community college to deliver a limited number of specified baccalaureate degree programs (and thus to appropriated funds): (1) through "a formal agreement with the state university in its service areas for the community college to deliver specified baccalaureate degree programs"; and, (2) through a community college delivering specified baccalaureate degree programs in its district.

The law specifies that both avenues require three pieces of information that must be addressed in community college proposals:

1. Demand for the baccalaureate degree program is identified by the workforce development board, local businesses and industry, local chambers of commerce, and potential students.
2. Unmet need for graduates of the proposed degree program is substantiated.
3. The community college has the facilities and the academic resources to deliver the program.

The proposals must be submitted to the Council for Education Policy, Research, and Improvement for review and comment. The Florida Board of Education is authorized to approve specific degree programs. Any additional baccalaureate degree programs must be approved by the Florida Board of Education.
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Council For Education Policy Research & Improvement:

Community College Baccalaureate Proposal Evaluation
COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION POLICY RESEARCH & IMPROVEMENT

COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The 2001 Legislature established procedures to expand access to baccalaureate degree programs through the use of community colleges (see Section 240.3836, F.S.). This policy was enacted in concert with the Legislature's establishment of a new K-20 education system. Among the major goals of the new K-20 system are:

- Provide a more seamless and student centered approach to achieving a high level of learning.
- Achieve a more coordinated and cost effective use of available resources.

The legislation enables a community college to offer a limited number of baccalaureate programs that are designed to meet local workforce needs following a review of the college's proposal by CEPRI and authorization by the Florida Board of Education.

A matrix of criteria will be used by CEPRl to evaluate each community college proposal. Consideration of each proposal will be guided by the Council's review of several issues – as follows:

I. **NEED** – is the need for the bachelor's program and demand for program graduates verified and important enough to implement a major change to the K-20 system?

II. **POTENTIAL IMPACT** – will the proposed program be of sufficient academic quality and will the program significantly reduce the identified need?

III. **USE OF RESOURCES** – is the proposed program the most effective way to use all education resources of the K-20 system?

IV. **IMPLEMENTATION** – can the proposed program be implemented in a timely and effective manner?

V. **ACCOUNTABILITY** – Does the proposed program comply with statutory requirements regarding time-to-degree, articulation, and access?

VI. **COST EFFECTIVENESS** – will the proposed program provide the most cost effective use of the State's education resources to meet the identified workforce needs?

The decision to support the approval and implementation of a proposed new bachelor's degree program will depend on the evaluation of the College's plan to improve baccalaureate degree attainment, to meet the identified workforce needs and to strengthen the delivery of the K-20 education system.

Additionally, the law specifically states that "the primary mission of a community college, including a community college that offers baccalaureate degree programs, continues to be the provision of associate degrees that provide access to a university". (s. 240.3836(3), F.S.)
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Mission Statements: Five Florida Colleges
Missions: Five Florida Colleges

St. Petersburg College

The mission of St. Petersburg College is to provide accessible, learner-centered education for students pursuing selected baccalaureate degrees, associate degrees, technical certificates, applied technology diplomas and continuing education within our service area as well as globally in program areas in which the College has special expertise. As a comprehensive, multi-campus postsecondary institution, St. Petersburg College seeks to be a creative leader and partner with students, communities, and other educational institutions to deliver enriched learning experiences and to promote economic and workforce development.

St. Petersburg College fulfills its mission led by an outstanding, diverse faculty and staff and enhanced by advanced technologies, distance learning, international education opportunities, innovative teaching techniques, comprehensive library and other information resources, continuous institutional self-evaluation, a climate for student success, and an enduring commitment to excellence. Our goals are to:

- Provide equal educational opportunities to a diverse student body;
- Prepare students for work in selected professional fields through Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, and Bachelor of Applied Science degree programs and in partnership with other colleges/universities through St. Petersburg College’s University Partnership Center;
- Prepare lower-division students for transfer into baccalaureate programs through the A.A. and articulated Associate in Science degree programs;
- Prepare lower-division students for careers requiring post-secondary education through Associate in Science, Associate in Applied Science, selected Technical Certificate and Applied Technology Diploma programs;
- Provide under-prepared students with opportunities to achieve college entry-level skills in reading, writing and mathematics through the college preparatory programs;
- Promoted expanded educational opportunities for area high school students through dual enrollment and similar programs;
- Provide opportunities to improve employability, enhance career skills, and attain personal enrichment through courses, seminars, workshops and other continuing education programs;
- Promote economic development for the state through special education and training programs including technical courses, workshops, and services designed to enhance the competitiveness of individuals, businesses and industries in the local, state, national and global economies;
- Contribute to the international education of students through a variety of courses, foreign study tours, faculty and student exchanges, linkages with international institutions, distance learning and other special programs;
- Serve target populations beyond the borders of Pinellas County through distance learning programs and other means that emanate from the institution’s history of services and specialized expertise; and
- Provide an open admission general education curriculum.

(St. Petersburg College, 2003b).
Miami Dade College

The mission of Miami Dade College is to provide accessible, affordable, high quality education by keeping the learner’s needs at the center of decision-making and working in partnership with its dynamic, multi-cultural community.

Vision Statement: In February, 1996, the Executive Committee of the college presented a vision statement for the future development of Miami Dade College. Subsequently this statement was endorsed by President’s Council and the Board of Trustees. The desired state of MDC in 3-5 years is to be the premier community college, renowned for its:

Satisfied, well-prepared students who, through their extraordinarily positive experience at MDC, have acquired the needed knowledge and skills to be successful in their ongoing academic and career pursuits;

Empowered employees, working within an environment that encourages creativity, risk-taking and accountability, who apply their individual and collective talents to fulfill the college’s mission;

Highly supportive community that recognizes the significant impact of MDC’s educational and training programs; and

Effective use of adequate resources to enable programs to flourish and the talents of people to emerge.

These broad goals are drawn from the Vision (V) and Mission (M) statements and represent the desired state of Miami Dade.

Goals Related to Students:

Strategic Goal I- To provide accessible (M) and affordable (M) education.

Strategic Goal II- To provide high quality education (M) that produces satisfied, well-prepared students (V).

Strategic Goal III- To ensure that students acquire the needed knowledge and skills to be successful in academic and career pursuits (V).

Goals Related to the Workplace:

Strategic Goal IV- To empower employees who will apply their individual and collective talents to fulfill the college’s mission(V).

Strategic Goal V- To provide an environment that encourages creativity, risk-taking, and accountability(V).
Goals Related to the Community:

Strategic Goal VI- To work in partnership (M) with a supportive community (V).

Strategic Goal VII- To ensure that the community recognizes the impact of MDC’s programs and training (V).

Goals Related to Resources:

Strategic Goal VIII- To make effective use of adequate resources in order to allow programs to flourish & the talents of people to emerge.

(Miami Dade College, 2005).

Chipola College

Philosophy and Purpose

Chipola is a comprehensive public community college whose primary purpose is to provide accessible, affordable, quality educational opportunities to the residents of Calhoun, Holmes, Jackson, Liberty and Washington counties and to all others who choose to attend. The colleges create a student-centered atmosphere of educational excellence and maintains an intellectual environment which inspires the full development of each individual’s goals, abilities, and interests. Because there is no substitute for quality instruction, the college empowers faculty members to establish and achieve the highest possible standards. The college also promotes a strong working relationships with communities, businesses, state agencies, and other educational institutions.

Mission and Programs

The Chipola College mission is to serve students in four major areas:

1. Providing educational programs which include general and pre-professional classes which lead to the Associate in Arts degree for transfer to other colleges and universities.
2. Providing applied technology programs which lead to the Associate in Science degrees which prepare students for jobs in their communities and Certificates of Training to develop or upgrade career skills.
3. Providing continuing education opportunities related to cultural and governmental changes and personal development, both mentally and physically.
4. Providing a broad range of students services and instructional and administrative support.

(Chipola College, 2004b)
**Okaloosa-Walton College**

The mission of Okaloosa-Walton College is to provide quality educational programs and services whereby students may achieve their goals and the community is enhanced through academic, vocational, cultural, economic, and personal development opportunities.

**OWC Goals:**

- To provide an environment that promotes equity and access to college programs for all members of the community.
- To provide student services and activities that enhance student success.
- To provide freshman and sophomore courses leading to baccalaureate degrees.
- To provide associate degrees and occupational programs that prepare students for employment and careers in the public and private sectors.
- To provide leadership and support for the economic and workforce development of Okaloosa and Walton counties.
- To provide college preparatory and basic skills instruction, literacy programs, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), adult secondary education, and vocational preparatory instruction.
- To provide social, cultural, and co-curricular opportunities in Okaloosa and Walton counties.
- To provide a variety of continuing education and distance learning opportunities.
- To provide understanding, application, and use of technology.

(Okaloosa-Walton College, 2005)

**Edison College**

The **PURPOSE** of Edison College is to deliver high-quality, convenient, and affordable learning opportunities to diverse populations.

In order to fulfill its purpose, it is the College's **MISSION** to strive for excellence through innovation and continuous improvement as it provides:

- General and pre-professional education through the Associate in Arts degree
- Workforce development programs through Associate in Science degrees and certificates of training for employment in specialized fields
- Access to baccalaureate degree programs through upper-division transfer, articulation, site-based programming, and partnerships with colleges and universities
- Preparatory instruction for students needing academic development for entry into and success in college-level coursework
- Personal and professional development opportunities through credit and non-credit programs
- Accessibility to programs through academic advising, flexible scheduling, and distance education
• Services and opportunities that promote academic, personal, and social growth among students
• Educational partnerships with business, industry, government, and other institutions
• Cultural resources for the community

**College Vision**

A learning centered college providing quality education and guidance in a caring, professional environment

**Values**

• **Respect:** Characterized by support for students’ and each other’s goals, communication, trust
• **Belief in Individual Human Potential:** Resulting in collegiality, reward, appreciation
• **Integrity:** Exemplified by institutional trustworthiness and individual incorruptibility

**Goals**

**Goal I**
Provide quality educational programming and services responding to community needs

**Goal II**
Facilitate student success (*through development, advising, and mentoring of students, and programs and services to reduce barriers for non-traditional students*)

**Goal III**
Strive for quality improvement

**Goal IV**
Improve resource utilization and seek alternative funding sources

**Goal V**
Promote articulation (*from high schools and vo-techs*) and transfer (*to other postsecondary institutions*)

**Goal VI**
Study, promote, and establish site-based baccalaureate programs

(Edison College, 2005).
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Survey Instrument and Demographic Information

(Reproduced as Used)
**Demographic Information**

College position (primary title):

- Department/Division Chair
- Dean, Ass’t. Dean
- V. P., Provost
- President
- Faculty (full time)
- Faculty (associate/adjunct)
- Staff
- Board Member, Trustee
- Other (Please name: ____________)

Highest Education Level:

- Below bachelor’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- EdD
- PhD
- Other (Please name: ____________)

Number of years involved at community college level:

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 20-25
- Over 25

Number of years involved at this college:

- 0-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 20-25
- Over 25

What percentage of time do you currently devote to the baccalaureate program?

- 0-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 75-100%
Florida Community College Baccalaureate Survey

Please respond to the following statements by placing a check in the appropriate box that most closely corresponds with your choice of responses. Your responses should be based specifically on your college’s new baccalaureate degree program(s) and your beliefs and attitudes toward such programs in general. The following choices are:

(1) Strongly Agree  (2) Agree  (3) Undecided  (4) Disagree  (5) Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The need for the new college baccalaureate programs is high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local workforce needs assessments are essential before initiating new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The need for these programs is primarily related to the nature of the delivery system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a significant shortage of trained individuals in the degree programs that were implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Articulation problems led to the need for these new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The need for these new programs was driven by student demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program enrollments met or exceeded expected student enrollments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student needs assessments are essential before initiating new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Demand for graduates in the new programs was documented in a study or needs analysis that was completed before implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The issue of student access to the baccalaureate degree led to the implementation of these new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The new programs will contribute significantly to meeting workforce needs in this service area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The new programs required a significant change in the community college's mission statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The comprehensive (multiple) nature of the mission of community colleges has expanded their mission too far.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The new programs changed or expanded the former stated mission of the college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The new programs may reduce student access to traditional community college programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Florida Community College Baccalaureate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Florida’s legislative and executive branches share the college’s vision for the future regarding the community college baccalaureate degree program(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Community colleges are moving from a comprehensive (multiple) mission approach to one that focuses on particular niches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Community colleges should give priority to communities, institutions and/or employers needs over a comprehensive mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The new baccalaureate programs represent a transformational change for community colleges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The new programs will significantly reduce the gap between supply and demand for baccalaureate graduates in these new service areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The structure of the new programs is the same or very similar to the traditional baccalaureate degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The new programs did not terminate any associate in arts or science degrees as a result of their implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The new programs did not have a significantly adverse impact on established programs in existing public or private institutions within the service area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>These new programs may result in conflicts between community colleges and other institutions over state funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Programs that are autonomous and self-sufficient are more efficient than partnerships (cooperative programs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The demands of serving upper division students burden current student service personnel and faculty members in different ways beyond former requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Adverse relationships between upper and lower-division faculty members have surfaced and must be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>There is a cooperative program with a four-year institution currently in place at this college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New programs should not duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cooperative programs with other colleges and universities have worked well for this college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>New distance learning programs should not duplicate existing programs offered by other institutions within commuting distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Community colleges should consider collaboration with other institutions before taking an independent road in baccalaureate degrees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Upon initiation of the new programs, current faculty members raised concerns that needed to be resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Florida Community College Baccalaureate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The structure of the new programs make them &quot;applied baccalaureates&quot; with specialized training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The structure of the new programs is the same or very similar to the traditional baccalaureate degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Internal assurances regarding capable/qualified personnel must be in place before initiating new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Program quality issues received high priority in the development of these new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Accreditation standards should allow for programs that respond to specific and unique institutional circumstances (e.g., rural isolation, programs for specific local organizations and businesses, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>There must be a clear provision for the compilation and reporting of performance data for accountability and evaluation before implementation of such programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>New programs must be supported by clearly established lines of accountability and responsibility before implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>New programs must comply with common prerequisites and other applicable state articulation agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Current accreditation standards and processes are flexible enough to allow for establishing new programs in this college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Internal assurances regarding structure and facility must be in place before initiating new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Admission requirements for the new programs are different than those in effect for the other non-baccalaureate programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Community colleges must provide for performance standards, which include outcomes assessment measures, before implementation of new programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Community colleges must do more to reach beyond state funding resources to other sources of funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>These new programs are cost-effective for the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs will rise at community colleges for traditional programs where baccalaureate programs have been established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The incremental costs to establish these new programs (including capital outlay) to the state are less than other available options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The costs to students in these new baccalaureate programs are less than other available alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for participating in this survey.
Appendix H

Interview Questionnaire
INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What were the driving forces in initiating this transformational change? (Result of a crisis or opportunity? External or internal influences?)

2. How did you identify the critical needs of your students and your community?

3. What impact issues have you experienced with other academic institutions? (Other cc's, nearby universities, etc.)

4. Is the community college mission compromised or changed by offering the Community College Baccalaureate? (Could this change in any way compromise the focus/values of community colleges?)

5. How is the Community College Baccalaureate viewed as compared to the traditional baccalaureate from 4-year colleges?

6. What was the make-up of the initial planning group?

7. What difficulties or conflicts did you encounter in initiating this transformational change in your college? (Faculty/resource/facility problems?)

8. What lessons have been learned? What recommendations do you have for community college leaders seeking to establish the Community College Baccalaureate in their schools?

9. How do you ensure program quality? (Internal/external?)

10. Are the costs of providing these programs different between the Community College Baccalaureate and traditional baccalaureate degrees?

11. How is competition for enrollments and allocation of state funds being addressed?

OPEN:

12. Is there anything else you would like to add with regard to any aspect of the Community College Baccalaureate?
Appendix I

Informed Consent Form
Informed Consent Form

Title of Research: “The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Degree-Producing Programs”

I. Federal and university regulations require researchers to obtain a signed consent for participation in research involving human participants. After reading the attached letter and statements in section II through IV below, please indicate your consent by signing and dating this form.

II. Statement of Procedure: Thank you for your interest in this research project being conducted by Debra K. Petry, an instructor at Okaloosa Walton College and a doctoral candidate at the University of West Florida. It is the intention of the letter of introduction, enclosed with this consent form, to explain the research project. This stage of the research project involves my administering a researcher-created survey to certain individuals in five colleges in Florida that have converted from being community colleges to baccalaureate degree-producing colleges. Individuals selected to complete this survey have knowledge of the specifics of the conversion at their respective colleges.

I understand that:

(1) the survey will be take approximately 10 minutes.

(2) surveys will be anonymously documented in the research report, although my position will be known (e.g., board member, faculty member, college administrator, etc.). Consent forms will be separated from the surveys as soon as they are received by the researcher.

(3) the researcher will share study results if they are requested.

(4) at no time will my name be referenced in the study results and/or reports.

(5) my participation is completely at my own discretion, and any lack of participation will be without penalties or repercussions.

III. Potential Risks of the Study:

(1) There are no foreseeable risks involved with this study.

IV. Potential Benefits of the Study:

(1) Data obtained from this study may provide community college professionals information that would allow them to consider essential
elements required to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs at their community college if they wish to do so.

(2) Information obtained from this study may provide valuable information to college professionals who already have these programs in place but wish to change or expand them.

(3) College professionals who have an interest in this transformation process will have an opportunity to review what those who have initiated the transformation have experienced, in order to better understand the transition.

V. **Statement of Consent:** I certify that I have read and fully understand the information provided and agree to participate in the research described herein. Permission is given voluntarily and without coercion or undue influence.

If you have any questions or concerns please call Debra K. Petry, the researcher, at (850)651-5577 or contact her at debpetry@cox.net.

___________________________________________            ______________________
Participant’s Name (Please Print)                                              Date

___________________________________________
Participant’s Signature
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Letter to Survey Participants

Letter to Key Baccalaureate Program Contacts
TO: Dissertation Study Participant
FROM: Debra K. Petry, Dissertation Researcher
874 Masters Blvd, Shalimar, FL. 32579
(850)651-5577 debpetry@cox.net
DATE: March 15, 2005
RE.: Dissertation Survey

Dear Dissertation Study Participant:

I am a doctoral candidate in education curriculum and leadership at the University of West Florida in Pensacola, working towards the completion of my dissertation entitled “The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Producing Programs.” The purpose of my study is to determine what key community college leaders in five colleges in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. In addition, I am considering the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs.

In order to complete this study, I am seeking your participation by completing the enclosed survey instrument. Your responses will be kept confidential to the degree outlined in the attached “Informed Consent Form.” Your participation is completely voluntary but is absolutely essential to this study. It would be greatly appreciated if you would respond as soon as possible and return it to me at the address listed above. The survey should take around 10 minutes.

If you have any questions, you are invited to contact me at my address, phone number, or e-mail address listed above. My doctoral supervisor is Dr. G. Michael Barry at (850)863-6538 or gbarry@uwf.edu if you feel you need to speak to him about my work.

If you agree to help me with my dissertation survey, please sign the enclosed consent form and complete the survey, returning both to the address listed above. I am extremely grateful for your time.

Again, thank you for your very valuable help with my dissertation on this important and current topic. If you wish to receive the results of this report, please indicate so at the end of the survey form.

Thank you and best regards,

[Signature]

Debra K. Petry,
UWF Doctoral Candidate
TO: Dr. Gene Prough, President, Chipola College
FROM: Debra K. Petry, Dissertation Researcher (UWF)
874 Masters Blvd, Shalimar, FL 32579
(850)651-5577 debpetry@cox.net
DATE: February 28, 2005
RE: Dissertation Survey and Interview Requests

Dear Dr. Prough:

I am a doctoral candidate in education curriculum and leadership at the University of West Florida in Pensacola, working to complete my dissertation entitled “The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Producing Programs.” The purpose of my study is to determine what key community college leaders in five colleges in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. I am also considering the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs.

I have asked Dr. Kitty Myers to help me with the coordination of this effort on the Chipola College campus. I am requesting five to seven individuals to complete the 10 minute survey, and three individuals to do a 30 minute interview with me. The surveys will be completed by individuals who have been directly involved in the process of establishing or creating the baccalaureate degree program in your college. The interviews need to be with the top three people involved in the program’s initiation, including yourself, Dr. Myers, and a third person. I need for these same individuals to complete the survey.

I will be contacting your secretary to schedule approximately 30 minutes of your time for the survey and interview which can be done at the same time. I know that you are extremely busy, but your input is a key element for my study. I sincerely appreciate your consideration in helping me with this endeavor.

Again, thank you for your extremely valuable help in my dissertation efforts on this very important and current topic. I will be happy to share with you the results of this report, if you so desire.

Thank you and best regards,

Debra K. Petry,
UWF Doctoral Candidate
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Letter to College Presidents from Dr. Richburg

Letter to College Presidents from Researcher
February 24, 2005

Dr. Gene Prough, President
Chipola College
3094 Indian Circle
Mariana FL 32446-2053

Dear Gene:

I am writing to inform you about an education instructor at Okaloosa-Walton College, Debra Petry, who has been with us for eight years. She is working on her doctoral dissertation and has recently been approved by her committee to begin her research phase.

Ms. Petry’s dissertation is “The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Producing Programs.” She will be surveying and interviewing individuals from the five community colleges in Florida that are currently authorized to provide baccalaureate degrees. She hopes to complete this part of her work before spring break.

I support Ms. Petry’s doctoral dissertation project, and am asking you to welcome her when she comes to your campus to pursue her survey and interview work. She hopes to work her surveys and interviews through the individual in charge of each college’s baccalaureate program.

Thank you, in advance, for your time and interest on behalf of Ms. Petry.

Sincerely,

James R. Richburg
President
TO: Dr. Gene Prough, President, Chipola College
FROM: Debra K. Petry, Dissertation Researcher (UWF)
874 Masters Blvd, Shalimar, FL 32579
(850)651-5577 debpetry@cox.net
DATE: February 28, 2005
RE.: Dissertation Survey and Interview Requests

Dear Dr. Prough:

I am a doctoral candidate in education curriculum and leadership at the University of West Florida in Pensacola, working to complete my dissertation entitled “The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Producing Programs.” The purpose of my study is to determine what key community college leaders in five colleges in Florida view as the transformations that occur in community colleges in order to provide baccalaureate degree-producing programs. I am also considering the factors that led to the introduction and initiation of these programs.

I have asked Dr. Kitty Myers to help me with the coordination of this effort on the Chipola College campus. I am requesting five to seven individuals to complete the 10 minute survey, and three individuals to do a 30 minute interview with me. The surveys will be completed by individuals who have been directly involved in the process of establishing or creating the baccalaureate degree program in your college. The interviews need to be with the top three people involved in the program’s initiation, including yourself, Dr. Myers, and a third person. I need for these same individuals to complete the survey.

I will be contacting your secretary to schedule approximately 30 minutes of your time for the survey and interview which can be done at the same time. I know that you are extremely busy, but your input is a key element for my study. I sincerely appreciate your consideration in helping me with this endeavor.

Again, thank you for your extremely valuable help in my dissertation efforts on this very important and current topic. I will be happy to share with you the results of this report, if you so desire.

Thank you and best regards,

Debra K. Petry,
UWF Doctoral Candidate
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The University of West Florida Institutional Review Board Letter of Approval
November 16, 2004

Ms. Debra K. Petry
874 Masters Blvd.
Shalimar, FL 32579

Dear Ms. Petry:

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Research Participant Protection has completed its review of your proposal titled "The Transformation of Five Florida Community Colleges: Converting to Baccalaureate Producing Programs" as it relates to the protection of human participants used in research, and has granted approval for you to proceed with your study. As a research investigator, please be aware of the following:

- You acknowledge and accept your responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human research participants and for complying with all parts of 45 CFR Part 46, the UWF IRB Policy and Procedures, and the decisions of the IRB. You may view these documents on the Office of Research web page at http://www.research.uwf.edu. You acknowledge completion of the IRB ethical training requirements for researchers as attested in the IRB application.

- You will ensure that legally effective informed consent is obtained and documented. If written consent is required, the consent form must be signed by the participant or the participant's legally authorized representative. A copy is to be given to the person signing the form and a copy kept for your file.

- You will promptly report any proposed changes in previously approved human participant research activities to the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. The proposed changes will not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the participants.

- You are responsible for reporting progress of approved research to the Office of Research and Graduate Studies at the end of the project period. Approval for this project is valid for one year. If the data phase of your project continues beyond one year, you must request a renewal by the IRB before approval of the first year lapses. Project Directors of research requiring full committee review should notify the IRB when data collection is completed.

Research and Graduate Studies
11000 University Parkway
Pensacola, FL 32514-5750

For More Information, UWF Equal Opportunity/Title IX Information

231
• You will immediately report to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to human participants.

Good luck in your research endeavors. If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact the Office of Research and Graduate Studies at 857-6378.

Sincerely,

Dr. Karen Rasmussen, Chair
IRB for Human Research
Participant Protection

cc: Dr. G. Michael Barry
    Dr. Joseph Peters

Sandra VanderHeyden
Director of Sponsored Research
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Research Design
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Source of data and instruments</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Literature source</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What major factors precipitated the transformation to a baccalaureate degree-producing program in five Florida community colleges?</td>
<td>Documents showing historical factors</td>
<td>Review of literature documents</td>
<td><em>Access to the Baccalaureate,</em> 2003</td>
<td>Textual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey questions to college leaders, faculty, and board members</td>
<td>2 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Armstrong, 2003a</td>
<td>Chi-square analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured interviews with college leaders</td>
<td>3 structured interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Evelyn, 2003</td>
<td>Lexical analysis using codings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. What were the reasons for the initiative to be considered and implemented?</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed survey</td>
<td><em>Access to the Baccalaureate,</em> 2003</td>
<td>Chi-square analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 structured interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Armstrong, 2003a</td>
<td>Lexical analysis using codings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd &amp; Skolnik, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts, 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Source of data and instruments</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Literature source</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. What critical decisions were made in order for this to occur?</td>
<td>Survey questions to college leaders, faculty, and board members</td>
<td>11 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed survey</td>
<td>Access to the Baccalaureate, 2003</td>
<td>Chi-square analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured interviews with college leaders</td>
<td>2 structured interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Armstrong, 2003a</td>
<td>Lexical analysis using codings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. How did the mission of the college change as a result of this transformation?</td>
<td>Survey questions</td>
<td>14 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>CEPRI, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured and open-ended interview questions</td>
<td>10 structured interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Florida Statutes, 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horne, 2002a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Call, 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cook, 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorenzo, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puycar, 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosenfeld &amp; Liston, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skolnik, 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Townsend, 2001, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What problems were managed and resolved during the process and what problems remain?</td>
<td>Survey questions</td>
<td>15 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Bailey &amp; Averianova, 1999</td>
<td>Chi-square analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structured and open-ended interview questions</td>
<td>9 structured interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Bailey &amp; Morest, 2003</td>
<td>Lexical analysis using codings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cejda, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furlong, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grubb et al., 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morgaman, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remington, &amp; Remington, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Source of data and instruments</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Literature source</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the perspectives that Florida community college leaders have who experienced this transition related to the following concepts: program selection, responsiveness to community needs, limited resources and funding, access for students, conflict versus collaboration with colleges and universities and quality?</td>
<td>Survey questions</td>
<td>26 Likert-type survey questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Armstrong, 2003a</td>
<td>Chi-square analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview questions, both structured and open-ended</td>
<td>10 interview questions using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Burkhart, 2002</td>
<td>Lexical analysis using codings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 open-ended interview question using researcher-developed instrument</td>
<td>Floyd, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd &amp; Skolnik, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Four Year Degrees,” 2004</td>
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