LESSONS IN LEADERSHIP: EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCING DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

DAVID J. LEÓN

Editor

LESSONS IN LEADERSHIP: EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCING DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Series Editor: Henry T. Frierson Jr.

LESSONS IN LEADERSHIP: EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FOR ADVANCING DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY

DAVID J. LEÓN

California State University, Sacramento, USA

CONTENTS

v

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Kelley Aveilhe	Institute for Higher Education Policy, USA
Alexander Gonzalez	California State University, USA
Roberto Haro	College of Ethnic Studies, San Francisco State University, USA
Rosemary Lauth	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, USA
David J. León	The Serna Center, California State University, USA
Rubén O. Martinez	Department of Public Administration, University of Texas at San Antonio, USA
Thomas R. Martínez	Public Policy and Administration Department, California State University, Bakersfield, USA
Jamie P. Merisotis	Institute for Higher Education Policy, USA
Marlene Ross	ACE Fellows Program, American Council on Education, USA
George Alan Smith	ACE Fellows Program, American Council on Education, USA
"Jack" Jackie Thomas	Middle Tennessee State University, USA
Patrick L. Valdez	HACU Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program, Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, USA
Audrey Yamagata-Noji	Mt. San Antonio College, Walnut, CA, USA
Joseph P. Zolner	Harvard Institutes for Higher Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, USA

This page intentionally left blank

FOREWORD

This book serves as the interface between three critical issues facing the country: Leadership, the country's changing demographics and the continued growth of underrepresented groups, and the current state of higher education.

Although leadership has been a topic of interest for a long while, today it is the focus of attention because of current events and the scandals that have plagued corporate America. Enron, Worldcom, Tyco, and even the New York Stock Exchange have been rocked by malfeasance and abuse by their leaders with seemingly very little acknowledgment or remorse for their roles in the demise or handling of their companies. Frequently, one hears or reads of corporate and other leaders being involved in some sort of misdeed that affects not only their lives and the lives and livelihood of their employees, but consumers all over the globe. The country has been outraged to the point that Congress was moved to pass legislation in Sarbanes-Oxley as a way to provide oversight to companies and organizations so that potential abuses are detected and the nation's consumers and economy are not damaged by unscrupulous individuals.

Unfortunately, examples abound of poor leadership and abuse at all levels in this country, from the crooked politician to the local pastor who has led his flock astray. On the other hand, there are examples of courageous leadership and the steady, focused, and positive influence of leaders in various settings. Mother Theresa is perhaps an extreme example of leadership, and one that stands in stark juxtaposition to the current climate.

But how does one understand it all? Is it that people are bad or is it that there is a lack of people who can lead? Do leaders posses certain characteristics that set them apart or can leadership be taught and developed? In an attempt to understand these issues, the literature on leadership has developed taxonomies on the types of leaders and characteristics that make good leaders. But beyond being able to identify characteristics attributed to successful leadership, leaders must grapple with other issues as well. Moral leadership is important at all levels, as is the notion that one type of leadership can't fit all situations. What makes a leader like General Electric's Jack Welch different from or similar to the generals who lead the army in

Iraq? While there are many questions, one thing is certain: Leadership is needed now more than ever at all levels of society.

The second major issue this book seeks to address is the role of leadership within the context of the changing demographics and complexion of the country. Not only are we a country that is "graying" and facing the growth of senior citizens who are part of the "baby boom," but the color and age of our next generation are changing as well. Demographer David Hayes Bautista of UCLA has estimated that by the year 2040 Latinos will comprise nearly half of all residents of this state. And that does not include the dramatic growth of Asians and other ethnic groups. More important, this projected growth will not be due mainly to immigration but rather to high fertility rates and the intermarriage of Hispanics with other groups.

California, the most populous state in the union, should be a barometer of the things to come and what the future will be like for the next generation of Americans, especially in the Southwest. Given the projections for the future, America as a multicultural, multilingual society seems much more a reality than a mere speculation. There is evidence that this trend is well underway. For example, the number of Latinos and other underrepresented groups already engaged in politics and the country's economy is evident. In fact, the past election saw the selection of the first two Hispanics to serve in the US Senate. Clearly, then, we need to develop and train leaders not only in politics and business, but at all levels of society for the development and well-being of our future citizens and the country.

The third issue – and one inextricably linked to the well-being of future generations – is education. While much has been said and written about the poor state of our education system at the K-12 level, relatively little attention has been paid to the role and need for a high-quality system of higher education in this country. If one looks at the current state of the economy and the changes that have been brought about by technology, it should be clear that a highly trained workforce is necessary for the future survival of this country. Unlike the 1950s, when a high school education was sufficient to secure a good job and pursue the American Dream, today the requirement is at least some college and preferably a bachelor's degree at the entry level for the jobs that are available. Without at least some education beyond high school, the prospects for those who don't have it are not bright.

However, while the need for higher education seems clear, the reality is that public support has dwindled during the past several years and, across the country, institutions of higher education have witnessed decreases in funding. In addition, at a time when training in science and math is paramount, education generally is not preparing students well enough to

participate fully in the potential careers open to them. In sum, higher education is at a critical juncture in its history. If it is to survive and thrive, the one thing it needs more than anything is the leadership that will take it to the next level of development.

The question, of course, is who will provide this leadership? Given the changes taking place, the answer has to include representatives from those constituencies that share a stake in the future. And that's why this book is so important. It provides a framework for how to begin to address the dearth of people of color in leadership positions in higher education. More important, it presents models on how to develop the leadership that is so sorely needed.

It has been demonstrated by research and anecdote that students do better when they have the proper role models. This includes faculty and administrators who look like them and who share the same world view as well as a common set of values and history. Since the major increase in participation in higher education by members of minority groups nearly 40 years ago, the issue has remained the same; there must be more faculty and administrators of color. In other words, leadership is the need as well as the key to the student success.

By beginning to act on the issue, we will influence the events of the future rather than be driven by them. The current and next generation of students, regardless of their color or ethnicity, deserve it. This book is a first step.

Alexander Gonzalez

This page intentionally left blank

PART I:
HIDDEN SPRINGBOARD:
THE IMPORTANCE OF
LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

This page intentionally left blank

WHY LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS MATTER?

David J. León

The growth of leadership programs in higher education is an intriguing, significant, half-concealed phenomenon. This book reveals it to a wider public.

These programs are hidden ladders that help the talented move to top executive positions. Their number and importance are growing rapidly, and potential participants, designers of future programs, and members of society in general all need to know more about them.

Since I co-direct a leadership program myself, I know their challenges from the inside out. I also know that no edited book so far has described and analyzed them, bringing their discoveries about success and failure together in one place. Thus, I decided to edit this work with an eye to facets of these programs that make a difference.

I asked the directors of traditional and newer programs to describe their focus, curriculum, and participants' reactions.[1] The result is *Lessons in Leadership*, which highlights how these programs developed and what they achieve. It includes many programs that target minorities, since they stand to benefit most as a group from such efforts and since their participation will likely have the greatest impact on U.S. higher education.

This book expands on the ideas in my article "Building a LEAP for Latinos in Higher Education," which appeared in my recent edited book

Latinos in Higher Education. That article discussed my experience as a participant in the Leadership Development Program for Higher Education (LDPHE) sponsored by the Leadership and Education for Asian Pacifics (LEAP) in the summer of 2001. (See Chapter 9 for a detailed description of this program.) LEAP focuses solely on Asian Pacific Americans (APAs) seeking to move up the administrative ladder. Even though I am Latino, they granted my request to participate and I discovered that LEAP's lectures, panel discussions, and exercises apply to other minority groups as well. In that article I urged the development of a LEAP for Latinos, since no programs existed for them at that time. I went on to create one (see Chapter 11).

The publication of *Latinos in Higher Education* led to my selection as a participant in the HACU-Kellogg Leadership Fellows Program for 2003–2004. This program is a collaboration between the Kellogg Foundation and Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) composed of historical Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), Hispanic serving institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges. A description of this newly created program appears in Chapters 4, 9, and 10.

This volume has three main sections: Hidden Springboard: The Importance of Leadership Programs; The First Wave: Traditional Leadership Programs; and The New Leaders: Programs Focused on Minorities. The first analyzes the rapid demographic changes occurring in American society and their impact on higher education. The second looks at two of the major players in higher education leadership and describes the changes in the programs over the years. The third focuses on the new kids on the block: programs created in part because of the lack of diversity in the traditional offerings. Although the diversity programs share many features with their older brothers, they place a stronger emphasis on the uniqueness of minority administrators in higher education.

Hidden Springboard: The Importance of Leadership Programs. The presence of minority students, faculty, and administrators in higher education is a relatively new phenomena. Before the civil rights era, there were few minorities on campuses across the country except for the HBCUs. Today most campuses have a rich diversity of students, faculty, and staff. Although the numbers have not kept pace with the growing minority population in the U.S., especially as it relates to Latinos, the scene is much improved since the 1950s and 1960s.

We begin with Rubén Martinez' article, "Latino Demographic and Institutional Issues in Higher Education: Implications for Leadership Development." Martinez argues that Latino academic leadership is evolving and

may soon be a major factor affecting higher education. Although the largest minority group in America today, Latinos are greatly underrepresented in significant leadership positions in higher education. As one moves from community colleges to elite, research universities, one finds fewer Latino high administrators. "One can count on one hand the number of Latinos who had held presidencies at research institutions," he says. Today, Latinos represent only 3.7% of college/university presidents in comparison to 6.3% Blacks and 87.2% whites. Why are there so few Latino presidents? Latinos are a young population. They are largely American-born and come from poor families who live in communities where the schools have high dropout rates and low college attendance. They generally enroll in community colleges and fail to transfer to 4-year colleges and universities. After graduation from college few attend graduate school, making a career as a faculty member and administrator nearly impossible.

Despite these trends, Latinos are graduating from colleges and universities in greater numbers. They are attending graduate school and obtaining Ph.D.s, enabling them to begin careers as faculty and administrators. The number of Latino college and university presidents is growing as well. Roberto Haro examines how are they faring and what lessons we can learn in his article "Experiences of Presidents of Color: When Perceptions Challenge Reality."

Haro extends Martinez' analysis by describing the "less visible but highly determinative attitudes on the part of faculty, community groups, alumni, and most important, members of the governing boards of the institutions actually responsible for hiring and dismissing top administrators." His article is based on a questionnaire given to 20 current and former Latino, African American, and Asian American college and university presidents. Eight were women. While Haro tried to find minority presidents from a cross section of America's higher education, most Latino and African American presidents were in public 2-year colleges.

Bias is the topic of his study. Haro notes that some presidents indicated that they did not experience it, but in follow-up conversations they noted "second guessing" by faculty and senior administrators on their campuses. Some women said they experienced a double burden: being female and minority. Haro argues that presidents felt bias in the form of blatantly prejudiced statements or "subtle, sly, and wily" comments, with retired presidents volunteering details while sitting presidents offering general comments. He identifies three areas that provoke the most bias: budget matters, personnel appointments, and intercollegiate athletics. What steps did presidents take to counter it? They invited hostile faculty for meetings, asked the

higher education national organizations for assistance, invited local ministers and civil rights advocates to campus for lectures, and selected academic departments to promote campus dialog. Examining the data for trends, the author finds that 90% of the Latinos, 70% of the African Americans, and 66% of Asian Americans were targets of bias. He offers his own views on why Latinos experience more bias, and concludes that leadership programs must frankly examine it as part of their curriculum.

The next article focuses on African American college and university presidents. The author, ''Jack'' Jackie Thomas, explores the development of HBCUs, describes interviews with several Black presidents, and assesses leadership programs he has attended. Thomas notes that many of the early HBCU presidents were white, and no African American served as president of the predominantly white institution (PWI) until 1970. Thomas conducted a survey of 20 African Americans who currently hold or held leadership positions in higher education. Fifteen are male and five are female. Twelve held positions in HBCUs, while eight were in PWIs. Most had come up through the ranks as faculty, and some had been department chairs, deans, vice presidents, and presidents. The majority held degrees in education, and ranged in age from 35 to 70 years old. Thomas notes that the respondents shared a similar leadership philosophy: build consensus and be inclusive, promote shared governance and honesty, be prepared to make the hard decisions, be communicative, and look for ways to collaborate with others. The interviews extended over a 2-day period and the leaders expressed varying opinions about how they fared. Many felt comfortable with their institution and had been in their current position from 1 to 3 years. They believed that gender, age, and race played important roles in the interview and selection process. Asked how they handled race issues, they gave a range of responses: ''ignore them,'' ''work even harder to eliminate it as a factor,'' ''with care.'' Their responses about the path to the presidency also varied. Some said there was no clear path, while others argued that one must obtain a ''series of higher education leadership positions of steadily increasing responsibility.'' Thomas concludes by commenting on his participation in three leadership programs: the Kellogg NAFEO MSI Leadership Program, the Executive Leadership Summit, and the ACE Fellows program.

The First Wave: Traditional Leadership Programs. There are three major programs in higher education leadership: The American Council on Education (ACE) Fellows Program, The Harvard Institutes for Higher Education (HIHE), and the HERS Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration. (To my regret, a variety of factors made

including an article on HERS impossible.) Combined, they have existed for over 100 years. The book treats the first two here.

George Alan Smith and Marlene Ross describe the Fellows Program as the "crown jewel" of the ACE. This description is apt because the program has existed for 40 years, enhanced the careers of 1,500 men and women, and drawn support from candidates, nominating and host institutions, foundations, and corporations. The ACE Fellows Program was created in the mid-1960s when "presidential vacancies were being filled rather unsystematically. Few, if any, institutions had formal programs to identify and educate future administrators." Early classes favored white males, with very few minority and women being represented. Since then the program has made progress, and the 40th class of 38 Fellows in 2004–2005 comprised 23 women and 15 men, including 8 African Americans, 4 South Africans, 2 Hispanics, 2 Asian Americans, and 1 Kenyan. In the last 10 years, 62% of the Fellows were white, 24% African American, 7% Hispanic, 4% Asian American, 1% Native American, and 1% multiracial.

The Fellows Program is still unique for its substantial experiential component. Fellows "observe leadership in action, participate in top-level decision-making meetings, and hear analysis of the choices available to presidents and rationales for choosing one option over another." Fellows can leave their home institution and participate for a full academic year, a semester, or just periodic visits; most select the full academic year. The Learning Contract is prepared and signed by the Fellow, nominator, and mentor. The Contract "identifies the Fellow's learning objectives, the methods that will be used to meet those objectives, and the questions that he or she would like answered over the course of the fellowship." Fellows must write two reports describing their progress toward their learning objectives, and reflecting on their experiences in leadership, administration, decision making and governance. An equally important aspect is mentoring. One Fellow remarked that her mentor was "deliberately transparent, which permits me to observe him both in moments of confidence and of uncertainty." The Fellows participate in 3 weeklong seminars, equally spaced throughout the year. Their themes include: leadership and institutional change, campus diversity, strategic planning, the business of higher education, academic planning and management, technology issues, personal and professional dimensions of higher education administration, and external forces affecting higher education. Fellows are also encouraged to visit other campuses and attend national conferences not related to their disciplines. Also, each class makes one visit abroad where they meet higher education leaders in places like Jamaica, United Kingdom, South Africa, Cuba, and Hungary.

The authors point out the benefits of the program to nominators, mentors, and fellows. For example, the nominator has an individual who is prepared and ready to assume a variety of campus assignments, the mentor benefits from the Fellow's work on special projects, and Fellows receive on-the-job training that can transform their lives and careers. Of the nearly 1,500 Fellows to date more than 260 have become presidents and chancellors of 300 colleges, universities, and systems.

The nominating institutions, host institutions, and ACE all share the cost of the program. Home institutions pay the Fellows' salary and benefits, host institutions pay a program fee and provide Fellows with professional development expenses, and ACE pays for the program's infrastructure. In addition, corporations and foundations have made substantial awards.

The program's curriculum has changed little over the years. However, the authors observe that there has been a shift from hierarchical views of leadership to a collaborative model. The authors also note the ever-greater integration of information technology, and alumni programs to keep Fellows in touch with each other and with advancements in the field.

In Chapter 6, we look at the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education (HIHE) under the directorship of Joseph Zolner, which offers another model for leadership programs. The summer institutes aim at administrators who are at various stages of their careers. HIHE has four main programs: the Harvard Seminar for New Presidents, the Institute for Educational Management, the Management Development Program, and the Institute for Management and Leadership in Education. Each has a different audience.

The 6-day Seminar for New Presidents addresses those who have been recently installed. The curriculum covers governance and board relations, building and managing the senior leadership team, institutional advancement, financial management, daily demands of the office, and the "personal side" of the presidency.

The 2-week Institute for Educational Management focuses on experienced presidents, provosts, and other members of the President's senior leadership team. The curriculum deals with the essentials of senior leadership, governance, financial management, campus diversity, building an effective senior leadership team, the corporatization and commercialization of academe, and strategies for mobilizing change through the development of action plans.

The 2-week Management Development Program is for middle-level managers in the early years of their administrative careers. The curriculum covers leadership, team effectiveness, campus community and diversity, academic administration, institutional values and integrity, financial

management, strategic mentoring, planning, and fostering innovation and change.

Lastly, the two-week Management and Leadership in Education Institute addresses experienced vice presidents and deans who see themselves as institutional change agents. The curriculum focuses on leadership, financial management, strategic alliances, institutional partnerships, planning, and transformational learning.

Typically, HIHE institutes enroll 450 to 500 participants per year. Since their inception more than 7,000 individuals have attended. HIHE strives to give participants an intense, highly interactive, "retreat-like" experience in the company of talented colleagues from colleges and universities across the country and abroad. The curriculum is based on an extensive collection of over 200 higher education case studies, discussions, and small group discussions developed by Harvard Graduate School of Education faculty. HIHE has a number of alumni activities to keep participants in touch with each other and with advancements in the field.

HIHE is committed to attracting a diverse population to all its programs. In fact, in the last 5 years for which data are available (2000–2004), administrators of color ranged from one-fifth to one-third of attendees. During this period, a total of 426 minority administrators benefited from the institutes. To increase their numbers, HIHE has acquired funding to help administrators from HBCUs and Tribal Colleges attend its summer core institutes. Participants rated the institutes very high. They give special recognition to the following six areas: enhanced context knowledge, developing a network of peers, personal and professional reaffirmation, practical application, multifaceted learning experience, and opportunity for reflection and renewal.

The New Leaders: Programs Focused on Minorities. These leadership programs are relatively new in comparison to the ACE and Harvard. They sprang up in part because some did not believe the mainstream programs were serving the special needs of minorities who seek leadership positions in higher education.

The Millennium Leadership Initiative (MLI), which Rosemary Lauth describes in Chapter 7, is a prime example of a program developed by minorities for minorities. On February 12, 1999, a group of African American presidents and chancellors met at the headquarters of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) to create the MLI. They were motivated by the novel *The Moviegoer*, in which author Walker Percy stresses that we are responsible for "handing one another along."

The founders asked themselves several key questions: What is different about minority candidates? Why were current professional development programs not serving their needs? How would they recruit talented veteran presidents to share their insights and forge meaningful connections with future presidents? How could they best prepare minority candidates to succeed in an executive search system? Ultimately, they determined that MLI would prepare minorities to assume leadership positions by providing them with a high-level, comprehensive preparation program and expand the pipeline for people of color to assume the presidency.

To launch this program MLI targeted marketing efforts to African Americans, Latinos, APAs and women. Most applications come from individuals encouraged to apply by AASCU member presidents and from MLI graduates themselves. From 1999 to 2004, MLI has enrolled 181 graduates composed of 123 African Americans (68%), 10 Latinos (5.5%), 7 APAs (3.9%), 1 Native American (0.6%), and 40 whites (22.3%). To be eligible, applicants must receive the endorsement of an AASCU current or former president and chancellor. A subcommittee of AASCU presidents and chancellors screens applications and decides whom to admit.

The MLI consists of a four-day professional development institute followed by a year of mentoring with a current or former president/chancellor. The curriculum addresses assessing and enhancing skills, targeting areas for improvement, receiving assistance to develop career strategies, and linking with a mentor to the next step, the executive search process. The Institute supports the idea of "pay it forward": paying a favor not just back, but to three new persons unknown to the giver. Many people invest in the summer institutes: AASCU member institutions provide financial support, and presidents and chancellors nominate candidates, donate time on MLI selection committee, and serve as experts and mentors. The participants are unaware of who invested in them until they arrive at the institute. The protégés are expected to "pay it forward" when the opportunity arises.

The Institute's curriculum begins with executive search firms. The protégés compose letters of intent, write effective cover letters and resumes, evaluate and "decode" position descriptions, and hone their interview etiquette and techniques. Highly regarded search firm executives and experienced presidents offer practical advice to avoid pitfalls and traps. The other areas include: negotiating the executive contract, financial management, advancement and fundraising, the art of communicating one's message to advance the institution, working with Congress, lessons on leadership, campus diversity, working with governing boards, and selected readings in the field.

Critical to MLI is the professional development plan of the participants. Presidential advisors critique these professional plans, and participants say this aspect is "one of the most unique and powerful elements of the institute." The advisors help protégés answer four basic questions: Where am I now? Where do I want to be eventually? What do I need to do to get there? What's my first step on that journey? After the Institute, each protégé is assigned a volunteer presidential mentor to continue the dialog. The mentors often invite protégés for a campus visit (which includes meetings with senior staff and community leaders), serve as a liaison to connect protégés to other people and resources, and refine their professional development plans. Mentors are asked to provide mid-year progress report and final evaluation. Twenty-two (12%) protégés have achieved presidencies, and one-third have made significant advances in their careers. This is an impressive record since MLI is only 6 years old.

In Chapter 8, Audrey Yamagata-Noji focuses on APAs and their quest for inclusion in higher education administration. In many respects, APAs have achieved the American Dream, as they are present in large numbers as students in America's most prestigious institutions. Yet, few hold executive and administrative positions on those campuses. The author describes the rise of the LDPHE in 1995 under the tutelage of Bob Suzuki, then President of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. President Suzuki invited J.D. Hokoyama, president and CEO of LEAP, Inc., to provide the infrastructure for LDPHE. The program seeks to provide a leadership pipeline for APA educators seeking executive level positions. Since there is an insufficient pool of mid-level APA managers, LDPHE focused on developing leaders from within the faculty and staff ranks.

The first class of 25 took place in June 1997. APA college presidents, chancellors, and other senior level administrators voiced the concern that most APAs possess the academic credentials and technical knowledge to assume executive positions in higher education, but lack the assertiveness, communication, and general leadership skills. Hence, LDPHE curriculum builds practical skills in these areas. It is an intensive, 4-day experience in the summer that focuses on in-depth interactions between participants and program faculty. The main sessions include: The 21st Century Leader: Surviving and Thriving in the Third Millennium; Understanding Asian Pacific American Values and Leadership Skills; Developing and Promoting Your Leadership Style; Effective Communication Strategies; Interviewing for Success (Mock Interviews); Risk Taking – Making Changes Happen; Mastering the Dynamics of Power; and Successfully Surviving Leadership Challenges.

Participants develop their own Leadership and Career Action Plan, and revise it each day of the Institute. The Plan includes: goals for myself (day one to day four), leadership qualities I value and my leadership skills and perceptions, my strengths and weaknesses, my options and what stands in the way, and my personal road map. From 1997 to 2004, about 190 participated in the summer institute, with Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos the major APA groups in attendance.

The vast majority (76%) of APAs are mid-level administrators and staff. LDPHE acknowledges that it must attract more APA faculty. In their evaluations, participants said they appreciated the interaction with their mentors, the guest speakers, the opportunity to interact with other APA staff and faculty, and the overall usefulness of the experience to their careers. They disliked the cost and length of the program, and felt the handouts could have been more useful. Funding problems continue to afflict the program. Follow-up activities with program alumni have occurred in 2003 and 2004, in sessions parallel to the regular program.

In Chapter 9, Jaime Merisotis and Kelley Aveilhe examine the newly created Kellogg-MSI Leadership Fellows Program created in the Fall of 2002 with the support of a 4-year, $6 million grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. In 1999, the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education was formed and the three principal members included the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), and the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). These organizations recognized the need for a leadership program to prepare the next generation of senior administrators for MSIs – those institutions identified by federal legislation as serving minority groups who suffered from historical segregation and educational deprivation. These institutions include HSIs, HBCUs, and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs). HACU represents more than 200 institutions, in 14 states, Puerto Rico, and six foreign countries; NAFEO represents 118 HBCUs; and AIHEC represents 35 Tribal Colleges in the United States and one in Canada. Together the alliance contains 350 MSIs and serves 2 million students. Even though each organization serves a distinct population the alliance draws them together to cooperate rather than to compete for scarce resources.

Since many presidents and senior level administrators in MSIs will be retiring in the next 10 years, leaders of the Alliance have pledged to identify and mentor the next generation. Together the Alliance and the Kellogg Foundation created the MSI-Kellogg Leadership Fellows project. President Merisotis of the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP) is the

manager and fiduciary agent. A project team was developed to design and implement the program. It printed application materials and created and sent promotional packages to all MSI Presidents. In its first 2 years, the program has been in high demand, with more applications than the available 30 slots. The Institute selects 10 fellows from each of the three communities. The fellows, mentors, and nominating presidents sign both the Fellowship Agreement and Learning Agreement.

The curriculum is based on a year-long mentorship between Fellows and MSI presidents where they work together on a mutually agreed upon project. The Fellows also meet seven to eight times during the year to discuss membership associations and advocacy organizations, legal and regulatory issues, board relations and cultivation, information technology, senior staffing, time management and priority setting, serving as an effective change agent, crisis management and conflict resolution, gender conflict and gender roles, ethics, personal motivation and vitality, and public speaking and advocacy. These meetings fall under three general thematic headings: planning/strategic issues, day-to-day concerns, and principles of leadership.

The first class took place in 2003–2004 with the Institute Week in Washington, DC. The coming together of three communities was a symbolic and emotional launch to the program, with receptions, dinners, panels, and guest speakers. For example, the Fellows visited Tribal Colleges in North Dakota, and HSIs and HBCUs in Florida. The final joint seminar took place in Mexico City, where the Fellows heard a lecture about indigenous colleges in Chiapas and visited Ibero-American University. The graduation ceremony in Mexico City reflected the three communities, since they participated in a native-honoring ceremony, heard a gospel music tribute, and dined on Mexican cuisine. The first year evaluations from the Fellows were very favorable. They responded well to the speakers and felt privileged to be part of this historic program, and they cited a network of new colleagues as the most beneficial aspect of the program.

Chapter 10, "Latino Leadership Development: Programs and Continuing Challenges" by Thomas Martinez and Patrick Valdez, describes the HACU component of the MSI-Kellogg Leadership Fellows project. The authors state that Latino administrators have a special role to play in higher education, that of change agent committed to a "new state of things." The authors criticize established leadership programs, which tend to be more concerned about "administrative operational, technological change, marketing, and other issues." The HACU program focuses on the experiences of Latino administrators and the conflicts they encounter as a "legitimate and

'necessary' substance for discussion and problem-solving exercises,'' and seeks to develop the next generation of HSI presidents.

The future for Latino CEO's in higher education does not look bright, given the low Latino college graduation rates. For example, in 2003 Hispanics, who composed 13% of the population, earned 6.4% of all bachelor's degrees, 4.9% of first-professional degrees, and 3.2% of doctoral degrees.

Application packets were sent to all 415 HACU-member institutions, and more applications were received than the 10 available Fellowships could accommodate. To be considered, Fellows must be nominated by their campus presidents, and selection is based on applicant's potential, learning plan, qualifications, appropriate terminal degree, strength of his or her essay and recommendations, publications, honors, and awards. Topics covered included development of vision and mission; leadership and change; board relations, shared governance, policy and strategic planning; critical issues in higher education policy; development, fundraising, grants and external funding; national policy perspectives, advocacy groups in higher education, and attending the HACU Capitol Forum. A key component of the program is the matching of Fellows with HACU presidents. It takes place early in the program and the mentors invite the Fellows for a campus visit. An important addition to the curriculum involves Latino women. For instance, the authors point out that two-thirds of the student population at HSIs are Latina and therefore HACU's leadership program must highlight gender-based issues.

In Chapter 11, David León and Thomas Martinez analyze the genesis of HACU Latino/a Higher Education Leadership Institute. This institute was originally conceived as a 1-day workshop and scheduled as a pre-conference activity before the annual meetings of HACU. The idea came from the summer LDPHE leadership program Leon attended in 2001. Although this program focuses on APAs, Leon envisioned one for Latinos since none then existed.

The HACU Leadership Institute is now in its third year, and the authors describe its evolving curriculum, highlighting panels that have and have not worked. The 1-day institute had an ambitious agenda: To provide demographic data on Latinos in higher education and insure that participants understood the background, to examine career development issues and provide appropriate exercises, to discuss policy issues and administrative trends in higher education, and to hear the views of Latina/o presidents regarding their own career paths and assessment of current and future trends for Latino students. Participants in the first Institute rated the highest both the president's panel and small groups focused on career development

issues. It was clear that they enjoyed the institute and in fact they asked that it last longer.

So the second Institute was a 2-day event. It included a new panel on Latina women and another on fundraising and development, and it extended the time for small group discussions. We dropped the panel on demographics and case studies of Latino/a presidents. Attendance fell from 34 to 19. Cost may have been a factor, since we had to double the registration fee and many institutions were curtailing travel due to state budget cutbacks. Top panels, according to participants' evaluations, were the President's Panel, fundraising and development, and career development.

Since participation rate had been low, we returned to a 1-day format. The third Institute attracted 23, a slight improvement from the prior year. The highest rated panels were the President's Panel, Core Values/'Coraje' in Latino/a Leadership, and the hands-on workshop.

Although the Institute is a work-in-progress, it has tapped a latent demand. As a result, it is now a regular pre-conference activity for HACU's annual meetings. The authors expect many more changes in the curriculum for next year.

In Chapter 12, an anonymous author examines the ill-fated Executive Leadership Development Program (ELDP) created by the California State University (CSU) system and lasting from 1992 to 2002. Chancellor Barry Munitz, who supported diversity in executive positions in the Office of the Chancellor and on the 24 campuses, began ELDP with the best intentions in 1991. In a series of meetings with Latinos, the Chancellor agreed to fund 2-year fellowships. At first the program focused on Latinos but it soon expanded to other groups.

The Fellows attended the Harvard University Institute for Educational Management as well as national conferences, and found placements on various campuses, though only a few had access to the Chancellor. In some ways the program followed the ACE Fellows approach. At its height it enrolled 16 fellows, most of them Latino. They entered with high hopes of becoming future deans, vice presidents, provosts, and presidents. Even the most cynical fellows joined in the optimism. However, when problems arose, the Chancellor's Office construed them as failings of individual fellows rather than of the program. Of the 16 involved, only one rose to dean, and this individual was arguably on track for a deanship anyway. Two found administrative assignments in the CSU but left shortly after unsuccessful tenures. The rest returned to their home campuses and two left the system altogether for positions elsewhere. Those who remained did not advance administratively.

Why did the program fail to live up to its promise? The author argues that campus Presidents never supported it. The program created resentment and anger among the fellows' faculty and administrative colleagues. In fact, those who returned to their home campuses rarely resumed their old positions, and the Chancellor's Office had to persuade campus presidents to take some back. The author contends that a misguided focus doomed the ELDP: it assumed that fixing the individual would fix the system. The fellows also suffered emotional pain and, in most cases, their aspirations for executive leadership positions in the CSU system were dashed.

Although illuminating, this experience may be atypical today, and in a final, brief section – less a chapter than a rounding off – I offer a few thoughts on leadership programs overall.

NOTES

1. I have asked the Executive Leadership Institute, the Executive Leadership Summit, and the HERS Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration to each submit a chapter. For various reasons, they declined or were unable to do so.

LATINO DEMOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Rubén O. Martinez

Latino leadership in higher education has only recently begun to receive scholarly attention (Esquibel, 1992; Contreras, 1998; Martinez, 1998; Gutierrez, Castañeda, & Katsinas, 2002; Méndez-Morse, 2004; Santiago Santiago, 1996; Valverde, 2003), with the subfield still in the incipient stages of identifying and describing representation patterns.[1] One might say that Latino academic leadership has not yet developed (or evolved) to a level that it stands as a major factor affecting the dynamics of higher education in the United States, and is perhaps most notable by its relative absence. As a result, there still is not a discernable body of knowledge on the nature and dynamics of Latino leadership in higher education. Indeed, there is no clear theoretical framework that has been systematically applied in the study of this subject matter. This should not come as a surprise as Latinos only gained significant access to higher education as students at the turn of the 1970s (Aguirre & Martinez, 1993; Martinez, 1998). At that time, according to Arturo Madrid, only 500 or so Latinos were found in the ranks of faculty

across the country, with few in the ranks of mid-level academic adminis-
trators and fewer still in the ranks of senior administrators, and none
as president of a major research university (cited in Gutierrez et al., 2002,
p. 298).

Although the situation has improved since then, Latinos today remain
greatly underrepresented in positions of academic leadership within the na-
tion's institutions of higher education (see Table 13 below; also see Lopez &
Reyes, 2004). In 1996, Vaughan lamented that ''...community colleges
[where Latinos are concentrated both as students, faculty, and staff,] have
not achieved the same degree of diversity among their leaders as they
have among their students'' (Vaughn, 1996, p. 5). This view was echoed by
Santiago Santiago (1996), who suggests that challenges are increasing for
Latino leaders committed to diversity in higher education.

Generally, as one moves from the lower to the higher end of the strat-
ification system of higher education one finds fewer and fewer Latinos.
Consequently, the pipeline gets smaller and smaller as one moves up from
community colleges to the land grant, flagship and ivy league universities
where the largest number of full-time faculty are employed (Trower & Chait,
2002).[2] Indeed, one can count on the one hand the number of Latinos who
have held presidencies at research institutions, beginning with the tenure of
Tomás Rivera as president of the University of California at Riverside in
1979.

Despite the efforts of the many national organizations of higher education
– such as the American Council on Education and the American
Association of State Colleges and Universities – to promote diverse lead-
ership, the gains have been incremental and small (Ortiz, 1998). Ginsberg
and Bennett (1989), in reviewing education reform reports published in the
1980s, note that ''the issues of improving minority participation and success
in higher education, though touched upon in some of the major reports,
have largely been ignored by the current [education] reform movement''
(p. 246). In the main, colleges and universities have addressed diversity
issues as additive descriptive elements, often doing the minimum in contexts
of competing institutional values, financial retrenchment, and resistant fac-
ulty and staff members. In very limited cases, diversity initiatives in higher
education have undertaken transformational approaches to institutional
change with varying degrees of success. In addition, some training programs
have emphasized institutional transformation leadership development
among midlevel leaders (see Filan & Seagren, 2003). Still, the overall re-
sult in relation to faculty diversity is perhaps best described by Trower and
Chait (2002):

> After decades of scholarly research, hundreds of campus committee reports, and scores of disciplinary and professional commissions on faculty diversity, the needle has scarcely moved and the numbers have hardly changed. The history of the academy on the matter of faculty diversity strongly suggests that self reform has not worked – and probably will not work (p. 37).

If reform efforts have not worked at the faculty level, they have had even less impact at the academic leadership level. These limited outcomes point to the intractability of the problem and portend limited possibilities for the development of Latino academic leadership over the next two to three decades (Salgado Carozza, 2002).

The limited inclusion of Latinos in leadership positions in higher education serves as a vivid reminder that intergroup dynamics in the United States remain tense and problematic for achieving an inclusive society that can function effectively in an increasing multicultural and global world (Contreras, 1998). Moreover, given the massive demographic shifts that have taken place over the past two decades, and the increasing proportions (however small) that Latinos comprise of students, faculty and administrative ranks at colleges and universities, it is highly likely that intergroup tensions will mount in the arena of education over the next several years. In such a context, the importance of Latino leadership will increase sharply.

Nevertheless, despite the leadership institutes and programs that focus on developing the next generation of academic leaders, it is doubtful not only that a sufficient number of Latinos and Latinas across the country are being groomed for positions of leadership but that such an approach is sufficient for achieving diverse organizations in higher education. It is even more doubtful that they are being prepared to meet the transformational demands of a global order that circumscribe and shape the changes necessary to close the educational gaps that exist between the dominant ethnic group (Euro Americans) and minority ethnic groups (Latinos, African Americans, Native Americans, etc.) in the United States at the beginning of the 21st century.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the demographics of Latinos in U.S. society, with an emphasis on education, and the structural issues that surround Latino leadership, with implications for academic leadership development. The chapter is divided into two major parts: (1) Part I provides a demographic overview of the three areas: (a) age, sex, and status characteristics, (b) economic characteristics, and (c) education characteristics (in order to have reference points for the demographic characteristics discussed, Latinos are compared to Euro- and African-American populations generally defined). (2) Part II discusses Latino leadership in

higher education in relation to the rational emphasis of higher education institutions, the normative context of leadership in higher education, and the dilemmas experienced by minority public administrators. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of institutional features and dynamics for leadership programs that seek to promote diverse leadership in higher education.

THE CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT

The educational status of Latinos in the United States is primarily a product of the American social stratification system, one characterized by class, race, and gender dynamics that privilege some groups at the expense of others (Fuertes & Sedlacek, 1993; Trueba, 1998; Aguirre, 2000). The ''education gap'' (as differences in educational outcomes across ethnic groups are referred to in this country today) between Latinos and Euro Americans is a result of institutionalized economic, political, and social processes that generally favor Euro Americans over Latinos and other ethnic minority groups (Kao & Thompson, 2003; Mickelson, 2003). Despite the availability of public education, educational achievement remains problematic for the nation as whole, and for ethnic minority groups in particular (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Over the past two centuries, education, especially higher education, has served as an important means for upward mobility to generations of European immigrants and their children. Historical Black Colleges and Universities served in a similar manner for African Americans late in the 19th and throughout the 20th centuries.[3] But, it was not until the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and the ''massification'' of higher education in the third quarter of the 20th century that access to postsecondary education was significantly expanded, in part in response to the workforce demands of an expanding economy (Aronowitz, 2000).

During that period, education generally was the site of major struggles by Latinos, African Americans, Native Americans, and other ethnic minority groups seeking increased access, equitable funding, financial support, and culturally relevant learning experiences. Those struggles consisted of efforts by minority groups to have greater influence and, in a sense, more control over education in general. Although the values of cultural pluralism and, more recently, diversity have been part of movements to make higher education more inclusive and multicultural, the struggles have achieved only modest successes (Ortiz, 1998; Aguirre, 2000). Culturally, American higher education reflects the dominant group's values and interests, and remains monocultural

even at institutions where Latinos comprise the overwhelming majority of students. As in the past, colleges and universities require ethnic minority students to change themselves to fit the organizational culture of higher education, one that reflects the values and interests of the dominant group.

Recent dramatic demographic increases among people of color, however, will most likely bring cultural differences into sharper focus in education institutions. While in the past education served as a vehicle for promoting a narrow national identity, and despite the reactionary cultural movements of the dominant group today, the call for an educational process that values and promotes equity and equality across diverse cultural populations will serve as the cornerstone for American democracy in the 21st century. Although civil rights struggles improved school financing, expanded the range of learning experiences available to minority students, and opened doors to colleges and universities, institutionalized processes of exclusion remain as barriers to the realization of a more inclusive and responsive educational system.

To some extent, today's struggles are over the features of inclusive educational organizations and the means to achieve them. Dominant and minority groups differ in their views regarding pedagogy and performance accountability, organizational culture, affirmative action, and the standing of diversity as a core value of societal institutions (Contreras, 1998; Aguirre & Martinez, 2003c). Bilingual education, standardized testing, school choice, and affirmative action are examples of hotly contested issues across the country (Mac Donald, 2004; Huntington, 2004). Group positions on issues tend to cluster around two opposing frameworks, the color-blind perspective of the dominant group and the multicultural approach of communities of color (see Aguirre & Martinez, 2003c).

The color-blind approach emphasizes the use of standardized tests to assess and improve the performance of students, teachers, schools, school districts, and so on.[4] The multicultural approach emphasizes the transformation of the organizational culture and context of schools, colleges, and universities so that they are aligned with and better able to meet the educational needs of Latino and other ethnic minority students. Both approaches seek to influence education-related policies to promote their values and views on improving education. Both recognize that education is generally regarded as a pathway out of poverty and is a key factor in professional and economic success for individuals and families.[5] Globalization processes that have engendered massive economic restructuring and reactionary cultural movements across many nations circumscribe this struggle (Benjamin, 2003).

In the United States, there is both the recognition that diversity is important for the stability and development of the nation and tremendous fear

that the "national culture" (i.e., the dominant-group culture) will give way to balkanization (Huntington, 2004). As such, the dominant group remains ambivalent toward diversity as a value and, despite the obvious demographic shifts, cannot find the will to elevate it to the level of a core organizational value, such as efficiency or effectiveness. The result is that diversity is seen as a descriptive feature of the environment to be managed by organizations (Aguirre & Martinez, 2003a).

This context raises significant questions regarding the development of Latino leadership in higher education both in terms of pipeline and expertise issues. Leadership programs tend to emphasize, among other things, budget analysis and development, interpersonal interaction and communication skills, planning and coordination, conflict management, and self-reflection and personal life management (Gilley, 2003; Hoppe, 2003). These are usually framed in the context of broader philosophical views of higher education as an institution in society and its role in promoting economic prosperity, political stability, and social coherence. The integration of diversity as a core value within each of these areas will be the major challenge for Latino leadership over the coming decades. Whether leadership programs can effectively develop Latino academic leadership that can do this remains to be seen, especially in a context of forces that work against the development of this type leadership.

In general, economic factors combine with social and political factors as part of a historical societal context that structures life chances across a range of population characteristics, with some, such as race and gender, more evident than others. Not surprisingly, Latinos lag behind the general population in several demographic areas, including income, employment, educational achievement, occupational prestige, and other social dimensions (Martinez & Aguirre, 2003; Ramirez & de la Cruz, 2003; Chapa & de la Rosa, 2004). The next section provides a demographic overview of Latinos in the United States with a specific emphasis on education as the context which provides the pipeline of potential leaders in higher education and in which Latino academic administrators must execute leadership roles.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

Age, Sex, and Status Characteristics

According to revised figures from Census 2000, Latinos were the second largest ethnic group in the United States at the close of the 20th century,

second to Euro Americans, and the largest racial minority group, having eclipsed African Americans.[6] The rapid growth of the Latino population from 1990 to 2000 (59.7%, in contrast to 13.2% for the nation as a whole) surprised not only the general public but demographers as well (Chapa & de la Rosa, 2004). In 2000, the 35.3 million Latinos residing in the United States comprised 12.5% of the nation's population, which numbered 281.4 million persons (Grieco & Cassidy, 2001). At that time, Euro Americans comprised 75.1% of the population, and African Americans comprised 12.3%. By 2002, Latinos had increased to 38.8 million persons, comprising 13.3% of the total population. Of these, 66.9% were of Mexican origin, 14.3% were of Central and South American origin, 8.6% were of Puerto Rican origin, 3.5% were Cuban, and 6.5% were of other origins. In July 2003, estimates set the Latino population at 39.9 million, comprising 13.7% of the overall population of the United States.[7] Its growth rate of 13.0% during the 39 months since Census 2000 was approximately four times that of the total population (3.3%). As a result, the Latino population is expected to triple by 2050, increasing to approximately 102.6 million persons, and comprising approximately 24% of the U.S. population, which is projected to be at 400 million at that time. The America of the 21st century will not be the America of the 20th century; ethnically, it will be more diverse, which portends major shifts in intergroup relations.

Latinos not only are one of the fastest growing population groups in the country, they also are among the youngest groups. Table 1 presents the age distribution by race/ethnicity for 2000. While the majority (67.7% or two-thirds) of Euro Americans are 25 years of age and older, followed by African Americans (57.6%), only a small majority (51.6% or one-half) of Latinos are in that age group. In other words, while one in three Euro Americans is less than 25, one in two Latinos is in that age category. The pattern holds across the age groups and the gaps widen at the older ages. Nearly two in five Euro Americans are 45 years of age and older, with one in four African Americans and one in five Latinos at or above that age. Euro Americans have the largest percent of persons 65 years of age and older (14.4%), followed by African Americans (8.1), and then Latinos (4.9%).

The relative youth of the Latino population has considerable educational implications. Latinos have the largest percent (37.8%) of traditional school/ college age groups (5–24 years of age), followed by African Americans (34.3%) and Euro Americans (26.3%). Latinos also have the largest percentage (10.5%) of small children and infants (less than 5 years of age), followed by African Americans (8.1%) and Euro Americans (6.5%). A clear implication of these figures is that more and more of the nation's classrooms

Table 1. Age Distribution in Percentages by Sex and Largest
Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S. for the Year 2000.

Age Groups (by Years)	Race/Ethnicity								
	Euro-Americans			Latinos			African Americans		
	Males (%)	Females (%)	Both (%)	Males (%)	Females (%)	Both (%)	Males (%)	Females (%)	Both (%)
> 65	12.1	16.5	14.4	4.0	5.9	4.9	6.5	9.6	8.1
45–64	23.7	23.7	23.7	13.0	14.5	13.7	17.9	19.3	18.6
25–44	30.4	28.9	29.6	33.8	32.0	33.0	30.7	31.0	30.9
18–24	9.2	8.5	8.9	14.3	12.5	13.4	11.3	10.6	11.0
14–17	5.6	5.1	5.4	7.0	6.8	6.9	7.3	6.3	6.8
5–13	12.6	11.5	12.0	17.4	17.6	17.5	17.7	15.5	16.5
1–4	5.1	4.7	4.9	8.3	8.4	8.3	7.0	6.1	6.5
<1	1.3	1.1	1.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.7	1.5	1.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 PHC-T-8, Tables 1–3 and 8.

will reflect increasing percentages of Latino students, especially in the early school years. Another is that the Euro American labor force is graying (Toossi, 2004), with the demographic shift changing the characteristics of the labor force. However, with many persons continuing to work past retirement age, job opportunities created by retiring Euro Americans may remain limited for Latinos and other minority populations (see Table 5 for their distribution across occupations).

Table 2 presents the nativity status of these three racial/ethnic groups in percentages for selected decennial years. The percent of foreign-born among all three groups has increased since 1970, with Euro Americans increasing from 4.2% in 1970 to 6.3% in 2000, and African Americans growing from 1.1% in 1970 to 6.1% in 2000. Foreign-born Latinos increased from 19.9% in 1970 to 40.2% in 2000. Two in five Latinos in the United States in 2000 were foreign-born, and that percent most likely has been increasing since then.

This fact raises considerable concerns about addressing the language needs of Latino students in the schooling process, especially at K-12 levels. Are this nation's schools willing and able to address the educational needs of a rapidly growing population group that is increasingly becoming Spanish speaking and bilingual? In today's political context, school readiness to address the educational needs of Latinos may not be the reality, as conservative sentiments among Americans continue to work to eliminate

Table 2. Percent Nativity for the Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S. by Selected Census Years.

Year	Race/Ethnicity					
	Euro-Americans		Latinos		African Americans	
	Foreign-born (%)	Native-born (%)	Foreign-born (%)	Native-born (%)	Foreign-born (%)	Native-born (%)
1970	4.2	95.8	19.9	80.1	1.1	98.9
1980	3.9	96.1	28.6	71.4	3.1	96.9
1990	3.3	96.7	35.8	64.2	4.9	95.1
2000	6.3	92.7	40.2	59.8	6.1	93.9

Source: The Foreign-Born Population: 2000. (December, 2003). Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR-34. U.S. Census Bureau; Table 8, Tech Paper 29, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau. Available on-line: http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0029/tab08.html.

programs, such as bilingual education (Evers & Walberg, 2004; Huntington, 2004), which address the language needs of students who speak a tongue other than English. In 2000, 17.9% or nearly one in six persons 5 years of age and older spoke a language other than English at home, and more than half of them (59.9%) were Spanish speakers. At that time, approximately 1 in 10 persons in the U.S. spoke Spanish at home (more if children under 5 years of age are included). The educational needs of these children will impact the nation's schools for many years to come, even if only as part of a struggle for educational responsiveness and equity.

Youths and children under 18 years of age live in households that differ by living arrangements among heads of household, including married-couple, mother-only, father-only, and neither-parent households. Table 3 presents selected characteristics of children less than 18 years of age for the largest racial/ethnic groups in the country by living arrangements. In 2000, approximately two in three of the nation's children lived in married-couple households, one in five lived in mother-only households, 1 in 20 lived in father-only households, and another 1 in 20 was living in a neither-parent household.

Overall, Latinos comprised 17.0% of children under the age of 18, Euro Americans comprised 61.2%, and African Americans comprised 14.8% (not shown in table).[8] The majority of children from Latino (62.6%) and Euro American (77.3%) groups were living in married-couple households, while one in three (34.5%) African American children were living in this type

Table 3. Selected Characteristics for Children Under 18 Years of Age for the Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S. by Living Arrangements and Nativity of Householder in 2000.

	Living Arrangements[a]											
	Married-couple			Mother-only			Father-only			Neither parent		
Total Number[b]	48,746,172			14,938,921			4,145,181			3,793,116		
Total (%)	68			21			6			5		
	White	Latino	Black	White	Latino	Black	White	Latino	Black	White	Latino	Black
Percent	69.5	15.6	7.5	42.0	18.2	33.7	53.5	21.6	17.9	37.9	24.7	30.3
Poverty rate	4.7	19.5	11.4	28.1	47.2	47.4	14.1	27.8	27.5	18.4	31.1	38.8

| | Nativity of householder[c] | |
Race/ethnicity	Native	Foreign-born
White	70.5	15.7
Latino	8.9	56.0
African American	7.6	16.3

Source: Children and the Households they live in: 2000. Census 2000 Special Reports. CENSR-14. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
[a]Determined by relationship to householder or to reference person in a related subfamily.
[b]The grand total is 71,623,390.
[c]The total number of Native-born is 59,376,440, and for Foreign-born it is 12,246,950.

of household (not shown). Approximately one in two African-American children lived in mother-only households in 2000. Using their respective percentages within the overall population of children as reference points, Latinos are slightly underrepresented among married-couple households by 1.4%, Euro Americans are overrepresented by 8.3%, and African Americans are underrepresented by 7.3%. Among mother-only households, Latinos are slightly overrepresented by 1.2%, Euro Americans are underrepresented by 19.2%, and African Americans are overrepresented by 18.9%. Among father-only households, Latinos are overrepresented by 4.6%, Euro Americans are underrepresented by 7.7%, and African Americans are overrepresented by 3.1%. Finally, among neither-parent households, Latinos are overrepresented by 7.7%, Euro Americans are underrepresented by 23.3%, and African Americans are overrepresented by 15.5%. These figures have significant implications for the socioeconomic status of these Latino youth (Battle, 2002). As the next section shows, youth living in neither-parent households have a substantially higher likelihood of living in poverty, which, as social scientific research demonstrates, has considerable negative consequences for educational attainment.

The poverty rate for each of the different racial/ethnic groups is also shown in Table 3 by living arrangement. In general, children living in households other than married-couple households are more likely to live in poverty. Latino and African-American children have substantially higher poverty rates than Euro Americans across all types of living arrangements, including married-couple households, which have the lowest poverty rates across the three structural arrangements. Latinos have the highest poverty rate (19.5%) among married-couple households, followed by African Americans (11.4%) and Euro Americans (4.7%). Children living in mother-only households had the highest poverty rates for all racial/ethnic groups, followed by neither-parent and father-only households. Latinos (47.2%) and African Americans (47.4%) have exceptionally high rates of poverty in mother-only households, with nearly one in two children living in poverty. The rate for Euro Americans (28.1%) also was high for this type of living arrangement. Among father-only households, Latinos (27.8%) and African Americans (27.5%) had similar rates, which were nearly twice that of Euro Americans (14.1%). Among neither-parent households, African-American children (38.8%) had the highest poverty rates, followed by Latinos (31.1%) and Euro Americans (18.4%).

In terms of nativity of householder, approximately 17.1% of all children lived in foreign-born households, and 82.1% lived in native-born households (not shown). The majority, or 56%, of all children in foreign-born

households were Latinos, 15.7% were Euro American, and 16.3% were African American. In relation to their percentage of the total population, Latinos are greatly over-represented among the foreign-born by 39%, Euro Americans are underrepresented by 45.5%, and African Americans are slightly overrepresented by 1.5%.

In general, the emerging demographic portrait of the Latino population is that it is growing fast and is relatively young, with the children more likely to live in poverty than their Euro-American counterparts. Much of the growth is due to immigration, which has considerable implications for education. Fuligni and Hardway (2004), for instance, note that foreign-born Latinos ''have more difficulty than other adolescents completing school at each stage of the educational pipeline'' (p. 99). At the same time, anti-immigrant sentiments driven by perceived threat among Euro Americans result in nativistic movements that seek to further limit the privileges of Latinos on a number of fronts, including education. In the context of widespread American fear of terrorism, Latino population growth is too quickly framed as a threat to homeland security, a convenient tool not previously needed to promote exclusionary policies such as Proposition 187 in California in 1994.[9]

Economic Characteristics

The socioeconomic status of Latinos as a group has not improved in recent years (Kochhar, 2004). Indeed, the real median income of the nation's households has declined over the past few years, and poverty rates have been on the increase across the country after substantial declines during the 1990s. Table 4 presents socioeconomic characteristics for the largest racial/ethnic groups in the U.S. in 2003. Median household income for Latinos ($32,997) in 2003 was approximately 69.1% that of Euro Americans ($47,777), and 111.3% that of African Americans ($29,645). In terms of per capita income, the disparities between Latinos and Euro Americans are even more evident, with Latinos ($13,492) making only 50.4% of the per capita earnings for Euro Americans ($26,774), and 85.5% of those for African Americans. Among other things, this is a result of a greater relative proportion of Latinos in the labor force and the fact that they are, at the same time, the youngest of the three groups. But it is also tied to structural and institutional dynamics that limit the life chances of ethnic minority group members across the nation.

Table 4. Socio-Economic Characteristics by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S., 2003.

Socio-Demographic Characteristic	Race/Ethnicity		
	Euro-Americans	Latinos	African Americans
Median household income	$47,777	$32,997	$29,645
Per capita income	$26,774	$13,492	$15,775
Unemployment rate (16 years and over) (%)	5.2	7.7	10.8
Youth (16–19) Unemployment rates (%)	15.2	20.0	33.0
Below poverty (%)	8.2	22.5	24.4
w/o health ins.(%)	11.1	32.7	19.6

Source: Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2003. (2004). Current Population Reports, P60-226. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Government Printing Office. Source for unemployment rates was the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Web: data.bls.gov.

Unemployment rates have increased for the nation as a whole during the present decade (at least during its first half) and, in 2003, unemployment rates among Latinos (7.7%) remained higher than those for Euro Americans (5.2%), but lower than those for African Americans (10.8%). Unemployment rates are higher among youth (16–19 years of age) than for all workers, with African Americans having the highest rate (33.0%), nearly twice that for Euro Americans (15.2%). Latino youth had an unemployment rate of 20.0%, substantially lower than that for African Americans, but higher than that for Euro Americans.

In 2003, the official poverty rate for the country was 12.5%, up from 12.1% in 2002, and from 11.7% in 2001. After hovering at rates near 30% during the 1980s and 1990s, poverty rates for Latinos and African Americans reached historical lows in 2000, when they dropped to 22.1% and 21.2%, respectively. In 2003, there were 35.9 million people in poverty across the United States, up 1.3 million from the year before, and up approximately 4.8 million from 2000. In 2003, the poverty rates for Latinos (22.5%) and African Americans (24.4%) were nearly three times the rate for Euro Americans (8.2%). Across all groups, poverty is highest among single female-headed households, with the rate for Latinos at 32.2% in 2003, 34.5% for African Americans, and 16.9% for Euro Americans (Dalaker, 2001).

The rate for persons without health insurance for the nation as a whole was 15.6% in 2003, up half a percent point from 2002 (15.1%). In 2003, the uninsured rate was highest among Latinos (32.7%), followed by African

Americans (19.6%) and Euro Americans (11.1%). That year, 45 million people were without health insurance, up 1.2 million from 2002. While the uninsured rate for children stayed at 11.4% from 2002 to 2003, the rate for Latinos (21.0%) was much higher than those for African Americans (14.5%) and Euro Americans (7.0%). Indeed, the rate for Latino children was three times higher than the rate for Euro American children. These rates are of major concern given the recognition that the first years of life are much more important than previously thought for emotional and intellectual development (Song, 2002). If children do not receive proper medical care in their early years, they may suffer developmental challenges later in life.

Table 5 presents the occupational distribution of the three largest racial/ ethnic groups in the country for the year 2000. The top two categories in which Latinos are more likely to be found are Sales and Office (23.1%), with Service (21.8%) and Production, Transportation and Material Moving (21.2%) so close that together they rank as the next major category. The majority of Euro Americans are found in Management, Professional, etc. (36.6%) and Sales and Office (27.2%) occupations. Although the relative rankings are reversed, the greatest percentage of African Americans also lies in Sales and Office (27.3%) and Management, Professional, etc. (25.2%). In contrast, among Latinos (18.1%), the Management and Professional category ranks, at best, fourth. Approximately one in five Latinos (21.8%) and African-American (22.0%) workers are found in the Service sector, with

Table 5. Percent Occupational Distribution[a] by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in U.S. for the Year 2000.

Occupational Group	Race/Ethnic Group		
	Euro-Americans (%)	Latinos (%)	African Americans (%)
Management, professional, etc.	36.6	18.1	25.2
Service	12.8	21.8	22.0
Sales and office	27.2	23.1	27.3
Farming, fishing, and forestry	0.5	2.7	0.4
Construction, extraction, and maintenance	9.6	13.1	6.5
Production, transportation, and material moving	13.2	21.2	18.6

Source: Occupations: 2000. (2003). Census 2000 Brief. C2KBR-25. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
[a]Based on a sample of employed civilian workers 16 years of age and older.

only 1 in nearly 10 Euro Americans being in this sector. Although the percentages are small, Latinos are more likely than the other two groups to have primary sector occupations such as fishing, farming, and extraction, and more likely to be in production, transportation, and material moving occupations. Unfortunately, these categories gloss over the racial division of labor that characterizes the occupational system in this country, and hide differences in the earning and occupational prestige levels among the groups.

For example, although the country experienced one of its longest periods of economic growth and job expansion in the 1990s, the status of Latinos did not improve as a result. The reason is that the job expansion of this period was "characterized by an asymmetrical polarization of employment opportunities weighted toward the high end of the job structure" (Wright & Dwyer, 2003, p. 321). The job expansion that occurred at the lowest level of the occupational structure provided employment to the foreign-born workers, the majority of whom were Latinos (*ibid*.). Moreover, since the real buying power of the minimum wage declined during the 1990s many Latinos may have been worse off at the end of that decade than they were at the start of it.

Overall, the socioeconomic well-being of Latinos is substantially lower than that for Euro Americans. They have lower income levels, higher unemployment rates, higher poverty rates, and higher uninsured rates, and are more likely to be found at the lower end of the occupational structure. The socioeconomic characteristics described above present the status of Latinos in the United States as precarious, and the situation may worsen in the context of the major economic and political challenges facing the country today. With professional and related occupations and service occupations expected to increase the fastest in coming years, Latinos may become more concentrated in service jobs, since technological impacts on the occupational structure are leading to more and more educational requirements (a process supported by the rational bureaucratic structure of American society, and a tool in maintaining superiority by the dominant group). Occupations such as medical assistant and network systems and communications analyst, which are expected to grow, will require higher education certificates and degrees. Consequently, the participation and success rate of Latinos in postsecondary educational programs will significantly impact the group's relative standing in the economy over the next several decades. Their success, however, will be tied to the nation's education systems, which seem unwilling to transform themselves to meet the educational needs of diverse population groups.

Education Characteristics

Educational performance among students, teachers, and schools has become a major concern of reform efforts today, with much of the focus centered on standardized and high stakes testing. The primary tension tends to be between proponents of "back to basics" schooling, who champion standardized tests, and those who champion student autonomy, creativity, and curiosity (Evers & Walberg, 2004). Just as important, however, are the racial/ethnic characteristics of the students themselves.

Table 6 presents the percentage distribution of K-12 public school students for the largest racial/ethnic groups in the country for the last three census years, 1980, 1990, and 2000. The most evident pattern has to do with changes in the relative proportions of the groups. Euro-American students decreased from 72.8% of the total in 1980 to 61.3% in 2000, and most likely the pattern is continuing. Latino students increased from 8.6% in 1980 to 16.6% in 2000, and African Americans remained stable at approximately 16.5%. The demographic shift with regard to Latinos was predicted since the 1980s, and the nation's public schools, which were informed about the impending population changes but did not fully prepare themselves for it, are now struggling to meet the educational needs of Latino schoolchildren, many of whom are first or second generation immigrants who present language arts challenges. Unfortunately, unlike in public administration generally, where governmental responsiveness has become a major value, schools demand that students change to meet educational contexts, rather than changing educational contexts to meet the needs of students, especially if they are minority group members.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of K-12 Public School Students for the Largest Race/Ethnic Groups, by Selected Years.

Year	Race/Ethnic Group		
	Euro-Americans	Latinos	African Americans
1980	72.8	8.6	16.2
1990	67.6	11.7	16.5
2000	61.3	16.6	16.6

Source: The Condition of Education Website (2000–2004). Participation in Education, Elementary/Secondary Education. Table 3–1. U.S. Census Bureau, National Center for Education Statistics. On-line: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2002/section1/indicator03.asp

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of 4th-Graders by the Percent of
Students in the School Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch by
Largest Race/Ethnic Groups, 2003.

Eligiblity Levels (%)	Race/Ethnic Group		
	Euro-Americans	Latinos	African Americans
<10	29	6	6
11–25	22	8	7
26–50	28	13	17
51–75	16	22	23
>75	5	51	47

Source: The Condition of Education 2004. NCES 2004-077. Washington, DC: U.S. Census
Bureau (2004), National Center for Education Statistics.

Table 7 presents the percentage distribution of fourth-grade students
eligible for free or reduced-price lunch by the largest racial/ethnic groups for
2003. Approximately one-half (51%) of Latino students are enrolled in
schools where more than 75% of students are eligible for free or reduced-
price lunches. Closely behind are African Americans, who are at 47%, and
may also be approaching the one-half mark. On the other hand, approx-
imately one-half (51%) of the nation's Euro American students are at
schools where 25% or fewer of the students are eligible for free or reduced
lunch. Indeed, almost one-third (29%) of them are in schools where less
than 10% of the students are eligible. The distributions of the dominant and
minority groups are visibly skewed in opposite directions. Widespread pov-
erty among the nation's two largest ethnic minority groups (Latinos and
African Americans) haunts the hallways and classrooms of the nation's
schools and, ultimately, limits the nation's vitality in all societal spheres.

Table 8 presents the percentage distribution of public school students in
mathematics classes taught by out-of-field teachers by school level, minority
student enrollment for the 1999–2000 school year, and percent of students
eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. An examination of the first part of
the table reveals that teachers who are certified but do not have a major
degree in the field teach many students mathematics. At the middle school
level teachers who are certified but lack a major degree in the field teach
approximately two in five students mathematics. Given the relatively even
distribution of these teachers across the distribution of minority enrollm-
ents, it seems to be a managed outcome. Further examination of the table
finds that teachers who have neither certification nor a major degree in the

Table 8. Percent Distribution of Public School Students in Mathematics Classes Taught by Out-of-Field Teachers by School Level, Poverty Characteristic, and Minority Student Enrollment, 1999–2000 School Year.

School Level	Percent Minority Enrollment				
	<10% Minority	10–24%	25–49%	50–74%	75% or more
Middle School					
Certification w/o major in field	42.3	52.5	40.5	38.9	41.4
Major in field w/o certification	1.8	0.1	1.7	5.7	3.4
Neither major nor certification in field	23.6	19.4	16.8	20.5	38.3
High School					
Certification w/o major in field	14.4	13.2	15.4	18.3	12.7
Major in field w/o certification	6.7	3.1	10.7	5.8	11.0
Neither major nor certification in field	6.8	7.1	10.8	17.5	15.2

	Percent of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch				
	<10%	10–24%	25–49%	50–74%	75% or more
Middle school					
Certification w/o major in field	55.2	39.1	40.4	36.1	60.0
Major in field w/o certification	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.4	2.5
Neither major nor certification in field	13.0	19.5	28.2	31.6	20.5
High school					
Certification w/o major in Field	14.7	13.8	14.9	16.1	14.3
Major in field w/o certification	5.7	6.1	6.5	12.6	7.2
Neither major nor certification in field	6.6	7.3	12.7	16.5	13.7

Source: The Condition of Education 2004. NCES 2004-077. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, National Center for Education Statistics.

field also teach many students mathematics. At the middle school level, up to 38% of students in schools with more than 75% minority students are taught mathematics by teachers who are neither certified nor have a major degree in the field. The same general pattern is evident in high school, but with a smaller percentage of students (15–17%) being taught by these teachers. Nevertheless, the distribution reflects the fact that minority students are somewhat more likely to be taught mathematics by teachers without certification or a major degree in mathematics. In a context of high-stakes testing, this fact puts Latinos and other ethnic minority students at a disadvantage in relation to Euro American students.

With regard to the percentage distribution of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, the same general pattern is evident as with minority student enrollments: Schools that have 50 or more percent students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch tend to have higher percentages of mathematics classes taught by teachers without certification or major in the field. The table also shows that efforts are made to avoid high levels of mathematics classes taught by teachers without certification or major degrees at schools with 75% or more poor students. Still, teachers who lack the relevant credentials in the field, especially at the middle school level, teach many students mathematics, and especially minority and poor students. Again, the specter of poor instruction in mathematics during a period of standardized and high stakes testing becomes a matter of concern.

Table 9 presents the educational attainment levels for persons 25 years of age and older by largest racial/ethnic groups for the years 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2002. Although the rates of Latinos with less than 5 years of elementary school education have decreased over time (from 15.8% to 8.7%), they consistently have the highest percentage of persons with low levels of education. Most likely, this is a result of the number of immigrants, especially from Mexico, who enter with low levels of educational attainment. African Americans made significant improvements at this level of education, reducing the percent of individuals with less than 5 years of elementary schooling from 9.1% in 1980 to 1.6% in 2000. Latinos still have a ways to go in reducing this rate to one comparable to that of Euro and African Americans.

Although Latinos have made significant gains at high school and college levels, in comparison to African Americans and Euro Americans, they consistently have lower attainment levels. Euro Americans consistently have the highest educational levels among the groups, followed by African Americans, who made significant gains at high school and college levels between 1980 and 2002. For instance, they increased "high school completion and

Table 9. Percent of Population Ages 25 and Older by Educational
Attainment by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups for Selected Years.

Year and Educational Attainment	Race/Ethnicity		
	Euro American	Latino	African American
1980			
<5 years elementary	1.9	15.8	9.1
H.S. completion or higher	71.9	44.5	51.4
4 or more years college	18.4	7.6	7.9
1990			
<5 years elementary	1.1	12.3	5.1
H.S. completion or higher	81.4	50.8	66.2
4 or more years college	23.1	9.2	11.3
2000			
<5 years elementary	0.5	8.7	1.6
H.S. completion or higher	88.4	57.0	78.9
4 or more years college	28.1	10.6	16.6
2002			
<5 years elementary	0.5	8.7	1.6
H.S. completion or higher	88.7	57.0	79.2
4 or more years college	29.4	11.1	17.2

Source: Educational Attainment by Race and Hispanic Origin, 1940–2002. Infoplease Web-
page. Available on-line: http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0774057.htm.

over'' percentages from 51.4 in 1980 to 79.2 in 2002. Latinos, on the other
hand, experienced about one-half (28.1%) the gains made by African
Americans (54.1%). Euro Americans increased high school completion rates
by 23.4%, going from 71.9% in 1980 to 88.7% in 2002. At the college level,
African Americans increased their percentages from 7.9% in 1980 to 17.2%
in 2002, a rise of 117.7%. Euro Americans increased their percentages by
59.8%, going from 18.4% in 1980 to 29.4% in 2002. Latinos experienced the
lowest gains (46.1%), going from 7.6% in 1980 to 11.1% in 2002. While
almost one in three Euro American and one in six African American persons
at least 25 years of age has at least 4 years of college, only 1 in 10 Latinos
has attained a college education.

Table 10 presents high school dropout rates for the largest racial/ethnic
groups in the U.S. for 1990 and 2000. Despite all the limitations of official
statistics on dropouts, which tend to depress the figures, they are somewhat
useful in developing a demographic portrait of the different groups. The
figures presented are for youth who are 16–19 years of age and who were not
enrolled in school and were not high school graduates. Latinos had the

Table 10. High School Dropouts[a] by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S., 1990 and 2000.

Year	Race/Ethnic Group[b]					
	Euro-Americans		Latinos		African Americans	
	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
1990	923,584	9.2	347,061	21.8	292,182	13.7
2000	695,082	6.9	529,192	21.1	266,602	11.7

Source: School Enrollment: 2000. (2003). Census 2000 Brief. C2KBR-26. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
[a]High School Dropouts are aged 16 to 19, not enrolled in school, and not high school graduates.
[b]Comparability of 1990 and 2000 figures is weakened by the fact that in 1990, respondents were not allowed to choose one or more race.

highest dropout rates in 1990 (21.8%) and in 2000 (21.1%), followed by African Americans (13.7% and 11.7%, respectively), and Euro Americans (9.2% and 6.9%, respectively). While both African-American and Euro-American groups experienced declines in the official dropout rates, the rate for Latinos remained relatively stable, with the dropout gap increasing between Latinos and the other groups. Indeed, in terms of absolute numbers, the figures for Latinos increased from 347,061 in 1990 to 529,192 dropouts. Slowly, their absolute numbers approach those for Euro Americans, who outnumber Latinos by more than five to one in the general population. Indeed, if Euro Americans continue to improve in this area, the numbers for the two groups will become more similar – an outcome that is neither desirable nor beneficial for Latinos.

Table 11 shows the percent of high school completers who attend college in the fall semester following their graduation from high school by largest racial/ethnic groups for selected years. Interestingly, Latinos had the highest rate (52.3%) in 1980, and the lowest in 2001 (51.7%). Their rate declined, however, by 10% points between 1980 and 1990, and then rebounded to the low 1950s, where it seems to be stabilizing. African Americans steadily increased their rate from 42.7% in 1980 to 54.6% in 2001. Euro Americans increased their rate from 49.8% in 1980 to 64.2% in 2001, and it seems to have leveled off in the mid-1960s since the 1990s. The gap between Latinos and the other two groups widened during this period. It is important to note that growth in immediate college enrollment during the 1990s was due to women, who increased their enrollment at 4-year institutions faster than

Table 11. Percent of High School Completers who make an Immediate Transition to College[a] by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S. for Selected Years.

Year	Race/Ethnic Group			
	Total[b]	Euro Americans	Latinos	African Americans
1980	49.3%	49.8%	52.3%	42.7%
1990	60.1	63.0	42.7	46.8
2000	63.3	65.7	52.9	54.9
2001	61.7%	64.2%	51.7%	54.6%

Source: The Condition of Education, 2003. NCES 2003–067. Table 18-1. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office. 2003.
[a]Based on data for high school completers who were enrolled in college the October after completing high school
[b]Included in the total, but not shown separately are high school completers from other race/ethnic groups

males (U.S. Department of Education, 2003a). Indeed, the gender gap in higher education may now be reversed, especially among the lower socioeconomic strata, which send proportionately fewer minority males than females to colleges and universities. The dynamics behind this pattern remain to be systematically studied, explained, and addressed programmatically.

Table 11 does not show the cumulative effects of leaks in the educational pipeline. It hides, for instance, the fact that since relatively few Latinos complete high school, the overall pool of high school completers is proportionately much smaller than that of Euro Americans. This skews determination, skills levels, and socioeconomic status upward among high school completers, and one can expect higher rates than if the pool was larger due to smaller dropout rates. Still, given the determination of Latino students to overcome obstacles in the education system and finish high school, it is somewhat surprising that their rate of immediate college enrollment has not increased over the past two decades. This fact points to persisting structural problems in the pipeline.

Although much is made about increasing minority enrollments in higher education, usually presented in year-to-year increases, the facts remain that Latinos are still greatly underrepresented as a whole and tend to be concentrated in 2-year institutions (Anderson, 2003; Fry, 2004). In 2000, slightly over 15 million students were enrolled at degree-granting institutions in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 2003b).[10] In general,

Euro Americans comprised 68.3%, African Americans 11.3%, and Latinos 9.5% of students enrolled at degree-granting institutions. Euro Americans comprised 64.0% of students at 2-year institutions, and 71.1% at 4-year institutions, indicating that their distribution across institutions, unlike those for Latinos and African Americans, is skewed upward. African Americans comprised 12.4% of students at 2-year institutions and 10.6% at 4-year institutions. Latinos comprised 14.2% of students at 2-year institutions and 6.6% at 4-year institutions. Of the nearly 1.5 million Latino students enrolled at degree-granting institutions, 57.5% were at 2-year institutions. In comparison, 36.4% of the 10.5 million Euro Americans and 42.5% of the 1.7 million African Americans were at 2-year institutions. Generally, the lower an institution is on the education stratification system, the lower the completion rate by students. For instance, it is not uncommon for 2-year institutions to have a 3-year graduation rate of 10%, meaning that 1 in 10 students complete the requirements for a 2-year degree within 3 years. Moreover, graduation rates tend to be lower among first-time college students. As such, there are several holes in the pipeline carrying Latinos students to commencement stages where college degrees are awarded.

Table 12 presents the percentage of type of college degrees conferred by sex and race/ethnicity of students for selected academic years. In 1991, Euro American women received 47.6% (nearly one-half) of the associates degrees conferred, 45.0% of bachelor's degree, 43.5% of master's, and 28.0% of doctorates. Except at the doctorate level (28.0%), Euro-American women received the highest percent of all degrees. Euro-American men, who received the highest percent of doctorate degrees (37.8%), had the next highest percentages in degrees received. A similar gender pattern is found among Latinos and African Americans, with more women receiving degrees than men, except at the doctorate level for Latinos (1.0%). By 2001, Euro-American women nearly closed the gap at the doctorate level with Euro-American men, and continued to maintain a lead at all other degree levels. Among Latinos, women increased the gap between them and men, and surpassed them at the doctorate level. African-American women also increased the gap between them and men across all degree levels.

Among the groups, Euro Americans received degrees at rates slightly greater than their relative proportion of the overall population, while Latinos and African Americans received degrees at much lower levels. The gap is least at the associate's degree level, where Latinos and African Americans receive the greatest percentages of the degrees conferred, especially in 2001. The gap increases at the higher degree levels, although it seems to be closing slowly over time. There has been a relative decline in the percent of Euro

Table 12. Percent of Type of College Degrees Conferred by Largest Race/ethnic Groups and Sex of Students for AcademicYears 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001.

Degrees	Academic year	Race/Ethnic Group						
		Total N	Euro-Americans		Latinos		African Americans	
			Men (%)	Women (%)	Men (%)	Women (%)	Men (%)	Women (%)
	1991							
Associate's		481,720	33.6	47.6	2.2	3.0	2.9	5.1
Bachelor's		1,094,538	38.5	45.0	1.5	1.9	2.3	3.8
Master's		337,168	33.9	43.5	1.2	1.5	1.8	3.2
Doctorate		39,294	37.8	28.0	1.0	0.1	1.5	1.7
	1996							
Associate's		555,216	30.5	46.3	2.8	4.1	3.2	6.1
Bachelor's		1,164,792	35.3	42.6	2.1	2.9	2.8	5.0
Master's		406,301	30.7	42.6	1.4	2.1	2.1	4.3
Doctorate		44,652	33.8	28.4	1.2	1.1	1.6	2.0
	2001							
Associate's		578,865	29.7	42.3	4.0	5.9	3.8	7.2
Bachelor's		1,244,171	32.3	42.2	2.5	3.7	3.1	5.9
Master's		468,476	26.9	41.6	1.8	2.8	2.5	5.7
Doctorate		44,904	31.0	30.1	1.5	1.8	1.9	3.0

Source: Digest of Education Statistics, 2002. NCES 2003–060. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2003.

Americans and a relative increase among Latinos and African Americans receiving degrees over the last decade or so. Overall, Latinos and African Americans remain greatly underrepresented among 4-year and higher level degree recipients.

It is also important to know who is teaching students, whether at K-12 levels or at institutions of higher education, and to know how well Latinos and other ethnic minorities are represented among the ranks of college and university employees. Table 13 presents the percentages of K-12 teachers, college/university faculty and college/university employees by largest racial/ethnic groups in the U.S. for selected years. Latinos comprise the smallest percentage (5.6%) of teachers in the nation's schools, followed by African Americans (7.3%), and then Euro Americans, who are the overwhelming majority (86.4%) of teachers. In colleges and universities, Latinos comprise only 3.0% of the faculty, followed by African Americans (5.1%) and Euro Americans (80.1%). Of the professional administrative employees, Latinos

Table 13. Percent of Fulltime, K-12 Teachers, College/University Faculty and College/University Employees by Largest Race/Ethnic Groups in the U.S. for Selected Years.

Education Level and Year	Race Ethnic Group		
	Euro American (%)	Latino (%)	African American (%)
K-12 1999–2000			
Teachers	86.4	5.6	7.3
Colleges and universities fall, 2001			
Faculty	80.1	3.0	5.1
Executive, administrative, and managerial			
employees	82.7	3.6	9.3
College/university			
presidents	87.2	3.7	6.3

Source: Data for K-12 teachers is from the *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2003*. Table No. 249. U.S. Census Bureau Webpage. Available on-line: www.census.gov/prod/www/statis-tical–abstract-03.html. Data for colleges and universities is from pages 28 and 29 of the Almanac of The Chronicle of Higher Education. 2004. 51(1).

comprise 3.6%, followed by African Americans, who comprise 9.3%, and Euro Americans, who comprise 82.7%. Latinos are least represented (3.7%) among college and university presidents, and most of these are in community colleges and comprehensive (teaching) universities, followed by African Americans, who comprise 6.3%. Euro Americans are 87.2% of college and university presidents. With such low representation in key positions at educational institutions, Latinos are likely to have little impact on educational processes, and little change is likely to occur within institutions to accommodate Latino students.

One of the major deficiencies in official data for employees in higher education is that they do not break down specific occupations by race/ethnicity, especially among administrators. For instance, experience tells us that ethnic minorities are more likely to be in student affairs and other non-academic administrative positions than in academic administrative positions, such as dean and provost, which are the key line positions in academic administration. Like most positions of leadership in American organizations, these remain under the control of dominant group members, who are more than simply reluctant to share leadership positions with Latinos, but

actively reproduce the racial distributions using organizational ideology, ethnocentric criteria and a ''vocabulary of motives'' to promote their interests in hiring processes (Aguirre & Martinez, 2003b).[11]

II. LATINO LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: PERSISTING CHALLENGES

Latino leadership in higher education occurs through a multiplicity of roles, including those associated with community and professional organization leaders, students, staff, faculty, administrators, trustees, and legislators (Martinez, 1998). These leadership roles are executed in the context of powerful internal institutional dynamics and even more powerful environmental influences. This section provides a discussion of the rational structure and orientation of institutions of higher education, the importance of the normative contexts in which they exist and operate, and the dilemmas experienced by minority public administrators as result of structured inequality and cultural oppression. All of these institutional dimensions impact leadership in higher education and present specific challenges in the development of Latino academic administrators and in the execution of their leadership roles, especially among those seeking institutional change.

Rationality, Efficiency, and Organizational Adaptation

The past two decades have emphasized organizational transformation (restructuring, reengineering, reinventing, etc.) as a means of aligning private sector organizations with global, technological, and demographic changes in the environment (Riposa, 2003). Although some adaptation tools employed in the private sector – such as strategic planning, performance outcomes, and customer service improvement – have been transplanted to the public sector, including higher education (Raines & Squires Alberg, 2003), the extent of organizational transformation in higher education that has been achieved is considerably less than in the private sector. In relation to diversity, the typical college and university continues to emphasize the value of efficiency and the rational control of its environment in the pursuit of its goals, and maintains a co-optive orientation in relation to demographic shifts. Rather than developing flexible organizational structures, they remain rational-bureaucratic organizations with formal hierarchies, rigid divisions of labor, mazes of rules, policies and regulations, emphases on

control, and increasing emphases on obedience on the part of subordinates (in this case, faculty members).

In relation to their environments, rational-bureaucratic organizations seek to control aspects that threaten to destabilize them. Selznick (1948), one of the first scholars to emphasize this point, argues that organizations generally seek to co-opt elements of their environments as a means of averting threats to their stability or existence (p. 34). In higher education, where rational-bureaucratic approaches prevail, colleges and universities have sought to incorporate diversity as passive or descriptive representation rather than as active or "substantive acting" representation (Pitkin, 1967; Meier, 1975; Aguirre & Martinez, 2002; Aguirre & Martinez, 2003a). As in the past, the general orientation of institutions of higher education, as in education generally, continues to be that students need to change themselves to fit the culture and processes of the organization, which sets the standards for success and the cultural context within which educational achievement is pursued. As cultural organizations, they seek to maintain dominant group values in place. Despite the "cultural wars" that took place in higher education during the past two decades, colleges and universities have emerged intact as Euro-American organizations. They have made incremental changes as a means of co-opting and thereby defusing diversity pressures, but they have successfully avoided transforming themselves to fit the educational demands brought about by the massive demographic shifts taking place. Greater changes have occurred in response to economic and political pressures stemming from the massive restructuring of the economy during the final part of the 20th century, which saw the rise of the corporate university (Steck, 2003).

The "corporatization" of universities has reaffirmed the value of efficiency within the core of these institutions (Lindsay, 1982), at the same time that diversity, as a social and demographic force, presents an increasing threat to the structure of these organizations. With the relative decline of subsidization of colleges and universities as a means of promoting access along with increases in technology and programming have come substantial tuition increases that have reduced access to working class and other low-income groups (CollegeBoard, 2004; Mumper, 2003), despite the various forms of financial aid provided to students. As economic inequality continues to increase in this country, low-income groups will experience greater difficulties in accessing higher education (Benjamin, 2003).

In this relatively austere environment, the corporate university literally acts like an entrepreneurial organization by selling its wares to students, alumni, and other markets (Aronowitz, 2000; Steck, 2003). Presidents have increasingly become externally oriented politicians and fundraisers having

to manage the images of their colleges and universities in student and philanthropic markets in the pursuit of financial stability for their institutions (Land, 2003). In doing so they have to contend with contradictory economic and political dynamics that create the following problematic situation: colleges and universities need to diversify their student bodies while at the same time preserving the cultural values and interests of the dominant group.

The more the demographic shift continues to take place, the more colleges and universities recognize that their futures depend on tapping minority student markets. At the same time, the more minorities they bring to the academy, the more dominant group members feel threatened, and the more the latter seek to keep the value of diversity at the margins of institutional culture. The result is continued attempts to co-opt diversity as a social force and absorb it into higher education as a descriptive measure that represents shifts in the racial and ethnic makeup of society rather than pursuing substantive organizational changes that create inclusive, multicultural environments where diversity is embodied in the organizational culture and diverse leadership is valued throughout the organization (Aguirre & Martinez, 2003a; Page, 2003). The co-optation of diversity as a rational bureaucratic approach of colleges and universities challenges Latino leadership that seeks to transform higher education to meet the needs of Latino and other diverse population groups in society.

Institutional Theory and Normative Contexts

Institutional theory holds that organizations in society are situated within normative contexts comprised of rules and requirements to which they must conform in order to receive support and legitimacy (Jaffe, 2001). Environmental rules and requirements constitute rationalized myths based on tradition and ideology that encourage organizational desire for acceptance and conformity. For example, as colleges and universities adopt the concepts and strategies of business corporations, imitating the drive for ''flexibility'' and ''lean production,'' they conform to the demands of political leaders and dominant group interests that seek to impose the ''restructuring models'' of private industry on higher education (McWilliam, 2002).

Diversity planning, for instance, is a tool imported into higher education, where many colleges and universities have used it to show that they are in step with the normative requirements of the external environment (political pressures, reform reports, etc.) which value diversity and that they are working to transform themselves into diverse organizations. However, unlike strategic

planning and other tools employed by business organizations to adjust to changes in the environment, in higher education the plans produced by these activities are seldom fully implemented once the initial return has been obtained in the normative context that demanded them. Moreover, since organizational leadership tends to be discontinuous, with new leaders seeking to make their own mark by emphasizing their own initiatives within the broader normative contexts, diversity initiatives in higher education are only as strong and lasting as the emphasis by and the tenure of presidents and diversity champions who launched them. Once those presidents and champions of diversity are gone from the organization, the value of efficiency is reasserted and faculty and staff prepare for the next initiative, one most likely defined either by the incoming president or the broader normative environment.

In this context, what room is there for Latino leadership to pursue transformational change in higher education? Indeed, the selection of senior administrators emphasizes fit within the organization, resulting in the hiring of those who are willing to conform to the normative context of the day (Herbert, 1974; Haro, 2003). Today, that context is one that is co-optive, market-oriented, and increasingly anti-immigrant. Latino academic leaders must not only understand these general trends in higher education, but they must seek to move from passive representation to active representation of Latino interests. It is not sufficient to simply want to be an administrative leader in higher education, as many do. They must have an inclusive vision of higher education, the courage and integrity to actively pursue it, and the standards that accurately reflect the changes needed to achieve it.[12] And this must occur at the same time that all the other pressures on the organization are attended to, including enrollment management, budget issues, facilities maintenance and expansion, and program development.

The more Latino administrators serve the interests of the dominant group in higher education, the more likely they are to be deemed "successful" leaders. Latinos, in general, however, may not hold the same view of these "successful leaders" as the dominant group does. As a result, Latino and other minority administrators must learn to cope with the conflicting role demands placed on them by the plurality of communities that surround them (Herbert, 1974; Lopez & Schultz, 1980; Santiago Santiago, 1996).

Dilemmas of the Minority Public Administrator

Latino faculty and administrators in higher education not only experience negative sentiments and treatment by dominant group members, they also

experience role conflicts as a result of competing cultural values and group interests (Lopez & Schultz, 1980; Martinez, Hernandez, & Aguirre, 1993/1994). Latino faculty and administrators tend to place importance on community expectations, student advocacy, and institutional change (Lopez & Schultz, 1980; Agor, 1988). The more they emphasize their ethnic identity in carrying out their responsibilities, the more role conflict they experience (Lopez & Schultz, 1980). They also tend to perceive "tokenism" as a significant process on campus (Aguirre, Martinez, & Hernandez, 1993). "Tokenism is the institutional inclusion of a limited number of minorities in order to give the appearance of progress in the area of race relations" (Martinez et al., 1993/1994, p. 48). Understanding of these issues and dynamics is critical to the development of Latino academic leadership.

Adam Herbert (1974) identified six forces that confront the minority administrator in America's public organizations that are still relevant today. They are: (1) system demands, (2) "traditional" role expectations, (3) colleague pressures, (4) community accountability, (5) personal commitment to community, and (6) personal ambition. As a result of competing demands, minority administrators experience several dilemmas as they seek to lead organizations. At the time Herbert (1974) published his article, the black/white binary was the prism by which race relations were examined. Today, the visibility of African Americans in public administration is more evident than it was back then, while Latinos are the ones noticeably absent from managerial and professional jobs (as shown above), including those in the higher education arena.

"System demands" are the behavioral expectations sanctioned in organizations and which keep Latino and other minority administrators in line, lest they be weeded out from the organization for "behavioral transgressions," such as pursuing multicultural learning environments. The result is that those Latinos deemed by the dominant group and its representatives as "safe" are the ones who tend to be promoted into and remain in positions of authority.

"Traditional" role expectations stem from the racial division of labor in society where some groups are seen as more fit for some occupations than others, and the core administrative are positions associated with members of the dominant group. Within the co-optation approach, some Latinos are placed in buffer positions intended to protect the organization and to reduce diversity pressures for organizational transformation. In higher education, these include affirmative action and diversity-oriented positions, including myriad positions with the terms "assistant" and "associate" in their titles. As noted by Herbert, many minority administrators, and this includes

Latinos, place job security above all else and become "impediments to efforts to address the needs of their communities" (p. 560). Lopez and Schultz (1980) found that buffer roles were a major source of role conflict for Chicano administrators in community colleges.

Colleague pressures stem from one's peers and take many forms. They are intended to produce conformity within the organization (and for senior administrators in higher education, in the community as well). Despite the fact that the academy tends to be more tolerant of difference, it nevertheless reflects the values of the dominant group. Latinos and Latinas who promote the values, interests, and practices of their own cultures within the academy risk becoming isolated. In contrast, the more assimilated they behave, the more likely they are to be accepted within the culture of the academy.

The fourth force is community accountability. Despite the need for minority administrators to actively represent the needs and interests of their communities, much as dominant group members represent their group interests under the guise of color-blind ideologies, the dominant normative context demands conformity to dominant group interests. In contrast, Latino communities, like other minority communities, expect Latino administrators to communicate with them and to care of them and their concerns. While co-optive tactics such as "tokenism" and "window-dressing" serve to cool out community demands, they do not and cannot eliminate community concerns that arise from categorical exclusion and social injustice. At some point, community accountability becomes a demand that must be met.

Personal commitment to community and ambition are the last two forces that Herbert identified as facing minority administrators. Importantly, Herbert notes that increases in the number of minority administrators create contexts in which individuals are more willing to express minority community needs. While numbers are indeed a factor in diversifying organizations, it cannot be taken for granted that active representation follows from descriptive representation, especially given the selection bias that leads to hiring "safe" minority group members. This is especially the case where personal ambition is more important for minority administrators than the pursuit of inclusive organizations.

According to Herbert, several dilemmas stem from these forces for the minority administrator. Given the focus of this paper, the dilemmas below have been adapted by the author to make them more applicable to Latinos in higher education:

- Higher education role expectations of Latino administrators do not coincide with the Latino administrator's own perceptions, goals, or expectations.

- Unresponsive institutional policies put Latino administrators in vulnerable positions vis-à-vis the institution, himself/herself, and the community of which she/he is a part.
- Often, the Latino administrator is put in a buffer position between the institution and the Latino community, unable to make meaningful decisions but expected to assume the responsibilities of programmatic failures and "cooling out" community frustrations.
- Advancement within the institution is generally a result of adherence to its normative environment, which holds that Latino community needs and priorities can be co-opted or substantively ignored.
- Institutions continue to limit the administrative positions that Latinos can occupy to those having to do with service delivery and communications with other minority group members.
- Latino communities often expect more from Latino administrators in higher education than they can deliver.
- Colleges and universities seem to search for "super" but "safe" Latino administrators, often to display them as "show pieces." In other cases, they hire individuals who are unable to perform a job "with the intent of showing that an effort was made but 'they just can't do this kind of work'" (p. 562).

The dilemmas experienced by minority administrators are embedded in a normative order that emphasizes compliance with the values of the dominant group and tied to the constraints associated with the positions they occupy. In a diverse organization, one that values cultural diversity, the dilemmas would not exist. Nevertheless, until inclusive organizations are developed, these dilemmas will continue to haunt Latino and Latina leaders in higher education.

CONCLUSION

Education and educational reforms are among the greatest public concerns in the United States today. From the assimilation emphases of the early 20th century to the student and teacher performance concerns of today, education has experienced one reform movement after another. Despite increases in the educational attainment levels among the U.S. population over the long run, the nation continues to fall behind other industrialized nations in performance and completion levels among students in both K-12 and higher education sectors (Ruppert, 2003; Evers & Walberg, 2004). In this context of

relatively poor institutional performance, the massive demographic shift that is underway poses increasingly greater challenges for American educational institutions. In addition, the reactionary political movements of the day make the education of Latinos even more precarious, threaten the development of inclusive educational organizations, and limit the well being of Latinos in general.

Several challenges continue to limit the chances for educational attainment among Latinos. These include contemporary ideological currents that emphasize color-blind means – such as back-to-basics curriculum and testing solutions – to improve education performance, and ignore structural, cultural, and organizational barriers. As a result, a multitude of factors that produce the outcomes described above remain ''out of sight'' and out of the public discourse. Consequently, the achievement gap between Euro Americans and Latinos continues to widen at the same time that key socioeconomic factors associated with educational attainment show little improvement and, in some cases, may be worsening.

As Latino immigrants continue to fuel population growth, the demographic challenges placed on the nation's schools and institutions of higher education continue to mount. The pressures will be especially great in states such as California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Arizona, and New Jersey, which already have large numbers of Latinos and continue to receive significant shares of Latino immigrants. This, in turn, engenders nativistic reactions by Euro Americans in the form of political pressures to limit services, including public education, to Latino immigrant youths.[13] At the same time, highly visible legal challenges to affirmative action in higher education and other sectors fuel Euro American sentiments against Latinos and other ethnic minorities. Finally, increasing tuition rates more and more limit access to higher education, not only for Latinos but other segments of the American class structure. The overall result is that Latinos are facing increasing social, political, and economic barriers in education.

This dynamic and multidimensional societal context presents several challenges to the development of Latino leadership in higher education. There are pipeline issues throughout the spectrum of education that reduce the proportion of Latinos moving from lower to higher levels, resulting in a relatively small pool of credentialed individuals who can be promoted to leadership. There also are issues concerning the availability of leadership development opportunities and the requisite content areas in which leaders of higher education institutions must develop expertise, including a broad perspective on the nature and role of higher education in society. Beyond the requisite content areas of budgeting, communication, and other key skills

required for successful leadership is the need for a critical understanding of the structures of oppression and inequality (both for self-understanding and understanding the plight of oppressed groups), the rational bureaucratic nature of American organizations and their modes of adaptation to a rapidly changing environment, and the nature of diversity leadership and its role in the transformation of colleges and universities into inclusive organizations.

An important question that arises is whether or not Latino academic leadership can be developed that effectively promotes and manages the societal and organizational changes necessary for improving Latino educational attainment. As passive representatives in higher education Latino leaders become part of the rational approach used by the dominant culture to manage diversity. In performing buffer roles they limit their ethnic identities to serving the interests of the dominant group and define themselves according to the normative context that gives those roles legitimacy. By these means, Latino community interests are marginally represented and effectively co-opted. Active representatives, on the other hand, promote diversity contexts in which their ethnic identities are respected rather than diminished. Such contexts accept plurality and value diversity.

The tension over diversity in society and in its institutions will continue to intensify over the next few decades. Without the influence of active Latino representation the situation may worsen until Latino grassroots communities have to rise up, as they have in the past, to create the needed changes. One thing remains clear, however: The pool of Latino academic leaders must be programmatically expanded in order to achieve greater active representation. Such preparation addresses, in addition to the usual areas of expertise, ways by which diversity can be integrated as a core value within higher education and other U.S. institutions.

NOTES

1. The works of Acevedo (1979), Lopez and Schultz (1980), Aguirre et al. (1993), Fuertes and Sedlacek (1993), Martinez, Hernandez, and Aguirre (1993/1994), Aguirre (2000), and Gutierrez et al. (2002) are exceptions to this statement because of their analytical emphases on structural and attitudinal issues.

2. Presence at the higher end of the stratification system of higher education by a minority group member does not necessarily correspond to talent or merit, it may simply be a result of a strategy of tokenism in which the dominant group feels secure enough in its power that it seeks to "manage" diversity by hiring a minority person, or the diversity strategy is at incipient stages and staff and faculty do not feel

threatened by the act of hiring a minority person into senior leadership positions. In addition, there appears to be an informal quota system in higher education whereby only one or two minority faculty members are hired into departments (if any).

3. For this reason, black scholars were writing about the black intelligentsia early in the 20th century, when a Latino intelligentsia still was not discernable. The exclusion of Latinos from higher education was much more complete than it was for African Americans until the 1960s.

4. See Bonilla-Silva (2002) for a description of five linguistic styles used by Euro Americans to articulate a color-blind ideology. Also, see Lewis (2004) for a view on how whites are blind to their own existence as a racial group.

5. As such, a good education is highly desirable but often difficult to obtain, especially at the highest levels of quality, because costs (including housing costs at the K-12 level) restrict access to those who can pay for it. Private education institutions, from K through 16, generally do better than public institutions in educating students.

6. See Census 2000 PHC-T-1. 2001. Population by Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States: 1990 and 2000. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Summary File for states, Tables PL1, PL2, PL3, and PL4.

7. This figure does not include the 3.9 million residents of Puerto Rico.

8. By 2003, these figures had increased to 18.6% for Latinos. See the U.S. Census Bureau News online at http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/001720.html.

9. See Mac Donald (2004) for an example of nativistic sentiments against Latino immigrants, who often are cast as ''illegal aliens.'' Indeed, this label has become a sore spot for many Latino immigrants, who believe they are unfair targets of American hostility.

10. The figures are for 4- and 2-year degree-granting institutions that were participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

11. One approach used to maintain institutional control when hiring ethnic minority members into senior administrative positions is to be highly selective and hire only those who are eager to meet the normative expectations of the dominant group and who, consequently, are unlikely to actively pursue the transformation of the organization on the basis of diversity values. While this approach passes scrutiny under the hiring criterion of ''institutional fit,'' it also serves to reproduce dominant group structures of control.

12. President Bush recently nominated Alberto R. Gonzales for the post of Attorney General of the United States. In his acceptance of the nomination, Gonzales claimed that a common prayer in Hispanic communities asks ''...for a chance to prove myself.'' This attitude reflects the willingness of those minority group members seeking positions of organizational leadership to conform to the institutional requirements of the dominant group in order to obtain a position of organizational authority. This attitude lacks the vision needed to bring about inclusive organizations, and seeks instead to promote the aspirations of the individual rather than the interests of Latinos.

13. Note the passage of Proposition 200 in Arizona on November 3, 2004, which requires that evidence of citizenship be provided when applying for state and local

public benefits that are not federally mandated. It also requires that government employees report U.S. immigration laws violations by applicants for public benefits or face criminal penalties. Although the text of the proposition did not define public benefits, the Arizona Attorney General has interpreted it to mean "welfare benefits."

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Acevedo, B. (1979). Socialization: Chicano administrators in higher education. *Emergent Leadership*, *3*, 28–41.

Agor, W. H. (1988). The thinking styles of Hispanic-American managers: An exploratory study. *Southwest Journal of Business and Economics*, *6*(Fall), 1–12.

Aguirre, A., Jr. (2000). Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace. *ASHE-ERIC: Higher Education Report* (Vol. 27, No. 6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (1993). Chicanos in higher education: Issues and dilemmas for the 21st century. *ASHE-ERIC higher education reports – report three*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Development.

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (2002). Leadership practices and diversity in higher education: Transitional and transformational frameworks. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *8*(3), 53–62.

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (2003a). The organizational response to diversity: Leading for diversity versus diversifying leadership. Paper presented at the 8th annual conference of the people of color in predominantly white institutions: Affirmative approaches to ensuring diversity. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, November 17–19.

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (2003b). The diversity rationale in higher education: An overview of the contemporary legal context. *Social Justice*, *30*(1), 138–152.

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (2003c). The postcolonial university: Racial issues in South African and American institutions. *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Comparative Studies*, *12*, 1–25. Available at: http://www.safundi.com/issues/12/aguirre.asp.

Aguirre, A., Jr., Martinez, R., & Hernandez, A. (1993). Majority and minority faculty perspectives in academe. *Research in Higher Education*, *34*(3), 371–385.

Anderson, E. L. (2003). Changing U.S. demographics and American higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *121*, 3–11.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Battle, J. (2002). Longitudinal analysis of academic achievement among a nationwide sample of Hispanic students in one- versus dual-parent households. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, *24*(4), 430–447.

Benjamin, R. (2003). The environment of American higher education: A constellation of changes. *Annals, AAPSS. 585*, 8–30.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2002). The linguistics of color blind racism: How to talk nasty about blacks without sounding 'racist'. *Critical Sociology*, *28*(1–2), 41–64.

Chapa, J., & de la Rosa, B. (2004). Latino population growth: Socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, and implications for educational attainment. *Education and Urban Society*, *36*(2), 130–149.

CollegeBoard. (2004). *Trends in college pricing, 2004. Trends in higher education series*. Washington, DC: College Entrance Examination Board.

Contreras, A. R. (1998). Leading from the margins in the ivory tower. In: L. A. Valverde & L. A. Castenell, Jr. (Eds), *The multicultural campus* (pp. 137–166). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Dalaker, J. (2001). *Poverty in the United States: 2000. Current population reports, series P60-214*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Government Printing Office.

Esquibel, A. (1992). *The career mobility of Chicano administrators in higher education*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Evers, W. M., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds) (2004). *Testing student learning, evaluating teaching effectiveness*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution.

Filan, G. L., & Seagren, A. T. (2003). Six critical issues for midlevel leadership in postsecondary settings. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 21–31.

Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Fuertes, J. N., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1993). Barriers to the leadership development of Hispanics in higher education. *NASPA Journal*, *30*(4), 277–283.

Fuligni, A. J., & Hardway, C. (2004). Preparing diverse adolescents for the transition to adulthood. *The Future of Children. 14*(2), 99–119. Available at: http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/fulignihardway.pdf.

Gilley, D. (2003). Bedside manner and effective academic administrative leadership. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 95–102.

Ginsberg, R., & Bennett, A. (1989). Reform initiatives and minorities in higher education. *Education and Urban Society*, *21*(3), 245–259.

Grieco, E. M., & Cassidy, R.C. (2001). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: March 2001. Census 2000 brief. C2KBR/01-1*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Gutierrez, M., Castañeda, C., & Katsinas, S. G. (2002). Latino leadership in community colleges: Issues and challenges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *26*, 297–314.

Haro, R. (2003). Latinos and academic leadership in American higher education. In: D. León (Ed.), *Latinos in higher education. Diversity in higher education series* (Vol. 3, pp. 37–55). Boston: JAI Press.

Herbert, A. (1974). The minority administrator: Problems, prospects, and challenges. *Public Administration Review*, *34*(6), 556–563.

Hoppe, S. L. (2003). Identifying and nurturing potential academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 3–12.

Huntington, S. P. (2004). The Hispanic challenge. *Foreign Policy*, (141), 30–45.

Jaffe, D. (2001). *Organizational theory: Tension and change*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kao, G., & Thompson, J. S. (2003). Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *29*, 417–442.

Kochhar, R. (2004). *The wealth of Hispanic households: 1996–2002*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Land, P. C. (2003). From the other side of the academy to academic leadership roles: Crossing the great divide. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 13–20.

Lewis, A. (2004). 'What group?' Studying whites and whiteness in the era of 'color-blindness'. *Sociological Theory*, *22*(4), 623–646.

Lindsay, A. W. (1982). Institutional performance in higher education: The efficiency dimension. *Review of Educational Research*, *52*(2), 175–199.

Lopez, A. F., & Schultz, R. E. (1980). Role conflict of Chicano administrators in community colleges. *Community College Review*, *7*(3), 50–55.

Lopez, E. S., & Reyes, B. (2004). *Faculty, managers, and administrators in the university of California, 1996 to 2002. CRB 04-009*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.

Mac Donald, H. (2004). The immigrant gang plague. *City Journal*, *14*(3), 31–43.

Martinez, R. (1998). Hispanic leadership in American higher education. *Hispanic association of colleges and universities*. Available at HACU Webpage: http://www.hacu.net/hacu/Kellogg_Educational_Reports_EN.asp?SnID=150329103 (Also available as ERIC Document 422038).

Martinez, R., & Aguirre, A., Jr. (2003). Resource shares and educational attainment: The U.S. Latino population in the twenty-first century. In: D. Leon (Ed.), *Latinos in higher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 37–55). Boston: JAI.

Martinez, R., Hernandez, A., C. R., & Aguirre, A., Jr. (1993/1994). Latino faculty attitudes toward the workplace. *Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators*. Special Theme Edition, pp. 45–52.

McWilliam, E. (2002). Against professional development. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *34*(3), 289–299.

Meier, K. J. (1975). Representative bureaucracy: An empirical analysis. *The American Political Science Review*, *69*(2), 526–542.

Méndez-Morse, S. (2004). Constructing mentors: Latina educational leaders' role models and mentors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *40*(4), 561–590.

Mickelson, R. A. (2003). When are racial disparities in education the result of racial discrimination? A social science perspective. *Teachers College Record*, *105*(6), 1052–1086.

Mumper, M. (2003). The future of college access: The declining role of public higher education in promoting equal opportunity. *Annals, AAPSS*, *585*, 97–117.

Ortiz, F. I. (1998). Career patterns of people of color in academia. In: L. A. Valverde & L. A. Castenell, Jr. (Eds), *The Multicultural Campus* (pp. 121–135). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Page, O. C. (2003). Promoting diversity in academic leadership. *New Direction for Higher Education*, *124*, 79–86.

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The concept of representation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Raines, S. C., & Squires Alberg, M. (2003). The role of professional development in preparing academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 33–39.

Ramirez, R. R., & de la Cruz, G. P. (2003). The Hispanic population in the United States: March, 2002. *Current population reports*, *P20-545*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Riposa, G. (2003). Urban universities: Meeting the needs of students. *Annals, AAPSS*, *585*, 51–65.

Ruppert, S. (2003). *Closing the college participation gap: A national summary*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Salgado Carozza, L. (2002). The need for mentorship in the minority professoriate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *1*(4), 351–356.

Santiago Santiago, I. (1996). Increasing the latino leadership pipeline: Institutional and organizational strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *94*, 25–38.

Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organization. *American Sociological Review*, *13*(1), 25–35.

Song, Y. (2002). *Early childhood poverty: A statistical profile (March 2002)*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty.

Steck, H. (2003). Corporatization of the university: Seeking conceptual clarity. *Annals, AAPSS*, *585*, 66–83.

Toossi, M. (2004). Labor force projections to 2012: The graying of the U.S. workforce. *Monthly Labor Review*, *127*(2), 37–57.

Trower, C. A., & Chait, R. P. (2002). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*, *104*(4), 33–38.

Trueba, E. T. (1998). Race and ethnicity in academia. In: L. A. Valverde & L. A. Castenell, Jr. (Eds), *The multicultural campus* (pp. 71–93). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2003, current population reports, P60-226*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2003a). *The condition of education 2003. NCES 2003-067*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2003b). *Digest of education statistics, 2002. NCES 2003-060*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *The condition of education 2004. NCES 2004-077*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Valverde, L. A. (2003). *Leaders of color in higher education: Unrecognized triumphs in harsh institutions*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Vaughn, G. B. (1996). Paradox and promise: Leadership and the neglected minorities. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *94*, 5–12.

Wright, E. O., & Dwyer, R. E. (2003). The patterns of job expansions in the USA: a comparison of the 1960s and 1990s. *Socio-Economic Review*, *1*(3), 289–325.

This page intentionally left blank

EXPERIENCES OF PRESIDENTS OF COLOR: WHEN PERCEPTIONS CHALLENGE REALITY

Roberto Haro

While the number of women presidents at American colleges and universities (including some of the most selective colleges and universities) has increased steadily over the past 15 years, the numbers and growth rate are not as rapid as many would want (Corrigan, 2003; Harvey, 2004). Meanwhile, the increase in the number of Latino[1] presidents (male and female) at the 2- and 4-year colleges and universities has not come close to matching the trend for White women. It is still something of a mystery why research regarding the conditions and factors that determine the low rate of presidential appointments for Latinos at institutions of higher education in the United States continues to lag. Aside from the various articles, chapters, and reports I have prepared on Latinos and executive selection in higher education,[2] the number of scholars can be counted on one hand, with a few fingers left over, interested in or responsible for publishing a chapter or report on this important topic.

There are several factors, which underscore the need to consider carefully the status of Latinas and Latinos on American college campuses. The rapid increases in the Latino population across this country raise policy matters that require attention. Of primary concern, it is now the largest minority population in the nation, even though Puerto Ricans living on the Island are

not counted in the Bureau of the Census total for the ''Hispanic Population'' in the U.S. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004). Among the minority groups in the U.S., it is also increasing faster in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total population than any other group. Next, developing Latino communities can be found in the South, in the Midwest, along the Atlantic seaboard, and in New England. Moreover, examining carefully the composition of this population group reveals that they are young – with a median age of 27 compared to over 50 for Whites.[3] In a recent report on high school graduates released by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) are valuable projections on high school graduates between 1988 and 2018 (WICHE, December, 2003). Among the major underrepresented racial/ethnic groups, the greatest numerical change is occurring among Hispanics. Between 1994 and 2002, their numbers in American public schools increased from 4.8 to 9.2 million students (WICHE, 2003, pp. 44–45). Meanwhile, the public schools across the nation are expected to have approximately 1.4 million fewer White students in 2007–2008 (WICHE, 2003, pp. 44–45). Leading American demographers have known about these trends and shared their data and information with anyone interested or willing to listen. Unfortunately, too few leaders in American higher education have considered seriously the rapid growth and projections for Latino high school graduates in our country. In several western and southern states, Latino students are, or will soon be, the largest number of high school graduates. In the two most populous states, California and Texas, Hispanics are seeking access to the 2- and 4-year colleges or universities in record numbers.

As mentioned above, this trend should preoccupy policy makers and leaders in education. But instead, general statistics about ''Tidal Wave II'' and the overall increases in the total number of students going to college are what state and national policy groups mention, never bothering to disaggregate the data to provide important insights on the groups with the largest increases in numbers and percentages among the traditional 17–25-year-old college age cohort. However, once the data and population trend for Latinos are considered carefully, they beg a few significant questions. Are the 2- and 4-year colleges and universities prepared to admit large numbers of qualified Latino students, many with socio-economic backgrounds far different from the traditional 17–25-year-old cohort of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s? Is there a national agenda to cope with this Latino interest in going to college? The ''college going gap'' between Whites and minorities has been widely discussed, even by the leaders of selective private colleges (Clayton, 2003). However, few scholars have focused attention specifically on Latinos

and have been as forward thinking as Georges Vernez and his colleagues at the Rand Center for Research on Immigration Policy. Vernez has documented the trends and their continuation through this decade, calculated the effects of doubling the number of Hispanics earning a bachelor's degree, and arrived at the costs and benefits of such a change (Vernez & Mizell, 2001). To double the number of Latinos attending public colleges and universities in America will require major commitments in the form of outreach efforts that will help Latino parents and their children better understand what steps are necessary for students to take, as early as the fifth and sixth grade to begin preparation for higher education.

Next, are there sufficient Latino faculty at public colleges and universities, particularly in states like California and Texas, to help teach these new students? Recent reports from each of these states reveal a disappointing situation. Ed Apodaca, Vice President for Student Services at the University of Houston—Central, prepared a report on Hispanic faculty in Texas (Apodaca, 2003). The California Research Bureau released three reports authored by Elias Lopez (Lopez, 2004), with the assistance of Belinda Reyes (Lopez & Reyes, 2004) and Refugio I. Rochin (Lopez & Rochin, 2003). Combined, these reports provide a distressing account of the very limited number of Latino faculty and administrators in Texas and California public institutions of higher education. There is much to be done in identifying and preparing Latinos to become professors, senior staff, and executives at American colleges and universities. And even more is needed to provide a hospitable campus environment for Hispanics, particularly in academic leadership roles.

I have raised the above as a backdrop for the central theme that will be pursued in this chapter. What happens when Latinos, and other minorities, become presidents? Before addressing this question, it is important to mention the educational and experiential process required to become a top executive in higher education. Beyond the time it takes to earn the appropriate graduate and professional degrees, and the different positions and roles in which a prospective higher education executive must serve, there are also the preparation and participation in the application process for top jobs. Yet, there are less visible, but highly determinative attitudes on the part of faculty, community groups, alumni, and most importantly, members of the governing boards of the institutions actually responsible for hiring and dismissing top administrators. And finally, after becoming a president, a new set of challenges confronts Latinos, and other minorities, infrequently, if ever mentioned in the professional literature, and not well treated, if at all, in executive leadership programs to prepare senior- level academic

leaders at American institutions of higher education. To better appreciate the time and preparation needed to reach those levels from which administrators are selected for top roles at the American 2- and 4-year campuses, some important resources need to be mentioned. Two recent books have provided important perspectives, and research results about the challenges Latinos face in gaining access to selective colleges and universities, graduating with honors, entering a highly regarded graduate program, and continuing in higher education as a staff member, faculty, and/or administrator (Leon, 2003; Castellanos & Jones, 2003). The anthologies also include sections dealing with Latinos and top campus roles, and in a few cases, information shared by former presidents about the treatment received during their tenure. These materials provide an important background for the direction of my recent study, undertaken to elicit from minority college and university presidents, experiences that may have involved their ethnicity, race, or gender. But before delving into these perceptions, a few words are necessary about the role of a president in academia, and why it is important for underrepresented groups, including women and minorities to become chief campus executives.

"What is so important about Latinos becoming college presidents?" This was a question posed by a senior member on the governing board of a highly selective university. It was one that several of his counterparts on different governing boards for campuses across the country wanted to ask, or had done so cautiously and indirectly; perhaps fearful their attitudes might somehow be made public. It has taken patience and considerable time for this author to "educate" people on search committees, and especially governing board members, about the significance of appointing Latinas and Latinos as presidents. First, restating the obvious, a president of a college or university can play a significant leadership role, and help change attitudes (albeit slightly, at best) and behavior on a campus. But I want to be candid. The changes most presidents contemplate are relatively minor, or benign (Bornstein, 2004). Any "hot issue" considered for action without the input and consent of the faculty and the board of governors can easily lead to the termination of a president's contract. And in some cases, like intercollegiate athletics, active alumni and wealthy benefactors for a sports program must be included and supportive. Otherwise, the only change that will result is the replacement of the current president with a new one! But still hanging in the air is the question posed earlier. To answer it properly, some commentary about the role of a president is important to consider.

The role and influence of the American college president have been researched and publicized in the professional literature of higher education.

Numerous authors have discussed such things as the effective president (Bornstein, 2003). Perhaps the most well-read commentary on the "power" of a college president appeared in James L. Fisher's book (Fisher, 1984). In it, he describes the various roles and obligations of a campus president, with particular attention devoted to off-campus activities and fund raising. Raising money for a college or university, whether it is private or public, is not only required of a campus leader, but in many cases, it is also used as a measure of his or her performance. Fund raising requires a president to meet and work with well-to-do groups and benefactors. Consequently, the cultivation of donors for a college provides numerous opportunities for the exchange of ideas and information, and may, at times, stray into areas such as emerging demographic trends and the status of minorities in this country. Beyond fund raising are certain duties that appear, on the surface, to be intangible, such as serving on local and regional task groups or commissions. These "opportunities" differ from service on paid boards, which most presidents, especially at selective colleges and universities, consider part of their employment package. Executive search firms, the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), the American Council on Education (ACE), and others concerned about the appointment of some presidents understand that service on paid boards of directors is an important benefit for them, basically for two critical reasons: added compensation and networking with key leaders and policy makers at the local, state, or national level. The latter role can be very significant when it comes to sharing reliable insights and information about developing trends in this country, specifically the Latino population increases. Having served on several major national boards of directors, I was not surprised that corporate leaders, foundation heads, and other top executives asked at various times over the last 20 years about "Hispanics," "Chicanos," "Mexican Americans," "Cubans," "Puerto Ricans," and other Latino groups. With each new census after 1980, the interest in Latinos increased among corporate and labor leaders, and a few foundation heads. These board members were quick to understand the need to "tap" an important labor pool, and "market" to an emerging population group. Unfortunately, educators and some foundation heads serving on these boards appeared unconcerned with the rapidly increasing Latino population. And so it was my mission to patiently "educate" my confreres on these boards about Latinos and their significance as a rapidly increasing community in our nation.

College and university presidents serving on important boards and commissions can directly and indirectly influence decision making at the local, state, and national levels. College presidents will, therefore, "rub shoulders"

with important leaders and decision makers, and become part of net-
works where critical issues are discussed, and attitudes formed that may
significantly affect options for action. And coming from an educational
institution, particularly where the campus may be highly selective and
nationally respected, these presidents have a certain cachet. They are
perceived as learned individuals, anointed by their institutions to occupy a
leadership role, and because of their positional leadership they are able to
express opinions that may carry some weight with others. Therefore, they
are capable of conditioning attitudes and, by extension, limited behavior
modification among some key policy and decision makers in our nation.
Several older but still important studies describe how critical decisions are
made in high-level policy groups and commissions that influence our society.
The Power Elite by C. Wright Mills (1956), and G. William Domhoff's
(1978) *The Powers That Be*, along with similar studies, delve into the
exchanges and interfaces between leaders from different parts of our society.
These leaders, many serving on two or more influential boards and com-
missions, learn and share from the interactive process which may play a
significant role in determining policies and practices that affect and
condition our lives. Membership in such "exclusive clubs," now popularly
referred to as *networking*, provides access to key decision makers and lead-
ers, and by extension the opportunity to exchange pertinent information
with others.[4] Consequently, when the increase in the Latino population
surfaces as a topic for discussion, or even an item on the agenda of a major
board or commission, who speaks for the Latino population? The limited
number of Latinos attaining top leadership roles in major corporate,
governmental, labor groups, with even fewer in the areas of philanthropy
and higher education, does not provide sufficient informed input on critical
matters germane to this minority population, and the larger society as well.
Therefore, when the time comes to examine carefully educational matters
that affect Hispanic students and their families, only a handful of Latino
college and university leaders are available to speak authoritatively on such
concerns in these cameral settings. The reality is that Latinos are not well
represented in the higher circles and among the power elite in America. This
continues to be a sore point for the Hispanic communities in this country,
and a limitation in decision making wherever it involves Latinos.

In other publications, I have shared information gleaned from surveys
that explored the selection process for provosts and presidents at American
colleges and universities. These studies yielded important insights on why
Latino males and females are not well represented as campus presidents,
particularly at the most selective private 4-year liberal arts colleges and

universities, and at the major publicly supported research/doctoral granting institutions. In general, too many college presidents are selected because they are cautious, evasive on "tough issues," and more "image" than substance (Lovett, 2002). I will not restate that research and information, but instead, refer the reader to a few informative studies (Haro, 1995; Haro, 2003; Haro & Lara, 2003). What is important for the reader to consider in this piece, however, is what happens when minorities and women, especially Latinas and Latinos, become college or university presidents.

With the above in mind, several years ago I decided to canvass minority presidents, active and retired, regarding any experiences involving bias toward them because of their gender, ethnicity, or race on their respective campuses, and in different settings off the campus. The study took almost 18 months, and covered the years 2003–2004. Rather than doing a large sampling and lengthy questionnaire, I focused attention on a small group of presidents. A structured questionnaire was designed with ten questions, not all of which needed to be answered. It was tested to determine what results might be gained. After some modifications[5] it was formalized for use. A total of 35 sitting and former college and university presidents were targeted. Twenty Latinos, ten African Americans and five Asian Americans were contacted. Ten Latinos (men and women) agreed, along with seven African Americans (females and males) and three Asians (women and men) (see Table 1).

The gender breakdown of the original group was 15 females, and 20 males. Among the actual interview group, eight were females and 12 were males. The 20 respondents came from states in several regions of the country. However, Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, and Texas yielded the largest number of presidents. For practical reasons, it was decided not to include presidents from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), and subregions of the U.S – such as Puerto Rico – where student populations were mainly minority. It was decided that the experience of a minority president, female or male, at a traditional White

Table 1. Target and Actual Interview Compositions.

	African Americans	Asians	Latinos
Target Interview Group Composition:	10	5	20
Actual Interview Group Composition:	7	3	10
	(3 females)	(1 female)	(4 females)

institution would be the place to gather information that would reflect important challenges a minority leader might encounter. Also, it was decided to canvass four types of higher education institution: 2-year colleges, private 4-year liberal arts colleges, regional public universities, and major private and public research/doctoral granting universities. Several immediate developments were visible. I could not find a single Latino president at the highly selective private, 4-year liberal arts colleges. Most of the African American and Latino presidents were clustered at the 2-year colleges. And, many of the African American presidents at universities were or had been at public regional institutions.

While the focus of this chapter is on Latino female and male sitting and retired presidents, I decided to include a small sampling of minority presidents from two racial groups: African and Asian Americans.[6] Previous studies I conducted on Latino top executives and the selection process for presidents and provosts at colleges and universities, while well received overall, were dismissed by some White, and even a few African American scholars because of the small sample sizes and ''the lack of comparison with other minority groups.'' By including African American and Asian American presidents, perhaps a catholic view of the attitudes toward Latinos and other minorities in academic leadership roles might surface.

Initial communication with the sitting and retired presidents was by correspondence, followed up with a telephone call, and in most cases, a site visit. Several of the sitting presidents never responded directly, instead having their executive assistants or secretaries indicate by e-mail or correspondence that they were not able to participate. At first, two presidents, an African American and a Latino did not respond. However, I learned later that these two had talked with colleagues participating in the survey, and following those discussions decided to become part of the study. One of these individuals left the presidency during the course of this study. Not every respondent was asked to answer the ten prepared questions. Some indicated that they had not experienced any form of ''overt'' bias toward them because of their gender, race, or ethnicity. However, in the follow-up conversation, most of them did mention ''second guessing'' by faculty and senior administrators on their campuses regarding personnel they appointed, or reservations about funding allocations in the budget, along with other matters that raised their antennae to the possibility of ''questions'' raised regarding their ''objectivity'' as leaders. Four of the women in the final target group (50%) indicated that they had experienced bias against them because of their gender, and one by a member of the governing board of her institution. It was difficult not to stray from the structured questionnaire

Table 2. Categories of Questions.

Was bias experienced while a sitting president?
If so, nature of bias (ethnic, racial, gender)
Frequency of bias
Location of bias
The source of bias – one, or more (faculty, staff, students, administrators, etc.)
The longevity of bias (did it end during your tenure as president?)
Actions or policies that surfaced bias

when talking with some of these leaders, especially those who had left the presidency or were retired. These conversations yielded significant pieces of information and insights, as well as strategies these former presidents employed to overcome what they perceived were biases against them and their ethnic group, gender, or race.

Admittedly, the sample size in this survey was far too small from which to make reliable generalizations regarding forms of biases that lodge against minority presidents. The study did, however, surface incidents that could be construed as negative (biased) attitudes toward minority campus leaders. Moreover, some of the women indicated that they had a double burden: being a female and a minority. Later in this chapter, the negative perceptions, or "double helix," females experienced will be more fully discussed (see Table 2).

Of the several questions put to the target group, three are of immediate concern. First, the initial interrogatory was whether the sitting or former campus president had experienced any form of bias because of ethnicity/ race/gender. Second, in a few cases, respondents indicated they had not experienced any *overt* form of bias. However, after probing these respondents, it became clear that the operant term *overt* was a conditioner that required further inquiry, eventually leading to guarded comments by presidents about "subtle, sly, and wily" remarks and behavior by others that made them "feel uncomfortable/wary." And third, there was the matter of the longevity for the perceived bias (once or more often). It is important to indicate that the questions designed for this survey were meant to capture the respondent's perceptions. And as such, only in a few cases was it necessary for the researchers to validate the comments of presidents by hard documentation such as newspaper articles, flyers, and radio and television recordings. In one case, the blatantly biased comments of an elected official were questioned by a member of the research team. This prompted a site visit. After reading newspaper accounts, talking with community people, and three radio and television personalities, it was dispiriting to learn the

Table 3.   Bias or Discrimination within Sample Size.

Sample Size	$N = 20$
Number perceiving bias or discrimination	16
Percentage	80%

extent of the elected official's bias toward the minority president. Unfortunately, this was not an isolated incident. A minority female president had also been subjected to negative comments by an elected official acting in concert with a group of disgruntled faculty.

While several of the sitting presidents canvassed were cautious in their comments and responses to the questions posed, this was not the case with those who had left the presidency. In several interviews, especially among retired presidents, the respondents did not wait to be questioned, instead volunteering information about incidents and events they perceived as forms of bias toward them because of their race, ethnicity and/or gender. These former presidents wasted little time letting me know how difficult it had been for them during their tenure as president (see Table 3).

The reader should realize that the two respondents initially indicating that they had not experienced any "overt" forms of bias were contacted for a follow-up conversation. In the follow-up interview they did share impressions and perceptions that might have involved "subtle" biases toward them. However, as they initially responded negatively to the question regarding overt comments or behavior reflecting bias, it was decided not to include them in the group that had. One of these respondents was African American, and the other was Latino. Both were sitting presidents at the time of the survey.

It was necessary for the presidents, once indicating that they were the targets of bias, to identify when the incidents first took place, and whether they were on or off the campus. Also, regardless of the extent of the bias experienced, did it continue, or was it overcome? And if it was overcome, what factors helped to lessen the incident(s) of bias toward them? Other questions asked included sources of bias on the campus, i.e., faculty, students, staff, administrators. For off-campus incidents, the parties involved and the setting were significant. A snide remark at a cocktail party regarding "affirmative action" as an explicator for the minority president's selection was not as serious as comments by an elected trustee for a two-campus community college district that alluded to Latino women, ascribing to them a dual bias. One of the trustee's statements was: "What can you expect?

After all, she's a Latin, and a woman to boot!'' The comment was made in a public setting, and overheard by several people.

BIAS EXPERIENCED WHILE A SITTING PRESIDENT

Gender Matters

Perhaps it is best to begin with the experiences of female presidents in this study. Among the eight women presidents canvassed, six indicated that they had experienced some form of gender bias during their tenure. Some learned of the bias against them through friends or associates, while others were subjected to masked, but direct, negative comments and behavior. A former minority female president indicated that she had been alerted by the search consultant during the final visit to the campus before the formal offer of appointment was made that one of the faculty members on the selection committee had strong reservations. When she pursued the matter with the consultant, the woman cautiously told her that the faculty member was not ''keen on women in leadership roles.'' The minority president stated that during the final interview, the biased faculty member did not acknowledge her during the introductions, never made eye contact, and refused to shake her hand when she offered it to him. Shortly after she was hired, this woman president said she tried to meet with the faculty member in question but each time was rebuffed. When asked about the last contact she had with the troublesome faculty member, the president said, "He was rude and muttered something under his breath about women not being suited to head a college."

An Asian American female, no longer a president, said she was always treated with respect by White male faculty and administrators. She was the only female president who claimed there had not been any bias toward her because of either gender or race. When asked why she was no longer a president, she replied that personal reasons and "health matters" caused her to move in a different direction. And in the follow-up question about stress, she did admit that during her tenure as president, "I worried a lot about my performance" and "had questions about the loyalty of the faculty."

A Latina president of a college mentioned several incidents during her first few months on the campus in which her "leadership suitability" was questioned. This particular college had, in the past, a tradition of strong support for its athletic programs, especially basketball and football. One of the influential community boosters for the basketball (men's) team asked the president if she had ever played basketball, or any other team sport. When

she said no, this man, in a public setting, asked what made her think she was suited to do what was needed for the basketball team to excel. "His inference was not lost on me," she said. "He was really saying that with no experience in team sports, and being a woman, I was hardly in a position to understand what was necessary to make the basketball program successful." Responding to a follow-up on this matter, she smiled and said, "Yes, I tried on several occasions to work with him, even asking that he help me better understand the game." When asked what resulted, she said, "Finally he looked away from me and said women didn't have a clue about athletics." In more than one case, men with biases toward women presidents used intercollegiate athletics in an attempt to diminish female leadership.

While most of the female presidents were at 2-year colleges or had recently left the presidency of a community college, the experience of an African American woman at a 4-year university is compelling. A highly regarded scholar in her field, this talented woman became the president of a 4-year university. "It was a minority, elected trustee who proved to be my worst enemy," she said. When asked to explain, she said, "I got it through the grapevine he had referred to me as nothing but an 'egghead in a skirt." The follow-up question involved the interactions between the elected trustee and herself. "It became nothing short of a nightmare for me," she said. When asked to explain, she said, "This man wanted to provoke a confrontation with me, and get me to a point where I might lose my composure and raise my voice and perhaps argue with him in public." She was convinced that the man's strategy was a deliberate attempt to provoke and discredit her in public.

A Latina college president mentioned something that was intriguing about the rationale for her selection by the governing board members. The college in question was undergoing difficult financial times, and enrollment had been steadily declining in the last few years. There was even talk about the possibility of closing the college.

"I was not as well certified as several of the finalists for the job," she stated, "and had never been a president" though two of the male finalists were sitting presidents. When asked why she believed the board of trustees had offered her the job, she said, "I guess it was a low-risk option for them." When asked to explain, her comments were fascinating: "Well, why not let a woman try her hand? If she failed, so what? But if she succeeded, they would take credit for the decision." For this board it was a "no lose" decision. However, it makes me wonder about other places where similar motivation may be involved in the decision to appoint a female president.

Nature of Bias

Several things were important to determine in the survey, beyond what has already been mentioned. I wanted to find out the nature of the bias, how the presidents reacted to it, and what steps they took to challenge such attitudes. More will be said about that later. But first, the most often- mentioned forms of bias were:

> *Selection of the minority president because of "affirmative action"*
> *Subjective decision making by the president*
> *Insufficient experience with key aspects of a president's role*

Each of the previously mentioned biases requires discussion.

Eleven (or 55%) of the sitting and former leaders mentioned comments they had heard directly, or from reliable hearsay, that "affirmative action" was the main reason for their selection and appointment to be the president of the campus. When asked to elaborate on this matter, three of the respondents (one a sitting president and two now retired) provided intriguing comments. A Latina stated that the term "affirmative action" had been mentioned by several faculty to categorize the selection of a woman for the top leadership role on campus. The institution involved had never had a woman president. "This group of White faculty was saying I did not get the job on merit, but because of my sex and race [sic]. I guess for them I was the 'runt of the litter' in the applicant pool." Her comments are telling, in several ways. First, the implication is that affirmative action was used to give her preference in the appointment process. Second, the antagonistic faculty group was implying that her academic preparation and experiential background were not "up to their standards" for a president at the campus. And finally, their attitude and comments about her appointment claimed a "political" versus a "sound academic" decision was made by the governing board. When asked if such "grumbling" was short lived or continual, she said, "No matter what I said or did, these old White men and women never let up. Even the day I left the campus, two of them were celebrating in the faculty dining hall, toasting the departure of the 'affirmative action' president."

A second vehicle used to express a negative bias toward a president involved subjective decision making. A retired Asian American president shared his frustration with the negative attitudes and comments that surrounded many of the decisions he made. I asked him to share an example of the biases he encountered, and his reply was, "I appointed the top candidate from an applicant pool for a middle management role on the campus," he

said softly, "but because the person was a minority, I was accused of reverse discrimination." When asked if any formal complaint or action had been taken by an individual or group, he said, "No, but I was pilloried by someone I did not recognize in a weekly publication, and by a conservative political group in the area." Asked if he had done anything to challenge these attitudes, he smiled and responded, "I tried to 'educate' my critics and open a dialogue with them on this matter." Did it work? "It took several years, and the exemplary performance by the middle manager to quiet most of the carping." I wonder about the time and effort by the President to address this bias, and how his energy and time could have been devoted to other challenges the campus faced.

A third accusation against minority presidents was insufficient experience with critical duties a president must perform. A female president mentioned that intercollegiate athletics had been held against her. She was asked to elaborate. To paraphrase, several members of the alumni association invited her to lunch, and their topic for discussion was the football program. At first, there was "polite" conversation to the effect that a successful president would devote whatever time and effort was needed to get resources to support the program, and that the football coach was, in many ways, someone who needed to be rewarded to continue a winning season. When she said nothing, and instead nodded at their comments, one of the wealthiest benefactors told her she needed to "get her priorities straight," because being a woman and lacking experience with a successful football program would be her undoing. When she challenged him by asking if he meant that as a woman she could not be as well informed about football as a man, he smiled and nodded, while the other men in the room laughed. "I never felt so insulted," she commented.

At another campus, a newly elected trustee took it upon himself to pressure the minority president to continue a small department in agriculture. The institution had, at one time, given priority to agricultural programs. However, the rapid urbanization of the area and changing student body had encouraged the campus to shift its focus away from agricultural offerings, especially instructional programs that could be merged with larger departments. The newly elected trustee was a successful entrepreneur, with strong commercial ties to farmers, ranchers, and people in the nursery business. When the new minority president took the advice of a faculty committee to merge the small agricultural department with a related program, a firestorm erupted. The trustee spoke at a local farm board meeting and told the members that the campus president was not like them (Whites), and because he was probably an immigrant could not understand the importance of

agriculture in that area. The following week a group of angry farmers and ranchers from the area called the chair of the trustees to complain about lack of knowledge and support for agriculture. He winced as he shared a comment that had been used against him. "One of the wealthy ranchers stated that as I came from a 'different culture,' I could not possibly understand the meaning of owning and working the land the way most Americans did." This particular incident was not an isolated one, and gradually became part of an effort to oust him. A year later, the faculty in the agricultural program joined with conservatives in other departments and forced a vote of confidence in the president. "I survived the first and second votes," said the president as he looked into space pensively, "but the opposition was getting stronger, and my supporters were being intimidated and abstaining. I decided to leave before the campus became further divided." A conservative candidate for the board of trustees was then elected and promised to join with the president's antagonist to "get the campus on the right path again."

One more example should be mentioned. An Asian American president told us it was necessary because of severe budget problems to initiate cuts in some of the support staff areas. Several staff, some part-time and mostly minorities, began to lobby people within the adjacent minority community (from which the college drew many of its students) to intimidate the Asian American president into restoring the cuts. When the president, with the backing of the governing board and senior faculty, refused to roll back the cuts, the situation escalated. A few days later, negative graffiti ("penny-pinching slope" and other derogatory terms for Asians) appeared on the walls of buildings on the campus. What the last incident reflects is a lack of tolerance for good leadership and necessary decision making, and resorting to biased behavior to cajole or insult a person because of his race. There is no place on a college campus, or elsewhere, for this kind of behavior.

Frequency of Bias

All respondents who indicated that they had perceived bias toward them because of their ethnicity, gender, or race were asked to respond to the following questions (see Table 4):

> *When did you first experience bias?*
> *Was it on or off the campus?*
> *Did it occur once? More often?*

Table 4. Frequency of Bias ($N = 16$).

Experienced Bias Once	Experience Bias More Than Once
3 (20%)	13 (80%)

Among the 16 respondents who had experienced bias, 13 (or 80%) mentioned more than one incident. And in a few cases, the presidents, both sitting and retired, stated that the bias ("abuse," as some of them called it) continued throughout their presidency. When asked how serious some of these incidents were, most (nine) used words like "troublesome," "disappointing," "unfortunate," "immature," and "out of character for a campus setting." Three of the presidents said the bias they encountered was "completely inappropriate," "personally insulting," "threatening," and "vicious." One president refused to comment on the bias she had experienced, indicating that it was beneath her to even discuss such behavior.

Presidents, like other public figures, are subject to criticism for their actions and decision making. And more than one campus leader has been involved in questionable behavior, such as hiring and generously rewarding favorites or building up a slush fund of money that has been eventually publicized by the media, leading to censure or resignation. However, castigating a campus leader because of gender, ethnicity, or race is a different matter. No misconduct or malfeasance is involved. Instead, intolerance and negative bias are used as weapons to injure a person. It was disappointing for some of the presidents to learn that stereotyping was taking place on campus, a place most of them considered a center for learning and a forum for free discussion.

Location of Bias

Nine of the 16 presidents experiencing bias indicated the incidents had taken place either on or off the campus (see Table 5). Seven of the 16 respondents stated bias toward them had taken place both on and off the campus. While any form of bias is undesirable, the location of such behavior says something about the settings where negative commentary and stereotyping go unchallenged. Questioning or insulting a person because of gender, ethnicity, or race is an act of commission. The intent to do harm is clear. However, the refusal to challenge such negative behavior is cause for great concern. It is unclear what exactly acts of omission may mean. Individuals may be

Table 5. Location of Bias ($N = 16$).

On Campus	Off Campus	Both
4	5	7

afraid, for any number of reasons, to challenge negative comments. However, when a person is insulted and maligned because of a bias and others remain mute, there is uncertainty regarding this silence, leading to speculation about complicity or tacit agreement with the perpetrators and their stereotyping.

Several of the presidents indicated that they were shocked, initially, by the way they had been singled out for "abuse." A Latina president was surprised to overhear a conversation in a faculty restroom. Two White women unaware the president was in one of the stalls said the reason she (the Latina president) had gotten the job probably was because she had slept with members of the governing board. One of the women followed this up by saying that Latinas could not control themselves and were just dying to make it with White men. In another incident, an Asian American president was coming out of a movie theater close to the campus when three students walked by him and began saying "chink chan chung" like it was something humorous. These are but two cases of bias that occurred well after these presidents had been appointed. One was on campus, and the other in an area adjacent to the institution. Neither of the acts of bias was provoked. But as one president said, "I've experienced displeasure with my decisions as an administrator, but attacks against me because of my ethnicity were unearned and hurtful."

Sources of Discrimination

It was not possible to quantify the data regarding the sources of bias for several reasons. The types of individuals and groups responsible for negative incidents were varied, and their affiliation with the campus difficult, and often impossible, to know. Most respondents were able to identify campus personnel, such as faculty and staff and administrators. However, off the campus it was harder to determine any relationship with the campus by the person making negative comments. In most off-campus incidents the respondents claimed they could not differentiate between those working at the college, community people, parents or friends of students, and others.

Moreover, where negative gratuitous comments came from teenagers, the respondents did not know if they were campus students, students from a local school, or non-students. What did emerge from the study was that faculty, staff, students, administrators, members of governing boards, community people, legislators, and even media people had made statements that were biased toward the women and minority presidents. The virus of bigotry, it seems, is carried by men and women of every age, and different walks of life, and can be found on or around many American college and university campuses. And this virus can so easily infect others.

Actions or Policies that Surfaced Bias

There were three kinds of decision making that seemed to provoke bias against women and minority presidents after they had been appointed: budget matters, personnel appointments, and intercollegiate athletics. Decisions by a president on budget matters, especially if cuts were necessary, was frequently mentioned as eliciting negative comments and behavior. It seems that protecting one's budget on a campus can surface strong sentiments. If a minority president, even when supported by a faculty/student/ staff advisory committee, made a necessary but unpopular budgetary decision, harsh comments followed. Or, as in one case where additional money was allocated to an ethnic studies program, in this instance, an African American studies unit on the campus, the president was accused of favoritism, regardless of the fact that the money came from private funds specifically designated for a minority studies program. Somehow, this fact was conveniently brushed aside or ignored by the faculty group that accused the president of "playing favorites with his ethnic pals."

Personnel appointments, particularly those positions close to a president triggered several incidents of bias. "I could not believe that staff in ———— resisted my attempt to appoint the top candidate in the applicant pool for the head of the center because she was a Black woman." The president in question is African American, and was surprised to learn from several members of the selection committee about the staff's rebuke, and biased comments that surfaced. In another case, a provost appointed a minority woman dean for an academic department. The president, a Latino, had left the matter to the provost and the faculty advisory committee. However, a rumor immediately circulated throughout the campus that the president had made the decision to hire the minority woman because he "wanted to force affirmative action on the school!" In another incident involving a Latino

president, a vice president for community relations was hired. However, when a Latino was selected for the job, a tense situation developed. Several groups on the campus objected, gossiping that the decision was a form of reverse discrimination. This particular campus draws students from a service area that is more than 60% Hispanic, and where they are the fastest growing population segment. The person selected for the job was born in the region, is half Scotch–Irish and Mexican, and worked successfully for the local chamber of commerce for many years. However, it seems none of these factors were considered significant or persuasive by the groups that leveled negative bias against the president.

Intercollegiate athletics was a sore point for many of the minority presidents, especially the females. Women presidents at campuses with a long-lived tradition of winning basketball, track, and especially football programs were subjected to overt bias because of their sex, and inferences that as women they could not possibly know anything about athletics. One female president mentioned that from the first day she set foot on the campus in September, it was made known to her that the director of intercollegiate athletics was "the most important person" at the institution. "I realized even before taking the job that the men's football and basketball programs paid for the other athletic teams," she said with a frown. "But the athletic boosters never let me forget two things. First, he [director of intercollegiate athletics] was a man and knew what he was doing. And two, as a woman, I could not possibly know anything about athletics." Athletic program supporters at campuses with successful winning teams, especially in football and basketball, tend to pose challenges for women presidents, particularly Latinas.

STRATEGIES TO AMELIORATE BIAS

The presidents experiencing bias were asked to discuss what steps they had taken to downplay or address the negative behavior toward them. A few attempted to overcome such behavior by dismissing it and moving on with their work on and off the campus. The respondents adopting a policy of forbearance to such incidents, and when questioned about their strategy, were divided about its success. On reflection, and with the benefit of hindsight, "turning the other cheek" may not have been the best way for these leaders to respond. One retired president said that on second thought he would have done something proactive. When asked if the negative behavior toward him persisted, he replied in the affirmative, but added that the

number of incidents diminished after 2 or 3 years. Yet, after he left the campus, "it was still an issue, and it needed to be dealt with."

Most of the presidents shared ideas about non-threatening and non-confrontational efforts to address the bias they encountered. On a very situational basis, one president mentioned an opportunity that developed by accident, which allowed him to confront a hostile White faculty member while walking his dog. "It was an unexpected opportunity for me to meet a man who had made several comments about my race. I went up to him and introduced myself, and asked if he had a moment to chat with me. He was surprised and did not answer. Instead, he began to shake his head and scurried up his driveway to avoid me." When asked if this antagonist had continued his negative comments against him, the president smiled and said, "Oh, he kept at it, for a while." Another president indicated she started to host faculty at her residence, especially those who seemed resistant to her. Her strategy was to engage these and other faculty in continuing "coffee chats and social conversations" where topics designed to build rapport could be discussed. To balance the group, she made certain to invite a person or two open to frank discussion about gender and ethnic/racial discrimination. When asked if this had been helpful in addressing the biased attitudes, she said her efforts had succeeded with most of the faculty. However, she added that "there were two senior faculty cranks in the assembly [campus faculty association] who actively challenged my decisions and would refer to me as 'that Negress' among their cronies." She left that campus and moved to head a larger institution. Another minority president appointed a campus-wide committee of faculty, students, staff, and alumni to foster "tolerance" on the campus. Several local ministers and civil rights advocates were invited to speak at town hall functions at the institution. This president also called upon campus faculty in psychology, sociology, and philosophy to take the lead in developing new ideas to surface differences that tend to separate people. It was reassuring to learn that the strategies proposed by the faculty in these disciplines and used by this president to meet the challenges of bias toward minorities on the campus had beneficial outcomes. When asked if any academic organizations such as the ACE, the National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) had been contacted for assistance, almost all of the presidents indicated they had not communicated directly with them. One president said she had spoken informally with key staff at the ACE and received very "general and benign suggestions." Another said he had approached a senior

officer at the AAHE and been referred to one of their minority caucuses. The referral had been constructive, leading to contacts and sources of information that were used to help address in a positive and constructive manner the incidents of bias on his campus.

TARGETS OF BIAS, THEIR RACE AND ETHNICITY

After structuring the data gathered from the survey and examining them for patterns, a curious development emerged. The data revealed that 90% of the Latino presidents had experienced some form of bias, followed by 70% of the African Americans, and 66% of the Asian American leaders (see Table 6).

This finding prompted the question of why Latinos appeared to experience the most bias. Because the sample size is small, the percentages may seem to be more dramatic than significant. Moreover, it was not possible to rank the severity of bias against the three different groups. An attempt was made to determine from each respondent the nature and extent of negative comments they learned about, along with a slight weighting factor. However, most of the presidents were evasive, while some quibbled with the terms we had developed to express the degree of hostility before answering. As one respondent said, ''I cannot put a value on the degree of pain. Any bias toward another person is hurtful.'' This is a difficult area, and one quite obviously beyond the scope of the study. Yet I hope other researchers will consider exploring this topic with added focus and precision.

The nagging question about the number of incidents and percent of bias experienced by the different groups was an overarching concern that would not go away as the data were analyzed. Finally, it was decided to look more closely at the outcomes for African Americans and Latinos, temporarily putting aside the data for Asian Americans. This was done to compare two groups of almost equal size and proportion than anything else. Moreover, it allowed a comparison between an ethnic and a racial group. This in no way relegates the concern with the experience of Asian Americans to a lesser priority. The simple fact that two out of the three Asian presidents had

Table 6. Targets of Bias by Race/Ethnicity ($N = 16$).

African Americans	Asian Americans	Latinos
5 (70%)	2 (66%)	9 (90%)

experienced some form of bias indicates a need to continue reviewing their situations as college and university presidents.

Why more bias against Latinos than African Americans? It was decided to explore this development with several African American and Latino scholars. Much to my surprise, two of the African American scholars contacted were intrigued by the survey and wanted to discuss the study and methods used to gather the data. The two Latino scholars contacted also looked carefully at the methodologies used in the study, and after examining the data, shared opinions that were quite similar to those proffered by their African American colleagues.

Both African American scholars contacted are at major research/doctoral granting universities. They urged caution in making inferences and generalizations from the data, simply because the sample size was too small. However, they were willing to speculate about factors that might help to understand the results. One hypothesized that African Americans have a longer history of suffering from discrimination than Latinos. The Civil Rights Movement of the late 1950s and on through the 1990s raised awareness across this country about the discrimination and abuses African Americans had experienced. Strong and vocal national and local African American groups were formed to counter biases and discriminatory behavior toward Black Americans.[7] "It has become increasingly more difficult for narrow-minded bigots to publicly express negative opinions about Blacks without serious repercussions," said an African American sociologist. He went on to posit that there was little public sentiment or tolerance for derogatory comments or behavior against Blacks. "I suppose you could call it a 'realization of consequences' that will result if a White bigot makes negative comments about Black folk on American campuses." When asked to elaborate on his comment, the African American scholar indicated that people on American campuses understand the history of slavery and discrimination Black Americans endured and do not appreciate or tolerate attitudes that attempt to denigrate people because of their race. The African American social psychologist agreed with the previous comments, and added, "There are still matters that separate the races across this country, and undercurrents that carry along negative perceptions about Blacks, even on college campuses. But for the most part, we have learned to live with and support each other in spite of our differences." He said that in most settings, particularly on college and university campuses, there was "zero tolerance" for any public activity that involved bigotry and discriminatory behavior toward Blacks.

So, given these opinions, what can be said about the data outcomes for Latinos in this survey? Both African American scholars believe that Latinos

are a new group on the horizon, and especially on American campuses. Lack of familiarity with each other can cause hesitation and initial separation between Hispanics and other groups. Any distance between people will often surface ignorance that causes suspicion and incorrect assumptions. These Black scholars added that until recently, Hispanics were located mainly in discrete parts of the country. The rapid increases in the Latino population, especially the recent concern about immigration from Mexico and other countries in the Americas and Spanish-speaking parts of the Caribbean, may have triggered a xenophobic response (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004). The Latina psychologist agreed with this opinion, and added two other factors, language and culture. She indicated that too many Americans were worried about the use of the Spanish language. "For many in this country," she said, "speaking any form of Spanish is un-American." The other Latino scholar agreed, adding that there existed a distorted low impression about Latino intellectual abilities among too many White faculty and academic leaders. "The limited knowledge some Anglos have about the Latino culture often is translated into the notion that we do not value education, and do not care about going to college," he concluded. "Perhaps the escalating number of Hispanics in our population is responsible for the anger and negative behavior toward them," said one of the Black scholars. There appeared to be agreement among the four Black and Latino scholars that because of the long historical presence of African Americans in this country, and their major role in the Civil Rights Movement, most people in the U.S. were sympathetic to them. On the other hand, the four scholars were in agreement that the limited knowledge about Latinos in this country was a distraction, and when coupled with escalating immigration (especially by undocumented workers), negative attitudes would arise. Another factor mentioned was the limited knowledge most Americans had of Latino local and national associations, such as the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), the National Council of La Raza (NCLR), and the GI Forum, and their track record in challenging discriminatory behavior toward Hispanics. One of the Hispanic scholars added that so far there were no dramatic incidents where a national Latino organization had challenged bigotry, as had the highly visible Black organizations (e.g., NAACP). Moreover, there is no dynamic leader and champion for civil rights like the Reverend Jesse Jackson within the Latino community. Finally, the scholars said that perceptions among uninformed Whites equated speaking Spanish and celebrating a culture that came from another country or region of the world as divisive and un-American. It seems, therefore, that Latinos and leaders of the major national

higher education associations in this country may have a significant challenge on their hands.

CONCLUSION

A small study, such as this one, cannot hope to do more than raise some important questions and stimulate creative thinking to address the conditions and challenges identified. While more systematic and large-scale research may be in order to determine the extent of biases toward women and minorities in leadership roles at colleges and universities, particularly against Latinos, new ideas and strategies are called for to ameliorate undesirable behavior and attitudes that may exist on our campuses. This chapter would be incomplete without sharing some ideas and strategies national and regional organizations and institutions, particularly those concerned with higher education, should consider to address, and overcome these challenges.

There are several national organizations that need to devote attention and resources to the development of strategies to overcome bias against minority presidents, particularly Latinos, at colleges and universities in this country. The organizations that first come to mind are those that serve members of governing boards at the 2- and 4-year colleges and universities. These entities provide information and some services to their membership, but need to look more closely at the conditions on a college or university campus that cause biased behavior toward a woman or minority president. Learning to identify and counter stereotyping on a campus, especially where it affects the institution's leader, is of paramount importance. Next, there are various national organizations that are focal points for presidents and top-level academic officers. Some have already been mentioned, like ACE, AASCU, NASULGC, and AAHE. However, there are others like the American Association of Universities (AAU), the American Association of Colleges (AAC), and the national and state-level Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (AICCU), to list but a few. These and similar groups need to pay attention to the challenges minority presidents, particularly Latinos, encounter because of their gender, race, and/or ethnicity on and off the campus. While they target a particular constituency, campus presidents, they do little besides engage in generalized conversation and sporadic dialogue regarding the changing face and gender of campus leaders, particularly at the 2-year colleges and publicly supported regional universities. It is in these two institutional settings where most Latina and

Latino presidents are located. And from the results of this study, it is the place where most Latino leaders experienced biased behavior. As mentioned earlier in this piece, no Latina or Latino presidents could be identified at the most selective private liberal arts campuses in the US. This omission is a sad commentary on the lack of progress by these important institutions to diversify their leadership. The organizations that relate to these institutions, particularly those targeting governing board members, need to enter the twenty-first century and accept responsibility for developing ways to find and appoint Latinos to leadership roles on their respective campuses. And once a minority president is appointed, especially a Latino, governing board groups should be alert and prepared to deal constructively with any signs of bias toward the new campus leader.

Another area that requires attention involves organized programs and activities involved in the preparation and training of candidates for leadership roles in higher education. Some, like the Harvard University Institute for Educational Management (IEM), have the opportunity and structure to devote attention to countermeasures when biases surface after a minority president is appointed. There are, of course, seminars provided for new college presidents by various organizations. At these seminars, recently appointed campus leaders are exposed to requirements and expectations of a presidency, and ways to be effective and efficient leaders. These groups need to include in their curriculum an agenda item dealing with biases toward minorities and women, and listing sites where campus leaders can go for assistance to overcome them. And, yes, there are places where these groups and organizations can secure the kind of intelligence and strategies to effectively counter biased attitudes and behavior on a campus. Consider the following:

An important link is missing between the institutions and organizations mentioned above, and groups that have as their core mission, or a major focus, to address and correct biases against minorities. At several major research universities in this country, there are programs and units that study discrimination toward minorities and share information about ''best practices'' to overcome undesirable behavior. There are also minority group organizations that regularly provide seminars and workshops on how to cope with discriminatory behavior. And for a price, there are for profit firms that will tailor a seminar or focused application they say will help to ameliorate biased behavior. There are many more resources that could be mentioned; but time and space will not allow this. Suffice to say that they do exist, and should be contacted to work closely with organizations like the Association of Governing Boards and the American Council on Education.

One last suggestion is offered. The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) is unfolding a leadership-training program for Latinos preparing for senior-level jobs on the campus. This effort might profit from expanding its curriculum to include how to deal with biases toward a Latino leader on a campus, regardless of the type of institution. A liaison that forges a partnership between HACU, AGB, and ACE, for example might be very beneficial. Moreover, it would expose AGB and ACE members and key staff to academic leaders and valuable resources in the Latino community. Such cooperation may, I am certain, lead to other desirable activities and positive outcomes.

Beyond the budgetary and pedagogical issues American colleges and universities will confront in the next two decades, there is the major challenge of improving the status and representation of Latinos on their campuses as students, staff, faculty, and especially leaders. The critical role a president can play on the campus, and at local and national levels, has been presented to underscore why more Latinos need to be presidents, particularly at the most selective private liberal arts colleges and major research universities. The limited numbers of Latinos in leadership roles at American colleges and universities require the attention and assistance of those responsible for appointing them, and for organizations that should be providing them with information, guidance, and training. But most important, the above groups and organizations need to realize that bias against Latinos in leadership roles is a serious challenge, and one that requires the highest priority for action on their part. The resources and groups, many from within the minority communities, are available to assist. All that may be required is a call for assistance.

NOTES

1. The term Latino will be used to identify people of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Caribbean, Central and South American ancestry, Spain, and other areas of the world, where Spanish is the primary language. Latino will also be used interchangeably with Hispanic and La Raza to avoid repetition.

2. To date, this author (R. Haro) has published over 15 articles, chapters, and reports on Latinos and executive selection in higher education.

3. Supporting data are available from the Bureau of the Census in their *Current Population Reports* issued each year to update the 2000 Census.

4. An important caveat is required here. Most presidents are unwilling to take a strong stand on "hot button" issues (Lovett, 2002).

5. I am indebted to several academic colleagues in Arizona, California, and Texas for reviewing the questionnaire and making significant comments for its revision.

6. For the purposes of this study, African Americans and Asians were categorized as racial groups, while Latinos were considered part of an ethnic group.

7. The terms African American, Black American, and Black, in singular and plural form, will be used interchangeably to avoid repetition.

REFERENCES

Apodaca, E. (2003). *Texas higher education Hispanic report card*. Houston, TX: University of Houston.

Bornstein, R. (2003). *Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit*. Washington, DC: ACE/Praeger.

Bornstein, R. (2004). The authentic, and effective, college president. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (July 30), B6.

Castellanos, J., & Jones, L. (Eds) (2003). *The majority in the minority*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Clayton, M. (2003). College presidents seek to close minority gap. *The Christian Science Monitor*, (November 10), 13.

Corrigan, M. (2003). *The presidency*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Domhoff, G. W. (1978). *The powers that be: Processes of ruling class domination in America*. New York: Random House.

Fisher, J. L. (1984). *The power of the presidency*. New York: Macmillan.

Haro, R. (1995). Held to a higher standard: Latino executive selection in higher education. In: R. V. Padilla & R. C. Chavez (Eds), *The leaning Ivory Tower*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Haro, R. (2003). Latinos and academic leadership in American higher education. In: D. Leon (Ed.), *Latinos in higher education*. London: JAI/Ablex Press.

Haro, R., & Lara, J. (2003). Latinos and administrative positions in American higher education. In: J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds), *The majority in the minority*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Harvey, W. (2004). *Minorities in higher education, 2002–2003: 20th annual statistics report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Leon, D. (Ed.) (2003). *Latinos in higher education*. London: JAI/Ablex Press.

Lopez, E. (2004). *The composition of staff in California's community colleges, 1994 to 2002*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.

Lopez, E., & Reyes, B. (2004). *Faculty, managers, and administrators in the University of California, 1996 to 2002*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.

Lopez, E., & Rochin, R. (2003). *California State University Faculty: 1985 to 2001*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.

Lovett, C. (2002). The dumbing down of college presidents. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (April 5), B20.

Mills, C. S. (1956). *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2004). *Current population reports*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Vernez, G., & Mizell, L. (2001). *Goal: To double the rate of Hispanics earning a bachelor's degree*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND/Education.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). (2003). *Knocking at the college door: Projections of high school graduates by state, income, and race/ethnicity*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

This page intentionally left blank

AFRICAN AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"Jack" Jackie Thomas

INTRODUCTION

Leaders are essentially individuals who have the ability to understand their own times, who express or articulate programs or policies that reflect the perceived interests and desires of particular groups, and who devise instruments or political vehicles that enhance the capacity to achieve effective change. In very limited ways, leaders imprint their personal characteristics or individual stamp on a given moment in time. Leaders do make history, but never by themselves, and never in ways that they fully recognize or anticipate. The social forces that define all historical conjunctures create the opportunities or spaces for talented individuals to make themselves heard above others. For relatively brief moments, they may create an illusion that it is they, and not the vast majority, who determine the possibilities of the future. Black leaders have given their own particular style and language to various phases and moments of American history, and they will continue to do so. But it may be the measurement of our ability to achieve a full redefinition of America's democratic project if over time black Americans are able to move away from the charismatic, authoritarian leadership style and paternalistic organizations toward the goal of "group-centered leaders" and grassroots empowerment. In short, instead of leadership from above, democracy from below. The time for all voices to be heard is long overdue. (Manning, 1998)

There continue to be concerns about African American leadership in higher education, and very little research has dealt specifically with the major issues. No matter how many questions have been discussed, no matter how

many concerns debated, African American leaders have made great strides in higher education since the 1800s. However, these have not come without much hard work, dedication, triumphs, failures, disappointments, battles, and political strategizing. African Americans did not start the quest for success, for leadership positions, and for academic excellence on equal grounds because they were not given their due share of the American dream, "their mule and forty acres of land." In essence, African Americans did not have the funding, the wealth, the resources, and all that is needed to compete equally with their counterparts. This quest has been quite difficult, but it required individuals to strive much harder in order to prove themselves and to illustrate that they too are worthy to lead and make cutting-edge decisions. Often, minorities in general, and African Americans in particular, have had to be twice as good as their competitors and endure twice as much scrutiny.

African American leadership in higher education varies across the spectrum depending on the kind of institution, whether it is a community, liberal arts, a comprehensive, a doctoral, a research institution or other organization. African Americans have been in higher educational leadership positions for years, from the establishment of some of the earliest historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) such as Cheyney University of Pennsylvania (1837 – Leslie Pickney Hill), Lincoln University of Pennsylvania (1854 – John Miller Dickey), Wilberforce University (1856 – David Payne), LeMoyne-Owen College (1862 – E.G. Ortmaen), Hampton (Institute) University (1868 – Samuel Chapman Armstrong), Tuskegee (Institute) University (1880 – Booker T. Washington) and many others. Many of these institutions started out as academies and normal schools and were led by principals. From the inception of higher education for many HBCUs, leadership was provided by white males (see Table 1).

African Americans who attended those schools were not seen worthy to lead their institutions. For example, Howard University, founded in 1867, was lead by General Howard, and the first black president was Mordecai Johnson in 1926. Spelman College was founded in 1881, was led by Harriet Giles, and did not get its first black president until 1953. The University of the District of Columbia was founded in 1955 and had its first Black President, Lisle Carleton Carter, Jr., in 1977. As the institutions gained college and university status, the title of the leadership position changed to president or chancellor.

It is important to note that some African Americans also held leadership positions at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) (see Table 2).

Patrick Healy became president of Georgetown University in 1873 and served as its leader until 1881. The next African American to serve as

Table 1. The Founding of the Nation's Historically Black Colleges and the Year They First Appointed a Black President.

State and Institution	Year Founded	Year of First Black President	State and Institution[a]	Year Founded	Year of First Black President
ALABAMA			**MISSOURI**		
Alabama A&M University	1875	1875	Lincoln University	1866	1880
Alabama State University	1867	1915			
Miles County	1907	1907	**NORTH CAROLINA**		
Oakwood College	1896	1932	Barber-Scotia College	1867	1932
Stillman College	1876	1966	Bennett College	1873	1889
Talladega College	1867	1952	Fayetteville State University	1867	1867
Tuskegee University	1881	1881	Livingstone College	1882	1882
			North Carolina A&T University	1891	1892
ARKANSAS			North Carolina Central University	1910	1910
Philander Smith College	1877	1896	Saint Augustine's College	1867	1947
Shorter College	1898	1898	Shaw University	1865	1931
Univ. of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	1873	1928	Winston-Salem State University	1892	1892
DELAWARE			**OHIO**		
Delaware State University	1891	1895	Wilberforce University	1863	1863
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			**OKLAHOMA**		
Howard University	1867	1926	Langston University	1897	1898
University of District of Columbia	1955	1977			
			PENNSYLVANIA		
FLORIDA			Cheyney State University	1837	1856
Bethune-Cookman College	1904	1904	Lincoln University	1854	1945
Florida A&M University	1887	1887			
Florida Memorial College	1879	1880	**SOUTH CAROLINA**		
			Allen University	1870	1870
GEORGIA			Benedict College	1870	1930
Albany State University	1903	1903	Claflin College	1869	1922
Clark Atlanta University	1865	1903	Morris College	1908	1908

Table 1. (*Continued*)

State and Institution	Year Founded	Year of First Black President	State and Institution[a]	Year Founded	Year of First Black President
Fort Valley State College	1939	1939	South Carolina State University	1896	1896
Morehouse College	1867	1906	Voorhees College	1897	1897
Morris Brown College	1881	1885			
Paine College	1882	1971	TENNESSEE		
Spelman College	1881	1953	Fisk University	1866	1947
			LeMoyne-Owen College	1934	1943
KENTUCKY			Tennessee State University	1912	1912
Kentucky State University	1886	1886			
			TEXAS		
LOUISIANA			Paul Quinn College	1872	1872
Dillard University	1869	1936	Prairie View A&M University	1876	1878
Grambling State University	1901	1901	Southwestern Christian College	1949	1967
Southern University	1885	1914	Texas College	1894	1895
Xavier University	1915	1968	Texas Southern University	1947	1948
			Wiley College	1873	1892
MARYLAND					
Bowie State University	1865	1911	VIRGINIA		
Coppin State College	1900	1926	Hampton University	1868	1949
Morgan State University	1867	1937	Norfolk State University	1935	1938
Univ. of Maryland Eastern Shore	1886	1886	Virginia State University	1882	1886
MISSISSIPPI					
Alcorn State University	1871	1871			
Jackson State University	1877	1911			
Mississippi Valley State Univ.	1950	1950			
Rust College	1866	1920			
Tougaloo College	1869	1964			

[a] The names of the institutions listed are those used today. Many were founded under different names. Some HBCUs do not know the date when their first black president took office. Others were unable to respond to JBHE research department inquiries. *Source:* JBHE research department. *Source:* The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges. (Summer 1997).

Table 2. African Americans Who Have Served as Presidents of Predominantly White, 4-year Colleges and Universities.

1873	Patrick F. Healy	Georgetown University	1993	Blenda J. Wilson	Cal-State Un. Northridge
1970	Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.	Michigan State University	1993	Gladys S. Johnson	Univ. of Nebraska-Kearney
1971	Randolph W. Bromery	University of Mass-Amherst	1993	Barbara Ross-Lee	Ohio School of Osteo. Med.
1972	James G. Bond	Cal-State Univ.-Sacramento	1993	Yolanda Moses	City College of CCNY
1972	James J. Garner	Florida Board of Regents	1993	James C. Renick	Univ. of Michigan-Dearborn
1972	David W. Dickson	Montclair State University	1993	Hilda Richards	Indiana Univ.-Northwest
1974	Charles Shelby Rooks	Chicago Theological Sem.	1994	Charlie Nelms	University of Michigan-Flint
1976	Mary Frances Berry	Univ. of Colorado-Boulder	1994	Marvalene Hughes	Cal-State Univ.-Stanislaus
1977	Wenda W. Moore	Univ. of Minnesota Regents	1994	Horace A. Judson	SUNY-Plattsburgh
1978	Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.	SUNY System	1994	Franklyn G. Jenifer	University of Texas-Dallas
1979	James M. Rosser	Cal-State Univ.-Los Angeles	1994	Eleanor J. Smith	Univ. of Wisconsin-Parkside
1980	Benjamin L. McGee	Arkansas State Univ. Trustees	1994	Ruth Simmons	Smith College (MA)
1980	Claudia Hampton	Cal-State Univ. Trustees	1995	Douglas Covington	Radford University (VA)
1981	Jewel P. Cobb	Cal-State Univ.-Fullerton	1995	Allen Sessoms	Queens College – CUNY
1981	Bernard W. Harleston	City University – NYCC	1995	Sidney Ribeau	Bowling Green State Univ.
1982	Bernard S. Jefferson	Univ. of West Los Angeles	1995	Augusta Kappner	Bank Street College of Ed.
1982	John B. Slaughter	Univ. of Md.-College Park	1995	Carol Surles	Texas Woman's University
1982	George A. Pruitt	T. Edison State College (NJ)	1996	Richard K. Fields	Ben. Franklin Inst. of Tech.
1983	Vera K. Ferris	R. Stockton State College	1996	Frank G. Pogue	Edinboro Univ. of Penn.
1983	Byron Skinner	University of Maine-Augusta	1996	Sylvan Lashley	Atlantic Union College (MA)
1984	Herman James	Rowan College	1996	Hugh J. Arnelle	Penn. State Univ. Trustees
1984	Clinton B. Jones	University of Michigan-Flint	1996	Muriel A. Moore	SUNY-Buffalo
1984	Kenneth Smith	Chicago Theological Sem.	1996	F. C. Richardson	Indiana University-Southwest
1985	Wilbert Lemelle	Mercy College (NY)	1997	James K. Echols	Lutheran School of Theology
1986	Eldridge W. McMillan	Georgia Board of Regents	1997	Edward Wheeler	Christian Theological Sem.
1986	Thomas Cole	West Virginia Regents	1997	Theodore Landsmark	Boston Architectural Center
1986	Franklyn G. Jenifer	Massachusettes Regents	1997	Irvin Reid	Wayne State University
1986	L. Endora Pettigrew	SUNY-Old Westbury (NY)	1998	Daniel Berstine	Portland State University
1986	Marguerite R. Barnett	Univ. of Missouri-St. Louis	1998	Adam W. Herbert	University System of Florida

Table 2. (*Continued*)

1987	Charles Nelms	Indiana University-Richmond	1998	Joyce F. Brown	Fashion Institute of Tech.
1987	Blenda J. Wilson	Univ. of Michigan-Dearborn	1998	Warren Buck	Univ. of Washington-Bothell
1988	Adam W. Herbert	Univ. of North Florida	1998	Benjamin F. Ruffin	UNC Board of Governors
1988	Randolph W. Bromery	Westfield State College (MA)	1998	Elson S. Floyd	Western Michigan University
1988	John B. Slaughter	Occidental College (CA)	1998	M. Lee Pelton	Willamette University (OR)
1988	David G. Carter	Eastern Connecticut Univ.	1999	James E. Lyons	Cal-State Dominguez Hills
1989	F. C. Richardson	SUNY College at Buffalo	1999	Shirley A. Jackson	Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.
1989	Irvin D. Reid	Montclair State Univ. (NJ)	1999	Carol Surles	Eastern Illinois University
1989	William E. Trueheart	Bryant College (RI)	1999	Nathan A. Chapman	Univ. System of Maryland
1990	Marguerite R. Barnett	University of Houston	1999	F. J. Talley	Olivet College (MI)
1990	Albert Yates	Colorado State University	2000	Calvin O. Butts	SUNY-Westbury
1990	H. Patrick Swygert	SUNY-Albany	2000	George Campell, Jr.	Cooper Union (NY)
1990	Milton Gordon	Cal-State University-Fullerton	2000	Warrick L. Carter	Columbia College (IL)
1990	Otis L. Floyd	Tennessee State Regents	2000	James E. Walker	Southern Illinois University
1990	James H. Evans	Colgate Rochester Divinity	2001	Antoine Garibaldi	Gannon University (PA)
1991	Josephine Davis	York College-CCNY	2001	Ruth Simmons	Brown University (RI)
1991	James E. Walker	Middle Tennessee State Univ.	2001	Rodney D. Smith	Ramapo College
1991	David T. Shannon Sr.	Andover Newton Sem.	2001	Gregory H. Williams	City College of New York
1992	Ivory V. Nelson	Central Washington Univ.	2002	Elson S. Floyd	Univ. of Missouri System
1992	Lisa Porche-Burke	Cal. School of Prof. Psychology	2002	Paul Kirkpatrick	Great Basin College (NV)
1992	Randolph W. Bromery	Springfield College (MA)	2003	Adam W. Herbert	Indiana University
1992	Freeman Hrabowski	University of Maryland-Baltimore	2003	J. Chris Toe	Strayer University (VA)
1993	Harley E. Flack	Wright State University (OH)			

Source: The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges. Fikes (Summer, 2004).

president of a 4-year institution was Clifton R. Wharton who became president of Michigan State University in 1970, almost a century later. Interestingly, the years from 1873 to 1970 constitute a huge gap where no other African American served as president of a PWI. However, over the years, the criteria for leadership positions in higher education held by African Americans have become much more complex and political. African Americans who are most successful in acquiring leadership positions have engaged themselves in various leadership preparation programs such as the Kellogg NAFEO MSI Leadership Program (2004), Executive Leadership Summit (Hampton University, 2004), Millennium Leadership Initiative (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2004), American Council on Education Fellows Program (2004), Harvard Institutes for Higher Education (Harvard University, 2004) and others. Programs such as these enable individuals to enhance their previously acquired skills and opportunities. These same individuals are some of the most effective leaders in higher education. According to Mary Wisniewski (2002), in *Leadership in Higher Education: Implications for Leadership Development Programs,*

> Higher education faces an unprecedented period of accelerating change that is driven by shifts in public attitudes, reductions in the level of public support, questions regarding higher education's priorities, and demands for greater accountability. To respond effectively to the complex educational, social, political and economic concerns of society, higher education must develop a cadre of academic leaders who can engage the institution and its faculty/staff in change and transform processes. (p. 1)

In addressing public attitudes as well as the expectation for increased accountability and the need for preparation, all of which became a major focus for leadership in higher education, more African Americans began to break barriers by seeking and obtaining leadership positions at PWIs. Today, African Americans hold various challenging leadership positions that have been rewarding yet often burdensome as well after considering the additional hurdles that they have to cross.

Many of the same challenges are faced at both HBCUs and PWIs. However, African Americans at HBCUs face a unique kind of challenge compared to their counterparts at PWIs. These challenges include obtaining resources and major financial support from donors and alumni, questions about institutional existence and need for a minority institution, quality of leadership and ability, quality of academic programs, and many others.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study examines the experiences of African American administrators who hold leadership positions and provides a discussion of the importance of various leadership programs. It looks at 20 African Americans who hold leadership positions or once did (retirees) at historically black colleges and universities or at PWIs. Data were gathered based on a survey distributed to each participant. The participants were told that the information that they provided and their institution would remain anonymous. They were also told that the outcomes of the research would be published and shared with them.

THE SURVEY

The survey consisted of focused questions to learn of the progression of individuals to leadership positions, whether they came through traditional academic ranks or non-traditional paths. The survey examined the participants' leadership philosophy, their qualifications and skills, their participation in the interview process, their academic rank, years of service, age, highest degree, salary, academic discipline, participation in leadership programs, and opinions about other generic questions about leadership in higher education. The 20 participants consisted of five African American women. Three women were from HBCUs and two were from PWIs. Fifteen African American men participated in the study. Nine men were from HBCUs and six were from PWIs. Two of the latter six were from community colleges. (see Table 3).

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS

Participants Profile

All of the administrators who responded to the survey held or had held senior-level positions. They all believed that they had the necessary

Table 3. Gender by Type of Institution.

Gender	Number	HBCU	PWI
Male	15	9	6
Female	5	3	2
Total	20	12	8

qualifications and skills for a leadership position. Most had come up through the academic ranks as a tenured faculty in a discipline. Some had been a department head, a dean, a vice president, and a president. However, five participants did not come through the traditional ranks, four of them from HBCUs and one from a PWI. Only two participants did not hold tenure in a department, and they were from HBCUs. The majority of the participants had degrees in education, while one held a degree in English, one in business, one in communications, two in mathematics, and two in law. Eight had a Ph.D., nine had an Ed.D., two had a J.D., and one a D.B.A. The age of the participants ranged from the category of 35–40 to 61–70 years. Six participants were aged 61–70, two were 57–60, eight were 51–56, three were 46–56, and one was 35–40. Nine were presidents, two were retired presidents, four were provost/academic vice president/chancellors, one was vice president for development, one was a dean, one was an associate dean, and two were university lawyers.

The budget of the participants' institutions is also important in terms of how much leaders can accomplish and how successful they can be. The budget also depends on the size and the mission of the institution. The budget of the institutions in this survey ranged from less than $25,000,000 to $300,000,000. It is important to note that the budgets of PWIs are far bigger than those at HBCUs. The average HBCU participant's budget was $60,000,000 – $70,000,000, while the average PWI participant's budget was $100,000,000 to $200,000,000. Also, the HBCUs have fewer students than the PWIs. The average HBCU's student enrollment ranges from 3,000 to 4,000 while that at PWIs ranges from 15,000 to 20,000 (see Table 4).

The salaries of the associate dean, dean, and vice president for Academic Affairs ranged from $100,000 to $124,000. The salaries of the presidents ranged from $150,000 to $299,999, though one president received more than $350,000.

Table 4. Enrollment and Budget (in millions) by Type of Institution.

Students	HBCU	PWI
1,000–2,999; 3,000–4,999: 5,000–6,999	30–40; 40–70; 100–200	60–70; Less than 25; none
7,000–9,999	80–90	None
10,000–14,999	60–300	None
15,000–39,999	None	200–300
20,000–39,999	None	200–300

LEADERSHIP PHILOSOPHY

It is quite interesting to examine the participants' leadership philosophies. Many were similar. For example, they all believed that in order to lead, one must be able to build consensus, be inclusive and share. Campuses that are progressive, and where the administrators have good working relationships with the faculty, are institutions where the leadership relies heavily on shared governance. In order to be successful, individuals must be willing to work hard at creating good working relationships. This is the reason why most of the participants state that honesty and telling the truth are very important. However, one participant added that, as a leader, "the president or chancellor can never forget that the 'Buck stops with him or her.'" In other words, after gathering all of the necessary input, the president or chancellor has to make the final decision and be held accountable for that decision. Another individual said that one "must set high expectations and lead by examples, to work extremely hard and to focus on details and specificity, to insist on integrity and honesty (personally and organizationally), to always be communicating, and to always look for opportunities to partner and collaborate with others." It is clear that good leadership has to do with building consensus. One participant mentioned that it is important for "leaders to have mentors." Most importantly, leaders should have someone outside of their institution to serve as an adviser or just as a sounding board to talk to and provide thoughts about various decisions being considered.

Although the participants had similarities, they also had their own unique leadership philosophies. One African American female at a PWI stated that one should "promote a positive attitude; move fast, never procrastinate; be passionate about what you do or do something else; and be loyal to yourself, your family, and your fellow employees." An African American male at a PWI stated that one should "be knowledgeable, be prepared, be accessible/approachable, be compassionate but firm, be willing to do what you ask your followers to do, don't be naïve but assume that people want to do the right thing." Another African American male at a PWI said that one should "focus on the people and their involvement in the organization." An African American female from an HBCU said, "Good workers should be rewarded; tenure and promotion are not to be taken lightly. The institution does not exist to give any of us jobs, rather to teach and serve as role models for students, to foster creativity and productivity of faculty and staff, and to engage with the communities around us. A better world and people should be the fruits of our labor."

THE INTERVIEW

Six general questions involved the interview process. Most of the participants were candidates in one to four searches. However, two African American males were in numerous searches. One, from an HBCU, had been in ten searches, and another African American from a PWI was in twelve searches. Individuals have to be careful of the number of searches that they enter because they do not want to get labeled as applying for just any position, or appearing desperate. This could hurt their chances of obtaining a good position. The participants had varied impressions of their interviewers. Some of them felt very positive and had a good feeling about the interviewers. Others felt that they were "private but nice and quiet versus state supported institutions, with resources and politics." Other responses included *fair*, *quite well and through*, *well done*, *extensive*, *competent and knew what their institutions needed*, *fair and balanced*, *exhibited a strong commitment to excellence and loyalty to the mission of the university*. One African American male at an HBCU stated that the he felt that the "[interviewers] needed help." Another African American male at a PWI stated, "some were more organized than others."

Most of the participants stated that they interviewed over a 2-day period. Four of them interviewed for only 1 day, while two participants interviewed for 3 days. When asked how they were ranked by the interviewing team, most of the participants said that they ranked number one. However, there were other responses, such as:

> *I assume number one.*
> *All of the positions I interviewed for I was selected for the position except for one.*
> *Fourth choice.*
> *Very hard to say. You want to believe that if you were offered the job, you must have had the top billing. You never know.*
> *I was appointed president with a 5 to 3 vote.*

Many of the participants felt good about their institution, stating that it met their needs and they were quite satisfied. The responses varied:

> *Perfectly. The college has highly competent and committed faculty and staff, excellent community support, and a great reputation among peer institutions.*
> *It proved a superb opportunity to make a real substantive difference. [The university] was in its early development.*
> *[It] was my alma mater. I loved my job and worked hard.*
> *It allows me to serve the community, to enrich lives and raise educational levels in the community.*

[The university] has been very beneficial to my professional and personal development. I have been able to take advantage of several opportunities to fulfill my career goals.

The university was in need of an academic leader with a vast amount of experiences in another system.

The institution's philosophy is very compatible with my needs.

Very well. I just don't care for the politics.

Provided the experience (5 years) to lead the internal campus affairs of a mid-sized university undergoing significant transition.

Similar with [my] common interest and needs.

It is an HBCU committed to modernization for the future.

These responses illustrate how the participants felt the institution fit their needs in general. It is important for administrators and others to feel satisfied with their position and be pleased about the institution so that they can represent their campuses in a positive manner.

Participants were also asked if they were a good fit for the institution. All of the participants felt that they were. Responses included:

I have a significant history with the institution as a faculty member, director of an off-campus center, and vice president for academic affairs… I was involved in a number of community-related activities, which served to enhance the image of the college. I am a futurist who appreciates a historical foundation.

I had the right mix of academic preparation (business economist), prior background (technology and distance education), and leadership skills (military and academe) to lead organizations through transition.

I work to provide vision, directions, and energy for the institution.

I believe in putting the student first, and I believe in academic excellence.

I have been able to align my goals to meet the goals and objectives outlined in the mission statement for the university in significant ways.

The institution needed a leader with a vision of what it can become locally, regionally, and nationally

Good for 10 years when I was an advocate. When the conservatives took control they wanted me out because of my civil rights background.

Most of the participants said that they would be in their current positions from 1 to 3 years. Two stated that they would remain in their positions from 4 to 5 years, and two were already retired. The average tenure of a president is 5 years, and then he or she may seek positions at other institutions. The tenure of other administrators, such as vice presidents and deans, is similar to that of a university president.

Most of the participants believed that gender plays an important part in leadership positions. However, the majority of the participants felt that age did not play an important role in leadership positions. Only four stated that one's age does play an important part in leadership positions. As indicated in the "Participants Profile" section, the average age of the respondents in

this study were 51 years old and above. It is important to note that most of the participants believed that race does play a part in leadership positions. When asked how they handled individuals who judge them based on their race, the answers varied. Some of the responses were:

> *I choose not to make these judgments. Attempting to discern another's motives is always a bit problematic.*
> *With care.*
> *I feel sorry for them and treat them objectively.*
> *It is dependent on the situation and the condition. Most of the time, I choose to focus on performance and productivity opposed to race and gender.*
> *Historically, as a product of the 1960s, I have challenged them and called them on it.*
> *Take race out of the equation that matters.*
> *Work even harder to eliminate it as a factor.*
> *Ignore them.*
> *Consider them to be ignorant and ignore them.*
> *The research supports the fact that there is great disparity relative to race.*
> *It helps if you have worked in minority and majority leadership positions.*
> *I treat them just like I treat everybody else – fairly.*
> *…you cannot ''handle'' ignorance. You can help to educate these individuals who judge, primarily because they are ignorant. Display with pride and humility your knowledge, your skills. Speak forcibly, but not in a dominant manner. Enough to show that stereotypes about the speaking and writing skills of some minorities are wrong and do not apply to an entire group.*

The participants clearly had their own ways of handling those who judge them based on their race. African American administrators, like everybody else, should be judged on the credentials and their ability to get the job done. However, as illustrated in the majority of the responses, race in America does play a part in leadership positions. African Americans at PWIs face various racial challenges, whether brought about intentionally or not. Some individuals are not aware that they are inflicting racial challenges because they simply have little or no exposure to those who are different from themselves. African Americans at HBCUs face racial challenges as well, but they are different. African American administrators at HBCUs find themselves not only defending their existence but also having to prove they are worthy of competing with leaders at majority institutions.

When considering a leader, individuals tend to examine not just credentials, responses to questions or background, but also overall appearance. One hundred percent of the participants felt that personal grooming was extremely important. In addition to being prepared as a leader, grooming creates a first impression prior to discussions or conversations. Sixty percent of the participants felt that ''perhaps'' a person's weight plays a part in how he or she is viewed in a leadership position. Ninety percent of the

participants believed that it is extremely important to be a polished, articulate speaker as a leader.

The survey also asked about the amount of time spent on activities. On an average, the participants spent 35% of their time on day-to-day operations, 25% interacting with campus departments/communicating with executives, 20% networking with outside groups, 10% building conferences on campus, and 10% addressing crises. Ninety percent of the participants worked more than 60 hours a week.

The number one choice that participants checked as their biggest hurdle to their effectiveness was the lack of adequate financial resources. Second was ineffective communication, and third, the lack of key staff/skill sets while managing. Building staff was fourth and poor support and service levels were fifth. It is important to note that the PWIs were better funded than the HBCUs, yet they all believed that the lack of adequate financial resources was their biggest barrier.

African Americans who aspire to the presidency find themselves trying to gain the necessary experiences so that they will have the qualifications to one day lead an institution. However, a major challenge that exists is to find the appropriate path to the presidency or chancellorship of an institution. There are traditional paths and non-traditional ones. The traditional paths involve advancing through the academic ranks and perhaps becoming a department chair, a dean, and a vice president for academic affairs/provost, or executive vice president. Most of the participants believe that such academic experience is the appropriate path for a presidency. However, others believe that there is no one appropriate path, particularly because they did not travel the traditional route. Among the responses are:

> There is no exact path any more to the presidency. Candidates in today's environment must have the ability to set visions, raise resources, build constituency, and provide consistent leadership. This type of individual may not come from traditional ranks of the academy.
>
> You have to have the experience and knowledge inclusive of garnering appropriate support.
>
> With the caveat that it depends upon the type of institution. I would say someone who has (a) been a faculty member and (b) who has held a vice presidential position – preferably provost.
>
> In my opinion there is no "appropriate" path to the presidency or chancellorship of a campus. The selection of a candidate should rest largely on the needs of the respective campus.
>
> Series of higher education leadership positions of steadily increasing responsibility.
>
> Some academic experience and a wealth of administrative knowledge and experience.
>
> Provost/chief academic officer.
>
> Varies depending on type of institution.

Exceptional administrative experience, strong support system, effective networking skills, evidence of effective fundraising skills, and proven record of excellence.

There are many books and articles on this subject. The traditional route has been through the academic chain, but presidents have come from student affairs and financial affairs. Some universities are deliberately looking outside of academia to the business community, for example, or to former prominent public officials.

LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The survey also addressed leadership programs that may have strengthened administrators' skills. There are five leadership programs mentioned in this research: Kellogg NAFEO MSI Leadership Program, Executive Leadership Summit, Millennium Leadership Initiative, American Council on Education Fellows Program, and Harvard Institutes for Higher Education. However, the Kellogg NAFEO Program and the Executive Leadership Summit are discussed at length. Individuals were asked to list other leadership programs in which they had participated (see Table 5).

KELLOGG NAFEO MSI LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The Kellogg MSI Leadership Program is one of the newly established programs to address the needs of minority-serving institutions. The inaugural class began in 2003–2004 for three types of minority-serving institutions: National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), and Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). The MSI Fellows Program was designed to prepare minorities for higher education administrative positions. Many of the presidents, particularly those who had retired, stated that they needed or wanted someone who was ready to step

Table 5. Institution Affiliation by Leadership Program.

Affliation	Number	ACE	Kellogg/NAFEO	MLI	HIHE	Other
HBCU	12	1	4	2	5	5
PWI	8	2		1	2	3
Total	20	3	4	3	7	8

into the presidency and move the agenda forward. It was also stated that many individuals who had become new presidents did not have the preparation, knowledge or experience to lead an HBCU.

More specifically, the Kellogg NAFEO Fellows Program was created to address the needs of African American leadership. Overall, the program was designed to

> …prepare 10 exemplary individuals per year (or 30 individuals across the three programs) for the challenges and rigors of becoming the next generation of senior-level leaders at nearly 340 Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs) in the US. In addition to participation in joint and individual workshops, seminars, and discussion groups during the academic year, each Fellow is matched with a Mentor president from another MSI who serve as a guide and resource throughout the Fellowship year and beyond (http://www.aihec.org).

It is important to note that the individual workshops, seminars, and discussion groups focused on the specific type of university. For example, the NAFEO group dealt specifically with HBCU issues. This kind of approach is most beneficial to Fellows because minority-serving institutions have distinctive issues compared to PWIs, and even other colleges and universities when one considers cultural differences. The Kellogg NAFEO Fellows meet head on the challenges that they face in HBCUs. They gain invaluable experience from listening and learning from current model presidents as well as those who have retired. Equally important, the Fellows learn from leaders from diverse kinds of HBCUs such as public and private institutions. Experiences like these are important to enable individuals to lead various kinds of institutions and to ensure that administrators are prepared.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP SUMMIT

Another fairly new leadership program to address the issues of African American administrators began in 2001: the Executive Leadership Summit (ELS), held at Hampton University. The program was primarily started by William Harvey – and known as the "Harvey Executive Leadership Model" – to train individuals for administrative positions. It is a 2-day workshop that prepares individuals for many kinds of administrative experiences. "The Summit provides participants with an opportunity to receive professional development training from a cadre of highly successful executive leaders through stimulating lectures, case studies, interactive sessions and one-on-one dialogue" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2004, p. A51). The

program is for "presidents (recently appointed), chancellors (recently appointed), provosts, assistant provosts, vice presidents, deans, assistant deans and other appointed executives" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2004, p. A51). The mission and vision of the summit is to:

> Foster team-building and sharing of knowledge, skills, and abilities between those who hold executive positions and those who aspire to assume top leadership positions;
>
> Create a network among those serving in the position of president at diverse small and mid-sized comprehensive universities and colleges with emphasis on the challenges presidents face in such settings;
>
> Provide opportunities for aspiring executive officers to hear first-hand those challenges that presidents face as well as to be exposed to the range of strategies that current leaders have found successful;
>
> Assist tomorrow's leaders in the development of strategies for accomplishing personal and professional goals; and
>
> Provide professional development and retooling for those who aspire to maintain excellence in their current leadership positions. (http://www.hampton.edu/events/leadership_summit/02.htm)

Presidents who have served under Harvey's leadership return to the campus to share their experiences with prospective and current administrators.

PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

The participants who took part in leadership programs believed that the sessions were very beneficial. Among the responses:

> *I gained greater insights into the role and scope of community college presidents. The experience and the networking opportunities helped me crystallize my interest in becoming a president.*
>
> *The experiences encountered by past chancellors have been very beneficial. They told real stories and how situations were handled.*
>
> *The program provided insight and networking opportunities.*
>
> *The programs have been beneficial, both personally and professional, and viewed as significant learning opportunities.*
>
> *Actually, building a network of colleagues in specialized disciplines was most beneficial. But, the programs also focused on the principles and "how-to's" of basic leadership and management skills.*
>
> *The programs were designed to prepare change agents.*
>
> *The Program provided a framework for effective leadership behavior.*
>
> *All of the programs have been beneficial.*
>
> *The program provided interaction and discussion with other leaders.*

ACE was very instrumental in helping me to develop a clear understanding of trans-formational change in higher education institutions and the impact of public policy and opinions on the change process.

As illustrated in the responses, these leadership programs have helped to sharpen the participants' skills and have helped them serve as better leaders, enabling them to take their colleges and universities to the next level.

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

My personal responses are similar to those of the participants. I have been a fellow in three leadership programs: Kellogg NAFEO Fellows Program, Executive Leadership Summit, and the American Council on Education Fellows Program. I have spent the majority of my career at HBCUs; therefore, the Kellogg NAFEO Fellows Program was extremely helpful because it dealt specifically with issues that leaders face at black colleges and universities. Much of the discussion throughout the year-long experience (we met on designated dates during the academic year) centered upon the lack of resources, management, budget and finance, leadership skills, national trends, case studies, and "real life experiences" from current and formal presidents and other executive leaders. The generic sessions with NAFEO, AIHEC, and HACU Fellows enabled me to learn and have a more diverse experience. I held a full-time position while participating in the program which made it difficult at times. However, spending a month at another HBCU was one of the most rewarding parts of the fellowship. I got a chance to focus fulltime on my responsibilities as a fellow, shadow a president, work on a project at the visiting institution, and engage in the day-to-day activities of the office of the President. Since I was in the inaugural class for minority-serving institutions, our class set a precedent for future fellows.

Like the NAFEO Fellows Program, the Executive Leadership Summit focused on HBCUs as well as national trends and other issues. This program differed strikingly from NAFEO's in that participants met for one intense weekend of activities that involved discussions and group participation. The Executive Leadership Summit is also a good program, but hopefully in the near future it can be expanded over a longer period of time.

As an American Council on Education Fellow, I had the opportunity to spend an entire year shadowing two presidents. Since I was on leave from my position, I was able to devote all of my time to being a fellow. I had the time to take in new knowledge and experiences, and to reflect and digest the new information. The invaluable experience helped prepare me for a

life-long career in administration. The ACE program afforded me the opportunity to gain knowledge and experiences regarding several kinds of institution, which is very beneficial when seeking positions at diverse types of colleges and universities.

The three leadership experiences afforded me the opportunity to become an agent for change. Networking was one of the most rewarding parts of all three programs. I made lifetime friends with whom I often speak informally but also use as sounding boards when dealing with difficult issues and research opportunities. Certainly, I encourage other aspiring leaders to become involved in leadership programs.

COMPARISONS OF PROGRAMS

The five leadership programs – Kellogg/NAFEO, ELS, MLI, ACE, and HIHE – are all similar in that they address the needs of individuals who aspire to be senior-level administrators. Kellogg/NAFEO, ELS, and MLI all focus on higher educational issues that minorities and underrepresented groups face, which is much different from those programs that have only a segment geared toward minority issues. Kellogg/NAFEO and ELS focus on HBCU issues while MLS deals with various issues such as those facing minorities at HBCUs and PWIs. These programs are fairly new and were created to address the lack of prepared administrators. ACE and HIHE are very well established, have been in existence for over 35 years, and have had a great impact on thousands of leaders. Although the two programs address minority-serving institutions and issues, the thrust of the programs is generic and can apply to any institution of higher education. These programs have done well in recruiting a very diverse pool of participants and are well connected to many sectors in higher education and business and industry. Each of the five programs is necessary and plays a vital role in training leaders for tomorrow.

CONCLUSION

Certainly, African Americans have made great strides over the years. However, it has not been without many trials, triumphs, and struggles that have led them to seek their own unique paths and means of coping and obtaining senior-level administrative positions. It is clear that the traditional path to the presidency has been altered. Individuals who seek the presidency and

other senior-level positions are more and more emerging from a variety of areas of higher education, private and public sectors, and business and industry. Whether one obtains a senior-level position simply depends on the needs of the college or university and how an individual may serve those needs. Because there is no one traditional route to the presidency, African Americans have been able to take advantage of the leg-up offered by leadership programs. Leadership programs such as the Kellogg NAFEO MSI Leadership Program, Executive Leadership Summit, Millennium Leadership Initiative, American Council on Education Fellows Program, Harvard Institutes for Higher Education, and others have helped propel African Americans into high-level positions. Leadership programs continue to strengthen African Americans' leadership and administrative skills, which makes them stronger candidates for searches at minority- and majority-serving institutions. In the future, leadership programs will be even more beneficial as the role of the presidency and other executive-level positions continue to change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Millennium Leadership Initiative. (2004). Retrieved October 21, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.aascu.org/mli/default.htm.

American Council on Education Fellows Program. (2004). Retrieved October 14, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.acenet.edu/programs/fellows/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (2004). Executive leadership summit. Washington, DC, October 1, p. A51.

Fikes, R. Jr., (Summer 2004). African-American presidents of predominantly white colleges and university, 1873 to 2004. *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education.* Retrieved October 10, 2004 from Web site: http://www.jbhe.com/features/42_black_colleges_pres.html.

Hampton University Executive Leadership Summit (2004). Retrieved October 19, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.hampton.edu/events/leadership_summit/02.htm

Harvard University (2004). Institutes for Higher Education. Retrieved October 14, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://atwork.harvard.edu/training/leadership.

Kellogg NAEFO MSI Leadership Program. Future Higher Ed Leaders Finding Common Ground.(2004). Retrieved October 10, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.aihec.org/AIHEC%20Documents/Kellogg%20Leadership%20Fellows/KEL_MSI.pdf.

Manning, M. (1998). *Black leadership*. New York: Columbia University Press.

The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges. (Summer 1997). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*. Retrieved October 10, 2004 from the World Web: http://www.jstor.org/view/10773711ww.jstor.org/view/10773711/di985026/98p0943h/   0?frame = noframe&userID = a12dbc9d@mtsu.edu/ 01cce44035005015fff08&dpi = 3&config = jstor.

Wisniewski, M. A. (2002). Leadership in higher education: Implications for leadership development programs. *Academic Leadership*. Retrieved September 2, 2004 from Web site: http://www.academicleadership.org/cgibin/document.cgi?file = 5/article1.dhtm.

This page intentionally left blank

PART II:
THE FIRST WAVE: TRADITIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

This page intentionally left blank

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FELLOWS PROGRAM: CELEBRATING 40 YEARS OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

George Alan Smith and Marlene Ross

The American Council on Education (ACE) Fellows Program is ACE's signature program. Often referred to as the "crown jewel," it has become a well-known and highly regarded feature within higher education. It has strengthened the skills, enriched the experience, broadened the perspectives, and enhanced the careers of nearly 1,500 women and men, most of whom have gone on to become senior leaders in higher education.

The Fellows Program is also the longest running higher education leadership development program in the United States and perhaps the world. It continues to attract strong interest from fellowship candidates, nominating institutions, host institutions, foundations, and corporations. Other institutions interested in preparing future leaders have honored the program by collaborating with and emulating it.

But though many other organizations have adopted parts of its model, it is still the only higher education leadership development program with an

experiential component, giving Fellows firsthand experience observing and participating in top-level decision-making and being mentored by presidents and vice-presidents. This component is essential to achieving the primary goals of the program, which are:

- To provide comprehensive leadership development opportunities to senior faculty and administrators.
- To prepare knowledgeable and thoughtful leaders skilled in the management of change.
- To enhance the effectiveness of participating institutions.
- To increase the diversity of the pool of higher education leaders.
- To increase communication among leaders in different sectors of higher education.

ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

Leading higher education advocacy since 1918, ACE continued this rich tradition when it officially established the Academic Administration Internship Program (AAIP) in 1964, with the assistance of a generous $4.75 million grant from the Ford Foundation. The initiative, now widely known as the ACE Fellows Program, began as a 5-year academic administration program, but has successfully continued for 40 years, gaining national and international prominence along the way.

Designed to identify and prepare senior faculty and administrators for the highest-level positions, the Fellows Program began as a response to the growth of higher education in the mid-1960s and the lack of prepared professionals to assume critical leadership roles. As Pearson and Marmion (1985) pointed out in *The ACE Fellows Program: The First Twenty Years*:

> The Great Society programs were flourishing, and money was available for many new educational endeavors. The community college movement was in full swing, teachers' colleges had become multi-purpose institutions, and the emphasis on universal education created a heady atmosphere. Several hundred annual presidential vacancies were being filled rather unsystematically. Few, if any, institutions had formal programs to identify and educate future administrators (p. 10).

Responding to the lack of formal programs to prepare future higher education leaders, an ACE advisory committee set out to provide the program with its original directions. The advisers included John Carson, a professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University; John Millett,

chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents; and Ellis Phillips, president of the Phillips Foundation.

ACE member institutions nominated 128 candidates to fill 25 fellowship slots during the program's first year, and the University of Michigan served as the official meeting place for the program's first seminar.

Consistent with the times, the gender representation was unbalanced, favoring males, and there was very low racial and ethnic minority group representation. The original class of Fellows was composed largely of white males, but did include two African-American males and one white female, who was a nun. Since then, the ACE Fellows Program has made remarkable strides in balancing its gender proportions, as well as increasing representation of various US racial and ethnic minority groups. The 40th class of 38 Fellows in 2004–2005, consisted of 23 women and 15 men, with eight African Americans, four South Africans, two Hispanic Americans, two Asian Americans, and one Kenyan.

Since the program's inception, 39 percent of participants have been women and 61 percent have been men. Recent figures, however, show a more promising trend. Over the past 10 years, 52 percent of all Fellows have been women and 48 percent men. Also, over the course of the program, 18 percent of Fellows (or 260) have been African American (145 males and 115 females), 5 percent (67) have been Hispanic (38 males and 29 females), and 2 percent (29) have been Asian (20 males and 9 females). There also have been eight Native American (1 male and 7 females) and six multiracial (2 males and 4 females) Fellows. In comparison, the past 10 years of the program have yielded 62 percent (209) white Americans, 24 percent (82) African Americans, 7 percent (24) Hispanic Americans, 4 percent (15) Asian Americans, 1 percent (5) Native Americans, and 1 percent (4) individuals who are multiracial.

In addition to gender, race, and ethnic diversity, Fellows also come from all institutional types, including doctoral/research, master's, bachelor's, associate, and specialized degree-granting institutions. In the past 10 years, more than 75 percent of Fellows have come from master's and doctoral/research degree-granting institutions.

As the Fellows Program has evolved, so has its leadership. As the following table indicates, early directors of the program held the post for brief periods, while more recent directors have served much longer, bringing significant stability and consistency to the program. In fact, the two most recent directors have collectively led the program for nearly two-thirds of its 40 years.

Directors of the Fellows Program	
Lanier Cox	1965–1966
Maxwell E. Lapham	1966–1967
David C. Knapp	1967–1968
Charles G. Dobbins	1968–1973
Thomas M. Stauffer	1974–1978
Madeleine Green	1978–1990
Marlene Ross	1990–present

THE FELLOWS PROGRAM TODAY: LEARNING LEADERSHIP

The program continues to stand out among higher education leadership programs for its experiential component. A recent in-depth program review described this special element of the program that continues to be its primary attraction:

> [T]he Fellows have always had access to all aspects of decision making. They learn administration by doing it – by taking on significant responsibilities under the tutelage of their Mentors. Today, the ACE Fellows Program is still the most comprehensive leadership development program in higher education. As was the case in its initial mission, the program continues to contribute to the future of higher education by expanding its reserve of experienced, well-qualified leaders (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 2).

While many professionals learn their jobs through trial and error, Fellows have the unique opportunity to learn the essential elements of campus leadership *before* they take on the job. They observe leadership in action, participate in top-level decision-making meetings, and hear analyses of the choices available to presidents and rationales for choosing one option over another. The Fellows have time to think about critical issues confronting higher education and explore potential solutions before they must make their decisions. In addition to their mentors, they discuss these issues with the other Fellows in their class, who represent a total of more than 70 institutions (including home and host). They participate in a rich learning experience, earning career-long advisers and friendships.

John C. Cavanaugh (1994–1995 ACE Fellow), president of the University of West Florida, said, "Only the ACE Fellows Program provides hands-on experience with proven, successful leaders in a mentorship model.

No simulation – no matter how good – can substitute for the real thing.'' Moreover, in his unpublished manuscript *The ACE Fellows Program: The Third Decade*, Robert E. Shoenberg (1994) found that ''the most widely appreciated aspect of the program is the broader awareness Fellows get of both individual institutions and higher education generally'' (p. 22). Shoenberg attributes this to their intimate exposure to critical issues at a higher education institution other than their home campus, and interaction with approximately 35 other Fellows from different institutions in different regions with different missions and cultures. In fact, Walter Massey (1974–75 ACE Fellow), president of Morehouse College, claims that ''faculty with some appetite and talent for administration need time to read and study education policy issues, to broaden their view and interests, and to cultivate their skills at working with people from various backgrounds. The ACE Fellows Program provides both the time and exposure'' that allow this learning to occur. A more recent Fellow, William Lynch (2004–2005), associate professor, voice & speech and vice president, Faculty Senate, Webster University, concurred, and commented on the program's global network:

> The Fellows Program provides an unparalleled opportunity to observe the administration of higher education at the micro and macro levels. In addition to the daily mentoring I receive at my host institution from the president and the senior administrative team, I have met with leaders in education at the state and national levels. I even met several presidents of universities in China!

THE PROGRAM: A YEAR OF CHOICES

Being an ACE Fellow opens doors to situations that are new to most Fellows. The fellowship year offers many opportunities for learning, and Fellows invariably have to choose among many interesting meetings, events, conversations, and visits.

To begin with, Fellows have three distinct participatory options: they can choose to leave their home institutions for either a full academic year, a semester, or periodic visits. The full academic year commitment is highly recommended, and most Fellows select it. In fact, Fellows who choose either the semester placement or periodic visits option often lament about the brevity of their experience and emphasize how much they would have preferred more time to work with the president and other mentors at their host institutions.

The program is built on one very important premise: *Leadership can be learned*. Fellows are exposed to both the theory and practice of higher

education leadership. To this end, each Fellow prepares a Learning Contract with input from his or her nominator. The Learning Contract identifies the Fellow's learning objectives, the methods that will be used to meet those objectives, and the questions that he or she would like to be answered over the course of the fellowship. The Fellow, nominator, and mentors all sign the contract. Although the mandatory learning contract serves as a formal accountability document, it is not a rigid script that cannot be altered as the year progresses. In fact, Fellows are encouraged to take advantage of every learning opportunity, even those that may not directly relate to the matters in the contract.

The Learning Contract also requires Fellows to collaborate with their nominators to select and describe an issue, project, or topic pertinent to their nominating institution. As they read, talk with other Fellows, visit other campuses, and attend conferences, Fellows raise questions and learn more about their projects. By doing so, they develop expertise in human and material resources that they can apply to the issue when they return to their home institution.

Twice during the year (mid-December and mid-June), Fellows complete a progress report in which they detail their work toward the objectives in the learning contract and discuss the effect of the entire experience (internship, seminars, campus visits, national conferences, observations, conversations, readings, etc.) on their thinking about leadership, administration, decision-making, and governance. Specifically, they discuss what they are learning and the differences that their new knowledge is making to their professional development.

The Mentoring Relationships

In a commemorative booklet in honor of the program's 40-year anniversary, David Fulton (2005), ACE Fellow 1989–1990, and past chair of the Council of Fellows (the alumni/ae group), described the essential elements of the program, including the importance of the mentoring relationships in helping the Fellows address current higher education issues:

> Four enduring features characterize the Fellows Program: its inclusiveness, in terms of people and institutions; the experiential learning strategy; the unique, long-term, one-on-one mentoring relationship; and the exposure of Fellows to the major leadership issues facing higher education…. A nominator will likely nominate those individuals who show promise at helping the institution meet current and future challenges. A mentor will work with a Fellow on those issues that he or she is dealing with every day (pp. 16–17).

For four decades, Fellows have applauded and expressed appreciation for the exposure that their mentors have given them. Fellows of the 40th class remain just as pleased with these relationships as earlier classes. William Lynch of the 2004–2005 class explained his mentoring experience:

> It has been humbling and inspiring to work closely with leaders who are so passionate and dedicated to the future of higher education. It is equally amazing that these leaders are so generous with their time, candid about the lessons they have learned, and eager to hear my opinions. I am confident that I am building relationships that will last throughout my career, and I am looking forward to the opportunity to share my newly found knowledge with others!

Echoing some of Lynch's points about the mentoring relationship, Fellow Helen Williams, assistant dean, College of Arts & Sciences, University of Delaware, and also of the 2004–2005 class, said:

> The primary mentor at my host institution makes certain that I have access to a variety of internal and external opportunities. Realizing that calm waters do not make a competent sailor, he is deliberately transparent, which permits me to observe him both in moments of confidence and of uncertainty. This demystifies the presidency, casts it in a sense of reality, and enables me to garner maximum benefit from my fellowship experience.

Tom Hayes, professor of Marketing, Xavier University (OH), also of the 40th class, illuminated the role of trust between the Fellows and their mentors:

> The thing I enjoy most about my relationship with my mentor is the level of openness that exists between us. She is very accessible and very frank with her observations and opinions about the dynamics of the college and anything else we discuss. She trusts me to keep everything confidential and I appreciate that. She is also very good about letting me know what I should work on based on her observations and does so in a "gentle" manner. I am drawn to her level of enthusiasm and energy.

The Curriculum

In addition to the mentorship, Fellows participate in three weeklong seminars: *opening* (generally held in late August), *mid-year* (generally in early January), and *closing* (generally in early June). The seminars feature experts on various topics within the following themes:

Leadership and Institutional Change
Diversity on Campus
Strategic Planning

The Business of Higher Education, including Financial Management, Budgeting, Resource Allocation, Fund Accounting, and Financial Reports and Analyses.

Academic Planning and Management
Technology Issues
Personal and Professional Dimensions of Higher Education Administration
External Forces Affecting Higher Education: Local, State, Regional, National, and International

With their travel funded through a professional development account provided by the host institutions, Fellows also are able to visit other campuses and attend national conferences. They are encouraged to go to conferences that they have never attended, particularly those on broad national issues rather than just ones related to their disciplines. Some Fellows organize panels to discuss their experiences as Fellows; others prepare sessions about an area they studied during their fellowship year and become presenters at these conferences.

Fellows also are encouraged to visit additional colleges and universities and other industries to complement their experiences at their host institutions. Fellows usually arrange for these visits to take place in the cities where the program's seminars will occur, typically before the seminars begin. With these campus visits, Fellows broaden their understanding of the many types of institutions that exist in the United States. They learn about the similar and different challenges institutions face and the variety of strategies used, which helps broaden their perspectives and understanding of higher education.

Each class of Fellows usually plans and executes at least one trip abroad, during which they visit universities and meet with influential higher education leaders. In recent years, Fellows have visited Jamaica, the United Kingdom, South Africa, Cuba, and Hungary. The Fellows have met with ministers of education, as well as presidents and other institutional leaders, to learn about the challenges and different cultural contexts of higher educational institutions in these places. In most cases, the Fellows establish collaborative relationships with institutions in other countries on behalf of their home and/or host institution.

THE RELATIONSHIP PARTICIPANTS: BENEFITS FOR NOMINATORS, MENTORS, AND FELLOWS

The Nominators

Some of the immediate and long-term payoffs that nominators attribute to the ACE Fellows Program include:

- Fellows return to their home campuses with new ideas, perspectives, knowledge, and skills in critical areas.
- Fellows have access to a global network of seasoned colleagues who are willing to share and discuss their best practices and approaches to institutional challenges.
- Fellows are prepared to assume a variety of leadership positions.
- Fellows can lead special initiatives or projects of urgent concern.

The Mentors

For mentors, there are clear rewards in having an ACE Fellow on campus. Higher education leaders who have hosted and mentored Fellows report that:

- Fellows offer a new slant on issues. They provide perspectives, ideas, and expertise from a different institutional culture.
- Fellows provide a direct professional link with other higher education leaders from institutions around the country.
- Fellows become a staff resource to pursue special projects, attend meetings, and provide a critical outsider's perspective to institutional approaches and issues.
- Fellows are part of a richer and broader pool of higher education leaders.
- Fellows are lifelong colleagues and professional friends.

In fact, the program's recent in-depth review supports these assertions. The following statements are indicative of the comments mentors have made about the benefits of mentoring a Fellow:

> *The Fellow provided a fresher, broader, outside perspective.*
> *It was our pride and duty to mentor a future leader.*
> *Mentoring a Fellow personally benefited me as a leader.*
> *The Fellow was and/or continues to be a valued colleague.*
> *The Fellow made a real contribution to this institution.*
> *The mentoring experience was so positive I'd like to do it again.*
> *The Fellows Program enhanced the growth of our own institutional leadership.*
> *It provided us an opportunity to learn about ACE and better understand the Fellows Program.*

One president, a former Fellow, commented,

> [My institution] is a better place because [the Fellow] was a part of it. I also appreciated the opportunity to be back in touch with the ACE Fellows Program. It is a wonderful program, and I believe in it deeply. In addition to his professional contributions, I have also benefited personally from having a new friend. It is a friendship I will maintain and prize for years to come (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, pp. 18–19)!

The Fellows

ACE Fellows Program alumni/ae commonly credit the Fellows Program
with providing them exceptional opportunities to:

- Observe firsthand how institutions and leaders solve real problems and
  challenges.
- Work alongside a president, a provost, or both on issues that are critical
  to the future of higher education.
- Stretch themselves intellectually and personally by leaving their home
  institutions, learning to interact with other Fellows, and participating in
  exciting projects and initiatives at an institution different from their own.
- Work on projects of great interest to them, their home campus, and their
  host institution.
- Receive on-the-job leadership training that transforms their lives and ca-
  reers.
- Make the difficult leap from a particular discipline to a position of lead-
  ership that requires a different set of abilities and skills and a much
  broader institutional perspective.
- Interact informally with other Fellows to share ideas, insights, and ex-
  periences.
- Gain the skills and experience they need to advance into positions of
  greater leadership responsibility.

To date, there have been nearly 1,500 Fellows, of whom more than 260 have
become presidents and chancellors of more than 300 colleges, universities,
and systems. Many of these Fellows who have served in such higher ed-
ucation leadership positions attribute their success as presidents to their
experience in the Fellows Program and the support they received from their
mentors and nominators. Irving P. McPhail, former chancellor of the Com-
munity College of Baltimore (1978–1979 ACE Fellow), is convinced that the
program "started [his] journey in academic leadership and propelled [him] to
two successful presidencies and a chancellorship."

   Mentors and nominators are just as enthusiastic about the relationships.
Jacquelyn M. Belcher, former president of Georgia Perimeter College,
stressed that her institution's Fellows "return home with a greater under-
standing and appreciation for the challenges of leadership. They add to the
internal pool from which future mid-level and senior leaders may be chosen."

   Echoing these sentiments, the 2004 in-depth review of the Fellows Pro-
gram found:

Fellows, alumni/ae, and senior leaders in higher education view the Fellows Program very positively. It is perceived as a high-quality program and an important service provided by ACE.

The program is seen as an important means of preparing individuals, especially those from underrepresented groups, for senior administrative leadership positions.

When Fellows were asked to discuss the impact of the program in focus group discussions, the following themes summarize the major points they raised. The themes are followed by sample comments.

- They became stronger faculty leaders on campus.

  [I]t's made me a much stronger faculty leader on our campus…[W]hen I'm serving on committees and chairing committees, I have a different lens than I did before I did the fellowship in administration. As a result, we've written a white paper on teaching and assessment…I didn't even know what [those] words meant prior to the fellowship. Now, we have a strong initiative, faculty-grounded, in looking at learning on campus and measuring learning. That's just a concrete example. But I think the idea sometimes with this fellowship is that it's there to create only administrators. I think one of the parts that we neglect is some of us then decide to go back as faculty members. And that gives us perspective and a lens to look at our campus in a completely different way, because we all know the strongest group on campus is strong faculty (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 14).

- They gained preparation for overall campus leadership, not for a specific position.

  I think the fellowship year prepared me for leadership, not for a position. When I came back to the campus, I was a coordinator of a doctoral program. I had about 15 doctoral students, I had to teach one graduate class, and I was called upon to be assistant dean. After two weeks, I was called to be an interim vice provost. I was pulled in all directions. But one thing that I discovered was that people were interested in my leadership (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 14).

- They gained a broader, national perspective on higher education issues.

  When you're back on campus…you know there are very few people on campus who really have a clear picture of what's happening at the national level…[Y]ou have the knowledge base. You're not just sitting there speculating.… So you go back with such a tremendous amount of information and knowledge about issues in general but also about your peer institutions and, more importantly, your peers (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, pp. 14–15).

- They learned to facilitate change.

  I got a much better understanding of how to facilitate the change process. And in a faculty roles and rewards task force that I'm heading, I've thought about it much differently than I would have, had I been charged with this responsibility before the fellowship (Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 15).

- They gained a stronger sense of self-confidence in their leadership skills.

> [The Fellows Program] has really taught me to have more confidence in myself.... I sit down with the provost once a month to talk about the task force and how it's proceeding. If he makes a suggestion and I feel strongly that that's not the way to go, I don't hesitate to speak up. I know how to finesse it so I'm not openly disagreeing with him, but if I feel strongly that what he's suggesting won't work, then I don't hesitate to say, "Well, that's one idea and approach, and we'll try out this for a while." And I think it has served that process very well (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 15).

As these statements indicate, participants reported that the ACE Fellows Program increased their leadership skills and enabled them to assume various responsibilities and positions in higher education. Some of the Fellows took these skills back to the faculty ranks, while others used them in new leadership positions on their home campuses. The program review pointed out that the most commonly reported perspectives were "a broader, national (and for some, international) perspective of higher education, as well as being able to facilitate change on their campuses" (ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report, 2004, p. 15).

The Selection Process

Applications are due on November 1 each year. Applicants must provide their professional and educational history, civic and community engagement, college and university service, professional activities, honors, fellowships, listings, awards, and research support. They also must write three brief essays and a general statement about their background, and provide four references, two of which must come from people who have supervised their work.

Upon receiving completed applications, a selection committee, including college and university leaders and ACE staff, carefully evaluates each candidate's file. Approximately 50 finalists are invited to Washington, DC, in late January and early February for interviews conducted by a committee of presidents. The announcement of the new Fellows class for the following academic year occurs in early March.

Any ACE member institution may host an ACE Fellow, and the nominator and Fellow work collaboratively with the ACE Fellows Program staff to select the host institution. Candidates need not identify their desired host institution before their selection as a Fellow.

Fellows are expected to return to their nominating institutions for at least one year after the fellowship. In fact, many Fellows return to their home

campuses for many more years, making significant contributions to their institutions in a variety of ways. College and university leaders who have arranged for the Fellows to return to new or expanded responsibilities benefit from the leadership skills, energy, and new ideas these Fellows bring back to their home institutions.

Many Fellows experience "end of the Fellowship blues." Participating in the inner circle of the president and vice presidents is such a special privilege that Fellows find it difficult to think about returning to their prior roles. Some Fellows compete for new positions on their campuses and are selected; some are appointed as special assistants to the president or vice president for a specific project; others are delighted to return to their former positions, with time to process all that they have learned.

Outcomes

The program broadens Fellows' thinking in ways not possible on one's own campus, provides them with a better understanding of higher education's challenges and potential solutions, gives them a national perspective on pertinent issues, exposes them to various types of higher education institutions, teaches them how to ask the right questions in order to get information they need, encourages them to welcome new ideas, and allows them to improve their leadership skills in a non-threatening and low-risk environment. They thrive as lifelong learners, and become essential contributors to a lifetime network of colleagues and friends.

"ONCE A FELLOW, ALWAYS A FELLOW"

In 1980, the program established a formal body of its alumni/ae – the Council of Fellows (COF), governed by an Executive Committee of 36 people, with 12 elected each year by the membership for a 3-year term. The officers, a chair, vice chair/chair-elect, and secretary/treasurer also are elected annually by the alumni/ae. The COF has four permanent committees (Finance and Annual Fund, Professional Development, Outreach and Engagement, and Nominating) that meet twice annually – at ACE's annual meeting in February and during COF weekend in Washington, DC, in June – to plan professional development workshops and other activities for the alumni/ae, help determine the direction of the Fellows Program, and support its sustainability. For example, the COF holds two professional development

conferences yearly, including an afternoon of professional development workshops on the day before the opening of ACE's annual meeting. Usually attended by 200 – 250 Fellows and other higher education professionals, these programs focus on current issues affecting higher education. The 2004 program, with the theme "The Business of Higher Education," included presentations and panel discussions on maintaining high quality in a time of financial stringency and the increasing role of technology in higher education.

The COF weekend is strategically scheduled immediately before the program's closing seminar so that incoming, current, and past Fellows can meet and interact with one another. The COF weekends are consistently well-attended by the Fellows, who enjoy the opportunity not only to convene, but also to participate in well-organized professional development activities and hear from well-respected higher education leaders and trend-setters. The 2004 COF weekend focused on both current and predicted roles of for-profit universities. Featured speakers included the president of the University of Phoenix, the president of a DeVry Institute campus, the vice president of Kaplan College, and the vice president of the Apollo Group, who addressed international expansion.

Another COF weekend during the latter half of the Program's fourth decade featured the late Frank Newman, then director of the Futures Project, who delivered a keynote address titled "The Seduction of the Academy: Can the Higher Education We Know and Love Survive the Lure of the Market?" Other presenters that weekend included Robert C. Dickeson, senior vice president for higher education policy, research, and evaluation, Lumina Foundation for Education, whose presentation was titled "Pogo Was Right: The Academy Is Its Own Worst Enemy," and Matthew Pittinsky, co-founder and chairman of Blackboard, Inc., who spoke on "The Wired Tower."

Since 1984, the COF has organized an annual fund. All Fellows are encouraged to make contributions to the fund, which is facilitated by the Finance and Annual Fund Committee. Each year, the Annual Fund campaign raises approximately $30,000. These funds support professional development activities for the alumni/ae and institutional stipends for Fellows from underrepresented groups, such as those from minority-serving institutions or community colleges.

In 2004, the COF also created the Fund for the Future, a quasi-endowment to support recruitment of new Fellows and to provide scholarship support for nominating institutions. Contributions from alumni/ae and others will help keep the Fellows Program affordable for those who might not otherwise be able to participate.

The COF has established an award for outstanding mentoring. The award recognizes those mentors who have demonstrated intentional mentoring, articulated strategies and values that underlay decisions, exhibited transformational leadership, and maintained a continuous relationship with their Fellows. The first honorees, who received their awards during the opening plenary session of ACE's Annual Meeting in February 2005, were Robert Carothers, president, University of Rhode Island, mentor to nine Fellows, and David Roselle, president, University of Delaware, mentor to six.

The *COF Newsletter*, published each year in the fall and spring, highlights the professional accomplishments of Fellows. The newsletter is also a means to share important events and dates. Fellows submit articles of all types, including those about conferences they have attended, presentations they have given, trips they have taken, books they have read, and issues on their campuses. There is also a section listing changes in Fellows' professional positions and contact information in order to maintain a useful and productive professional network.

Although a fellowship lasts for no longer than an academic year, the COF enables the collegiality, mentoring, and professional counseling and networking for the Fellows to continue. F. Javier Cevallos, president, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, a 1996–1997 ACE Fellow, and 2004–2005 COF chair, explained:

> I was amazed by the number of individuals who opened their doors to the Fellows [and how] the combination of Fellows, mentors, nominators, and supporters of the program…create an impressive lifetime network of colleagues.

The relationships are everlasting, and *Fellows are always Fellows*.

CHANGES OVER THE DECADES

Although the Ford Foundation contributed start-up funds for the Fellows Program's first 5 years only, including all expenses for Fellows, the program has continued to thrive with a strong commitment from ACE, its member institutions, other foundations, and sponsors. The nominating institutions, host institutions, and ACE now share expenses for the fellowships. ACE supports the program infrastructure, including staff salaries, the development of program materials, and expenses for speakers. Home institutions are responsible for the Fellows' salary and benefits during the fellowship year, while the host institutions pay a program fee and provide the Fellows' professional development expenses.

Reflecting on the program's 40-year milestone, Fulton (2005) attributed higher education institutions' continued willingness to fund each new class of Fellows to the program's stellar reputation:

> The program's longevity provides other critical evidence of its quality. The design of the Fellows Program requires it to obtain the active support of well over a hundred presidents each and every year to nominate, pay for, and host Fellows. The commitment…is significant, in terms of actions taken, time, and treasure. Over the years, literally thousands of presidents have made these commitments. That the Fellows Program has managed to command such commitment for 40 years strongly substantiates its importance and effectiveness (p. 16).

Funding from outside academia also has helped sustain the program. Since the Ford Foundation contributed its initial grant, the program has received many grants for various initiatives from other foundations and corporations, including the Asia Foundation, BellSouth Foundation, Bush Foundation, CIGNA Corporation, Gabilan Foundation, General Service Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, Hewlett Foundation, IBM Corporation, James Irvine Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, James Knight Foundation, Lilly Endowment, Inc., Lumina Foundation for Education, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Phillips Petroleum Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, the Stuart Foundation, and USA Group Foundation.

In 2003, the program was awarded a $905,589 2-year grant from the Lumina Foundation for Education to help increase the number of Fellows from community colleges. In past years, ACE has received relatively few nominations from community colleges, typically two or three each year. However, due to the grant from Lumina, nominations from community colleges rose to nearly 20. Another recent grant from the Henry Luce Foundation was awarded to integrate information technology into program curriculum and delivery. With the help of this grant, program staff members have conducted a series of mentor orientations via videoconference, and have converted all official program forms to electronic format. In addition to printed brochures, flyers, and applications, these program materials can be downloaded from the ACE web site at http://www.acenet.edu/programs/fellows/.

Although the program's curriculum has changed during the past four decades, its original framework has remained consistent. Shoenberg (1994) explained that the program's model, which "forms the basis for this enterprise, continues to work well in providing a stable platform on which to ground the Fellows Program and an adaptable structure that allows it to respond to the continuing changes in higher education and in the program's immediate circumstances" (p. 1).

One significant curriculum change worth noting is a shift from simple hierarchical views of leadership to those that are much more collaborative and complex, an adjustment that is widely reflected in contemporary literature about the subject. Another curricular change is the integration of Blackboard^{TM}, an online course management system that Fellows use to access the program's agenda and required and suggested readings. Fellows also use Blackboard to engage in small group work, using synchronous and asynchronous conversations between seminars, and to communicate with one another during and after their fellowship year.

Over the years, the number of applicants without traditional academic backgrounds, but who come from administrative positions in higher education, has increased. These Fellows have a wealth of experience in higher education administration and provide different perspectives to the learning community formed by the Fellows.

A final notable change relates to the program's burgeoning international exposure. For instance, the 2004–2005 class of Fellows included five international participants among its 38 members: one Kenyan and four South Africans. Previous classes have attracted Fellows from Turkey, the Czech Republic, India, and Mexico.

COLLABORATIONS

Throughout its history, the ACE Fellows Program has collaborated with numerous organizations throughout the United States and abroad, to provide leadership training for their established and emerging leaders. ACE has collaborated with the Fulbright Program, to sponsor college leaders from India; the South African Universities Vice Chancellors Association (SAUVCA), to sponsor several university leaders from that country; and the F. Marion Bishop Trust Foundation, to sponsor doctors of family medicine who were preparing to be medical school deans and health science center vice presidents. SAUVCA plans to join the ranks of other institutions that have adopted the Fellows Program's model, by establishing a leadership development program of its own for South African higher education professionals.

LOOKING AHEAD

The ACE Fellows Program has maintained a stellar reputation within the higher education community for 40 years. The program's staff foresee

continued integration of information technology to assist in its delivery, and expanded partnerships and collaborations as well as keeping the curriculum current and relevant for higher education leadership. Fulton (2005) observed:

> The Fellows Program has…avoided what might be called organizational entropy – a gradual decline in the energy in the system. It takes a great deal of energy to recruit nominators, Fellows, and mentors year in and year out, in good years and bad. The energy available to most organizations, particularly those dependent on voluntary commitments of time and money, gradually subsides over time. There is no evidence of such a decline in the Fellows Program. In fact, in the program review report, there is considerable evidence of continued vitality among the staff, alumni/ae, and other program supporters (p. 16).

With such accolades from current and former Fellows, nominators, and mentors, the ACE Fellows Program seems clearly here to stay. Fulton (2005) continued:

> The ability to maintain the loyalty of a large group of presidents, the energy to persistently recruit Fellows, mentors, and nominators, and the flexibility to adapt to changing times – these factors together explain the longevity of the Fellows Program. There appears no reason why these same factors will not carry the program for another 40 years. The American Council on Education is exceedingly well-served by its 'signature' program to the ultimate benefit of the higher education community throughout the nation [and the world] (p. 17).

The Fellows Program continues to shape and often transform the lives of the men and women who participate. Most of them indicate that the program has been the best professional development experience of their lives, changed the way they thought about themselves, influenced their professional decision-making, and provided opportunities for establishing a network of new best friends.

REFERENCES

ACE Fellows Program Review: Self-Study Report. (2004). Washington, DC: American Council on Education (unpublished).

American Council on Education. (2005). The fellows program. Retrieved January 10, 2005 from the World Wide Web: www.acenet.edu/programs/fellows/

Fulton, D. (2005). *ACE 40th anniversary commemorative booklet*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Pearson, C., & Marmion, H. (1985). *The ACE fellows program: The first twenty years*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Shoenberg, R. E. (1994). *The ACE fellows program: The third decade*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education (unpublished).

THE HARVARD INSTITUTES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF FOSTERING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS OF COLOR

Joseph P. Zolner

For more than 35 years, the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education (HIHE) have been offering comprehensive leadership development programs for the higher education community. HIHE is an administrative unit of the Harvard Graduate School of Education whose mission is to provide post-degree professional development experiences of high quality and high relevance to higher education practitioners. Over time, HIHE programs have been developed and structured in ways to address the managerial challenges and career advancement issues faced by higher education leaders at distinct stages in their professional careers.

Directed at a broad cross-section of administrative levels and areas of professional responsibility, HIHE offers four "core" summer institutes as well as other programs targeted to specific segments of the higher education community. HIHE's four core programs include:[1]

The Harvard Seminar for New Presidents. This 6-day program is for newly appointed college and university presidents and chancellors. The presidential experience of those participating in the seminar ranges from chief executives who have been appointed but not yet assumed office to those who have completed no more than 12 months of their presidencies. The program focuses on key leadership transition and organizational entry issues faced by newly appointed presidents. The curriculum focuses on governance and board relations, building and managing the senior leadership team, institutional advancement, financial management, the daily demands of the office, and the "personal side" of the presidency.

The Institute for Educational Management. This 2-week offering is for experienced presidents, provosts, and other members of the president's senior leadership team. The program addresses key challenges confronting the chief executive and his/her cabinet-level colleagues and also provides opportunities for personal reflection and professional renewal. The Institute for Educational Management (IEM) curriculum covers four key topics – senior leadership essentials (addressing areas like leadership, governance, and financial management), the many contexts of leadership (including campus diversity and building an effective senior leadership team), the changing higher education "industry" (touching on the growing "corporatization" and commercialization of academe and the advent of significant competitive threats posed by for-profit institutions and other non-traditional educational providers), and mobilizing for change (helping participants develop action plans to foster productive on-campus innovation and institutional transformation).

The Management Development Program. This 2-week program is for middle-level managers in the early years of their administrative careers (deans, associate deans, assistant deans, program directors, and department heads) and covers the distinctive set of leadership challenges associated with managing from the "middle" of the institution. The curriculum addresses leadership, team effectiveness, campus community and diversity, academic administration, institutional values and integrity, financial management, strategic mentoring, planning, and fostering innovation and change.

The Institute for Management and Leadership in Education. This 2-week institute is for experienced administrators (vice presidents and deans are the administrative positions most represented in the program) and considers the organizational and personal factors most responsible for fostering institutional change and transformation. Most participants are embroiled in significant change issues on their campuses (strategic repositioning, reorganization, introduction of new curricula and/or programs, and the like) during

the time of their institute participation. The curriculum addresses topics of importance to aspiring institutional change agents – leadership, financial management, strategic alliances, institutional partnerships, planning, and transformational learning.

In addition to the four "core" summer programs (delivered annually) described above, HIHE has developed additional professional development experiences for targeted higher education constituencies. For example, HIHE currently offers a 1-week leadership institute for college and university librarians (offered in collaboration with the Association of College and Research Libraries) in the summer. In the past, HIHE has offered a "Seminar on Advancement Leadership for Presidents" designed for college and university chief executives in conjunction with the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), a governance program for teams of chief executives and board chairs of higher education institutions and not-for-profit organizations in conjunction with BoardSource, a 1-week leadership program for higher education general counsel in association with the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA), and a seminar for college and university trustees, regents, and other governing board members.

In short, HIHE has considerable experience (and an impressive track record over many years) serving the leadership development needs of the higher education community and specific administrative functions within it.

In a typical year, HIHE welcomes between 450 and 500 higher education leaders to its programs; many of these participants are administrators of color. Since its inception in 1970, HIHE has welcomed over 7,000 college and university leaders from both the US and abroad to one or more of its professional development offerings.

HIHE strives to create intensive, highly interactive, "retreat-like" experiences that provide the information and insights necessary for personal and institutional success. The Harvard programs offer an all-too-rare opportunity for administrators to focus on critical leadership and management issues in the company of talented colleagues from an eclectic and heterogeneous crosssection of colleges and universities. Through case studies,[2] discussions, small group interaction, and a variety of other learning methods, HIHE participants acquire new perspectives on leadership, engage in personal reflection, create conditions for meaningful professional renewal, and build more effective professional networks.

A critical component of HIHE's success is the ongoing involvement of multiple Harvard Graduate School of Education faculty members in institute planning, design, and delivery. Key faculty contributors include Richard Chait (Professor of Higher Education), Richard Elmore (Gregory

R. Anrig Professor of Educational Leadership), James Honan (Senior Lecturer on Education and IEM Educational Co-Chair), Susan Moore Johnson (Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. Professor of Teaching and Learning), Robert Kegan (William and Miriam Meehan Professor in Adult Learning and Professional Development and MLE Educational Chair), Richard Light (Walter H. Gale Professor of Education), Bridget Terry Long (Associate Professor of Education), Judith Block McLaughlin (Senior Lecturer on Education and HSNP Educational Chair), Gary Orfield (Professor of Education and Social Policy), and Charles Willie (Charles W. Eliot Professor of Education, Emeritus).

HIHE also administers an alumni relations program designed to keep institute participants in touch with each other and with developments at Harvard. There have been four distinct elements to HIHE's ongoing contact with program alumni:

Delivery of an annual "Alumni Seminar" professional development program: Each fall, HIHE stages a program designed exclusively for institute alumni that focuses on a key issue of relevance to higher education leaders. Past seminars have addressed the future of affirmative action in higher education, the growing use and efficacy of performance measurement in higher education, and a growth of entrepreneurship and new forms of educational design and delivery among colleges and universities. Staged at Harvard, the HIHE alumni seminar typically runs for 2 days and includes opportunities for continued professional networking and other "reunion"-type activities.

Alumni Listservs: HIHE develops and administers an electronic listserv for each program cohort. The listserv is created a few weeks prior to the start of each institute to facilitate pre-program communication and preparation and continues following the completion of the face-to-face program experience. HIHE listservs are designed to foster both alum-to-alum and program-to-alum communication.

Alumni Receptions: Each year, HIHE sponsors alumni receptions during the annual meetings of major higher education professional associations. In the past, HIHE has organized gatherings during meetings of the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The primary objectives of these meetings are networking, socializing, and reconnecting with current HIHE activities and plans.

HIHE Alumni Bulletin: On a twice-yearly basis, HIHE produces an Alumni Bulletin that serves to update institute alumni on recent HIHE

activities, reinforce upcoming application deadlines and other program-related information, and present recent research results of HIHE faculty. An always-popular feature of the Alumni Bulletin is the ''Class Notes'' section of the publication where institute alumni can post late-breaking news regarding job changes, promotions, publications, awards, and the like.

Even as the HIHE program portfolio has grown and evolved over the last three-and-a-half decades, its offerings have always addressed key leadership issues and challenges facing administrators at specific stages in their careers.

THE HARVARD INSTITUTES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Birth of the First Higher Education Leadership Institute

The current Harvard Institutes for Higher Education trace their origins to the mid-1960s when a group of Harvard program planners began to develop what was, at that time, a radical and revolutionary idea – to create ''a broad general program of substance which would bring together people not of the same but of the differing occupations within education'' (Institute for Educational Management, 1973, p. 2). Until this time, no higher education professional association or other education/training entity had considered seriously the notion of launching a focused and substantive program in educational administration to address the professional development needs of college and university administrators.

Since no provisions had been made among Harvard's academic units to bankroll such an untested (and potentially risky) undertaking, considerable effort early on was directed to securing foundation support for the initiative. These initial efforts took place with the understanding that external funds would be sought only for a fixed period of time needed to establish the curricular and programmatic legitimacy of the institute. Once on solid intellectual and financial footing, it was expected that the program would become self-sustaining and self-perpetuating.

In 1969, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation was approached for financial support of a market research/feasibility study and, assuming favorable results from this analysis, a larger grant to create a significant leadership development program. A clear desire to recruit minority participants to the program was an explicit part of early overtures to the philanthropic community (Institute for Educational Management, 1973, p. 8). An initial $20,000 grant was obtained from the Sloan Foundation for the market

research study, a project undertaken with the help of professional staff from the Harvard Business School. Two months later, Harvard received a $280,000 Sloan Foundation grant to support development and delivery of the first programs planned for 1970 and 1971. At this time, Sloan and Harvard had an explicit understanding that foundation monies would be used only for preliminary program preparation and the first 2 years of teaching. After that, Harvard and its fledgling program would need to become self-sustaining.

The IEM welcomed its inaugural class to Harvard in the Summer of 1970. Administered by and headquartered at the Harvard Business School, the first program featured an all-business school faculty lineup. As originally conceived, IEM was the first attempt to apply theories, concepts, and thinking traditionally associated with management of for-profit business and private sector ventures to the organizational context and leadership challenges confronting higher education institutions.

The first IEM group numbered 63. The class completed a 6-week program of study that was organized into four major areas: managing the educational institution, information systems for planning and control, management of funds, and human behavior and organizational problems.

In addition to providing funds to support development and delivery of the first two offerings of IEM, the Sloan Foundation approved an IEM-initiated plan for ''administrators from disadvantaged or developing colleges and universities to permit their participation in the IEM educational administration program.'' A $30,000 grant was directed to this purpose and helped to ensure more diverse and representative cohorts in each of IEM's first two classes. This amount was subsequently matched by the Esso Education Foundation and was earmarked ''for fellowship aid for administrators from the predominantly Negro colleges'' (Institute for Educational Management, 1973, p. 16).

The interest and commitment of the philanthropic community during the early history of IEM was critical in helping to get the institute off the ground and marked the first of several instances of foundation support for Harvard programs designed to foster the professional development of college and university administrators of color.

Over time, IEM was both embraced and valued by the higher education community. The program demand remained strong, and IEM managed to become self-sustaining once the Sloan start-up monies and a subsequent development grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation were fully expended. Enrollment growth was immediately evident – there were 63 members of the first class in 1970, 80 in 1971, 120 in 1972, and 127 in 1973. In fact, the

early and rapid success of IEM spawned additional Harvard programs to serve the burgeoning interests and needs of the higher education community.

Addressing the Needs of a New Higher Education Audience: The Creation of MLE

The National Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education (MLE) offered its first program at Harvard in August 1979. The institute was developed by the Harvard Graduate School of Education in cooperation with The College Board, whose efforts in lifelong education were, at that time, coordinated through its Office of Adult Learning Services and the Future Directions for a Learning Society program. The Sears-Roebuck Foundation provided financial support to the program. As described in the inaugural program brochure, the purpose of MLE was to:

> Assist the leadership of American higher education to chart new institutional directions, to define new roles, and to implement lifelong education in responsible, effective ways.

Institute materials explained the program focus in even greater detail:

> The MLE curriculum places equal stress on developing management skills for the implementation of lifelong education and acquiring knowledge and understanding of the critical issues facing educators who will serve growing numbers of adult learners in the 1980s.

The institute's format and design were derived from the already-successful IEM model (by 1979, IEM had already delivered management training to almost 1,000 senior-level administrators from over 400 different institutions). MLE's target audience, however, was somewhat different. Institute planners were struck by the growing impact of lifelong education in the coming decades. Many segments of American society – women returning to work after childrearing, workers seeking new skills or a career change, and members of minority groups – were expressing interest in lifelong learning opportunities in increasing numbers. MLE was designed to provide a training venue for those who would be serving the needs of this emerging market of "non-traditional" learners.

The learning environment for the 10-day MLE institute was designed to enable senior-level administrators to develop new skills and perspectives, establish a network of leaders with similar responsibilities and experiences, and explore plans and strategies for more effective use of resources when addressing the needs of emerging student markets. The first MLE cohort numbered 79. The program quickly experienced market acceptance at levels comparable to those enjoyed by IEM a decade earlier. Enrollment remained

steady with 89 participants in 1980 and 82 in 1981. After a 1-year dip to 68 in 1982, enrollment rebounded to 83 in 1983, 75 in 1984, and 73 in 1985.

A significant milestone in MLE's curricular evolution and market focus occurred in the late-1990s. By this time, so-called "non-traditional learners" (i.e., students outside the 18–22 year-old age group) were found in significant numbers throughout all sectors of higher education. As a result, the managerial functions performed by administrators represented in MLE's historic target audience and primary constituency – continuing education administrators and other campus offices serving the needs of lifelong learners – had, in most significant respects, been subsumed by other, more "mainstream" institutional units. This demographic shift in MLE's primary audience had been translated into dwindling institute enrollments during the mid-1990s[3] and led program planners to question how to adjust the curricular focus to achieve the kind of impact MLE had historically enjoyed within the higher education community.

In response to this development, MLE program planners modified the curricular orientation of the institute. Effective with the Summer 2000 offering, the Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education was renamed the Institute for Management and Leadership in Education (a change that enabled HIHE to retain the powerful "MLE" brand within the professional development marketplace) and the curriculum was reengineered to focus on issues of institutional and personal change and transformation. Taking full advantage of the guidance and research of Robert Kegan (William and Miriam Meehan Professor in Adult Learning and Professional Development at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and MLE Educational Chair), several new instructional units were incorporated into the curriculum. Strategic alliances and partnerships, new markets and new revenue streams, the advent of for-profit higher education, fostering change and innovation, and the implications of new forms of educational delivery on "traditional" institutions were all added. In addition, greater attention was devoted to identifying personal barriers that might stand in the way of implementing enduring institutional change. These program changes were well received in the marketplace and program enrollments rebounded to historic levels.

Bringing Leadership Training to the Middle Management Ranks:
Creating MDP

As IEM and MLE continued to enjoy marketplace success, interest in and demand for Harvard-based leadership training continued unabated. Now

well into adolescence (if not adulthood), IEM had become a fixture within the higher education leadership development firmament as it continued to offer an annual program for senior-level administrators. Demand for the "Harvard model" of professional development became so strong that, by the mid-1980s, demand for IEM was well beyond what the program could reasonably accommodate. In addition, interest in professional development was being expressed by administrative levels for which the original program was not designed. Growth of the "middle management" ranks within higher education represented still another constituency interested in addressing professional development needs. In response, the Harvard Graduate School of Education launched the Management Development Program (MDP) in the Summer of 1986.

Originally designed for administrators with significant professional responsibility and whose future duties would require skills and knowledge beyond those developed via exposure to a single function or discipline, MDP built its curriculum around two related themes. The first, "Leadership and Management," provided intensive training in basic management skills like human resource management, financial management, leadership and decision making. The second theme, "The Higher Education Enterprise," focused on the distinctive institutional characteristics of colleges and universities, covering topics like governance, the social role and function of higher education, the major forces shaping its future direction, and the influence of higher education on society. To differentiate this offering from IEM, MDP was developed to attract participants with middle management titles and job responsibilities – deans, associate deans, assistant deans, program directors, department chairs, and the like. The unique set of challenges associated with having to "manage from the middle" were highlighted and included throughout the program.

Creation of MDP enabled the HIHE to expand both its curricular focus and the number of administrators and institutions it could serve. MDP welcomed 85 participants to its first offering in 1986. Interest in the program remained in the early years – with 85 participants in 1987, 87 in 1988, 96 in 1989, and 95 in 1990 – and throughout the program's history.[4]

Adding Another Piece to the Leadership Development Puzzle: Creation of the Harvard Seminar for New Presidents

Operating with a robust three-program portfolio of leadership development institutes that were serving some 300 higher education administrators

annually, HIHE added an important new piece to its programming puzzle in the Summer of 1990.

The idea for a fourth Harvard leadership development program specifically for new college and university presidents, emerged from collaborative discussions among Harvard Graduate School of Education faculty and HIHE staff.[5] The seminar's ultimate curricular focus connected nicely with the research of Judith Block McLaughlin and David Riesman, a work that had resulted in the 1990 publication of *Choosing a College President: Opportunities and Constraints*. In the course of their research, McLaughlin and Riesman identified a distinctive set of leadership transition and presidential "entry" issues of particular relevance to the new campus chief executive officer. Since both McLaughlin and Riesman were based at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and interested in disseminating their findings to higher education practitioners, the necessary ingredients for a successful new program were in place. The inaugural offering of the Harvard Seminar for New Presidents (HSNP) in 1990, chaired by Judy McLaughlin, welcomed 33 "rookie" presidents[6] to campus for an intensive 6-day experience, which included plenary sessions, small group discussion, and individual consultations that addressed topics of particular import to a new president – presidential leadership, trusteeship, financial management, fund-raising, building an effective senior leadership team, crisis management, articulating a vision, and the "personal side" of the presidency.

Positioned as a smaller, more intimate "off the record" opportunity to explore the challenges of the presidency with a group of similarly situated colleagues, the Seminar for New Presidents hit established enrollment targets immediately and participation has remained steady throughout its 15-year history. On average, 40–45 newly minted presidents participate in the program each year.

SERVING THE NEEDS OF ADMINISTRATORS OF COLOR

Since the inaugural offering of IEM in 1970 (aided by foundation monies that supported the participation of minority administrators), HIHE has been committed to attracting diverse participant groups to all of its programs and incorporating key demographic, political, social, and institutional issues influencing postsecondary education into all institute curricula.

Table 1 summarizes the representation of administrators of color in HIHE's four core programs over the most recent 5-year period for which

Table 1. Representation of Administrators of Color at the HIHE: 2000–2004.

Program	Summer 2000 (%)	Summer 2001 (%)	Summer 2002 (%)	Summer 2003 (%)	Summer 2004 (%)
IEM	22	26	30	20	21
MDP	28	33	29	33	30
MLE	15	24	24	24	23
New Presidents	12	23	21	15	13

Note: These data are self-reported and do not include program participants representing institutions from outside the United States. Non-US representation within each HIHE program typically runs between 5% and 10% of the total participant group.

data are available (2000–2004). Each year, the participation of administrators of color ranged from one-fifth to one-third of all those attending an HIHE summer program offering. During this period, a total of 426 minority administrators attended one of HIHE's core summer institutes.

Throughout its history, HIHE has benefited greatly from the involvement of faculty of color who have helped to shape the institute curriculum[7] and from the generosity of foundations willing to make financial resources available to enable the participation of administrators of color and/or administrators from minority-serving institutions in HIHE institutes, seminars, and programs. The supportive legacy started by the Sloan and Esso Educational Foundations in the early 1970s has been continued by other organizations to the present day. Two recent examples of this largesse are particularly noteworthy.

The Bush–Hewlett Fellowship Program

In 1997, HIHE consummated an agreement with the Bush Foundation in Minneapolis, Minnesota and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in Menlo Park, California to establish the "Bush–Hewlett Fellowship Program," an initiative to support the leadership development of senior-level administrators at private historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). This successful collaboration, now in its 9th year, has had a significant impact on a traditionally underserved segment of US higher education. The Bush–Hewlett Fellowship Program includes three central components:

Scholarship Support: Up to six full scholarships have been provided annually to enable senior-level administrators from private HBCUs to attend IEM. All candidates for Bush–Hewlett fellowships must apply and be admitted to IEM through HIHE's standard application process.[8]

Post-IEM Networking Meetings: After IEM each summer, the fellowship program provides for a ''networking meeting'' that includes all Bush–Hewlett fellows from the prior 2 years' IEM classes. This 1-day meeting has typically been staged at a location that is geographically convenient to the majority of fellows (Atlanta has been an oft-used site and, more recently, ''virtual'' meetings have been staged via teleconference). To foster cross-year networking, the gathering provides an opportunity to introduce the most recent year's fellows to the prior year's fellowship cohort. Additional time is spent sharing experiences and insights on how the IEM curriculum applies to specific institutional challenges confronting the fellows. Emphasis throughout the meeting is on practical application of leadership theories and models learned at IEM to the ''real world'' institutional circumstances faced by the fellows.

Campus Visits: The fellowship program also provides for campus visits to eligible HBCUs. Each fall or winter, HIHE faculty members Charles Willie and James Honan have visited two or three HBCUs in different regions of the country and met with each school's president and/or other members of the senior leadership team. These meetings have accomplished two important objectives: 1) to market and otherwise spread the word to eligible institutions and individuals about the Bush–Hewlett fellowship program for IEM, and 2) to gather information about the challenges facing HBCUs to ensure that the IEM curriculum is updated appropriately to incorporate these issues. Since the inception of the fellowship program, Professors Willie and Honan have visited a dozen or so HBCUs throughout the US and met with numerous administrators, faculty, and staff there.

Since the fellowship program's formal launch in Summer 1997, 54 senior-level HBCU administrators – representing 26 different institutions – have attended IEM (as of Summer 2004). Feedback from these participants about their IEM experience, provided at the close of each institute, has been uniformly positive and very enthusiastic. Anecdotal evidence further suggests that the Bush–Hewlett program's networking objective is also reaping dividends. In one instance, a Bush–Hewlett Fellow who attended IEM in 1999 as a dean was later appointed as president of another HBCU. The second-in-command at the president's new institution had been one of his Bush–Hewlett Fellowship colleagues at IEM. In a similar vein, several participating institutions have become ''repeat customers,'' sending several administrators

Table 2. Participating Institutions: Bush–Hewlett Fellowship Program (1997–2004).

- Bennett College for Women
  Greensboro, North Carolina
- Bethune-Cookman College
  Daytona Beach, Florida
- Claflin University
  Orangeburg, South Carolina
- Dillard University
  New Orleans, Louisiana
- Fisk University
  Nashville, Tennessee
- Florida Memorial College
  Miami, Florida
- Hampton University
  Hampton, Virginia
- Huston-Tillotson College
  Austin, Texas
- Interdenominational Theological Center
  Atlanta, Georgia
- Jarvis Christian College
  Hawkins, Texas
- Johnson C. Smith University
  Charlotte, North Carolina
- Morehouse College
  Atlanta, Georgia
- Morris College
  Sumter, South Carolina
- Oakwood College
  Huntsville, Alabama
- Paine College
  Augusta, Georgia
- Philander Smith College
  Little Rock, Arkansas
- Rust College
  Holly Springs, Mississippi
- Saint Augustine's College
  Raleigh, North Carolina
- Saint Paul's College
  Lawrenceville, Virginia
- Shaw University
  Raleigh, North Carolina
- Spelman College
  Atlanta, Georgia
- Stillman College
  Tuscaloosa, Alabama
- Talladega College
  Talladega, Alabama
- Texas College
  Tyler, Texas
- Tougaloo College
  Tougaloo, Mississippi
- Voorhees College
  Denmark, South Carolina

to IEM under the fellowship program's financial auspices, with the explicit goal of creating a common language and shared leadership vocabulary among members of the president's senior leadership team (see Table 2).[9]

The Leadership Development Initiative and Tribal College Leadership Development Project

A second interesting example of HIHE collaboration with the philanthropic community has been an ongoing project funded by the Plan for Social Excellence, Inc. (PFSE) in Tampa, Florida. PFSE's interest in adopting a "grassroots approach to educational enrichment and reform"[10] designed to foster initiatives at the local level dovetailed nicely with HIHE's interest in furthering the professional development interests of administrators of color

at historically underserved institutions. This partnership has produced two distinct initiatives over the past decade.

The first, started in 1995 and called the ''Leadership Development Initiative'' (LDI), targeted middle-level administrators of color regardless of institutional affiliation, prior professional background, or administrative experience. Designed to complement the Bush–Hewlett project's focus on IEM, LDI directed scholarship monies to qualified minority administrators interested in attending MDP and MLE. In return for their institute scholarships, fellows agreed to serve for 3 years on an LDI Steering Committee designed to identify strategies to promote leadership development among higher education administrators of color. Initially, Steering Committee meetings took place twice annually (one in Cambridge and one in conjunction with the national conference of a major higher education association) with a focus on clarifying the issues and challenges facing minority administrators in higher education. Later, as the leadership issues requiring attention were clarified, Steering Committee attention shifted to the development of tangible action plans. During the course of his/her 3-year stint with the group, each committee member was asked to develop and implement one tangible action to advance leadership development for minority administrators in higher education.

During the late 1990s, an interesting array of projects and activities was completed by individual LDI fellows. Activities ranged from publication of an article on leadership development challenges facing minority administrators in The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education to the staging of a 1-day ''Leadership Challenges for Educators in Higher Education in the New Millennium'' at Cheyney University of Pennsylvania[11] to presentations on leadership development opportunities for administrators of color at several conferences and professional association meetings to encouraging colleagues to attend HIHE or other leadership development experiences. One LDI Fellow, however, had an idea that would ultimately help define the next phase of HIHE outreach to administrators of color.

When serving as Associate Provost and Associate Academic Vice President at the National Hispanic University in San Jose, California, Rene Trujillo attended HIHE's MDP in 1999 as an LDI Fellow. He thoroughly enjoyed his MDP experience and, as a result, became an ardent supporter of HIHE's outreach efforts to the minority community. As his LDI fellowship ''project,'' Rene identified Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) as a sector of the higher education community that would derive great benefit from HIHE's leadership development activities. Though not a tribal college administrator himself, Rene had long-standing relationships with TCU

colleagues and believed that taking steps to make them more aware of what HIHE had to offer would be of considerable value. Supported by a PFSE "mini-grant" in the Fall of 2001, Rene traveled to Billings, Montana to present his own MDP experiences and the HIHE program portfolio to a meeting of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) Board of Directors. Founded in 1972 by the nation's first six tribal colleges, AIHEC's mission is to support the work of tribal colleges and the national movement for tribal self-determination.[12] Now an organization of 34 US colleges and 1 Canadian institution, AIHEC has become an important national coordinating body for its member colleges and universities and is governed jointly by each member institution. Rene received a very favorable response from the AIHEC board, and plans were developed during the 2001–2002 academic year to establish what would be called the "Tribal College Leadership Development Project," an initiative launched in Summer 2003 with the help of a generous 3-year grant from the Plan for Social Excellence.

Building on its earlier successful experiences with the Bush–Hewlett and LDI scholarship programs, the tribal college project represented a comparable effort to serve the needs of another important (and historically underrepresented) segment of US higher education. Using a combination of PFSE funds and HIHE financial aid, scholarship support to attend any of HIHE's four core summer institutes was made available to qualified administrators from AIHEC institutions. As with the Bush–Hewlett program, all candidates were required to apply and be admitted to the appropriate leadership development program via HIHE's standard application process. Since the inception of this initiative in 2002, 17 TCU administrators (representing 11 different AIHEC institutions) have attended an HIHE summer institute (Table 3).

As part of HIHE's routine institute follow-up, all TCU participants were asked to assess the value and relevance of the experience to the leadership challenges faced at their home institutions. To a person, each participant described his or her time at Harvard as very positive and productive.

ENHANCING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL: A BRIEF MINI-CASE

The potential to translate HIHE activities targeting leadership development at the *individual* level into larger *institutional* gain is nicely illustrated by the contact and collaboration that HIHE has enjoyed with Dillard University. A brief "mini-case study" of this 6-year relationship follows.

Table 3.   Participating Institutions: The Tribal College Leadership
Development Project (2002–2004).

- College of Menominee
  Nation Keshena, Wisconsin
- Crownpoint Institute of Technology
  Crownpoint, New Mexico
- Haskell Indian Nations University
  Lawrence, Kansas
- Institute of American Indian Arts
  Santa Fe, New Mexico
- Little Big Horn College
  Crow Agency, Montana
- Northwest Indian College
  Bellingham, Washington
- Oglala Lakota College
  Kyle, South Dakota
- Sisseton Wahpeton College
  Sisseton, South Dakota
- Tohono O'odham Community College
  Sells, Arizona
- United Tribes Technical College
  Bismarck, North Dakota
- White Earth Tribal and Community College
  Mahnomen, Minnesota

A private, historically black, faith-based institution located in New Orleans, Louisiana, Dillard University was founded in 1869 with a mission to provide academic programs of excellence in the liberal arts. In 1997, Michael L. Lomax was appointed President at Dillard. Lomax brought an impressive career in politics to his new appointment, having served for 12 years as Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Fulton County in Atlanta, Georgia. In addition, he had previously taught on the faculties of Morehouse College and Spelman College and had also served at Emory University, the University of Georgia, and Georgia Institute of Technology. It was hoped that President Lomax's demonstrated political acumen and impressive academic credentials would translate into institutional success for Dillard.

President Lomax attended the HSNP in Summer 1997 and found the program to be extremely helpful in aiding his transition to the university. While at Harvard, he became aware of HIHE's full portfolio of programs to serve multiple groups of higher education administrators. His involvement with HIHE also directly coincided with the launch of the Bush–Hewlett program that had targeted the participation of senior-level administrators from institutions like Dillard in IEM. Seizing this opportunity, President Lomax made a strategic decision to send members of his administrative cabinet to the institute. For four of the next 6 years, Dillard sent one of its cabinet-level administrators to IEM as a Bush–Hewlett Fellow. During this same time period, three other administrators from the middle ranks of the Dillard hierarchy (representing the university's business, finance, and sponsored research areas) attended the MDP supported by Dillard's own institutional resources. Reinforcing his 1997 experience in the New Presidents seminar, President Lomax made two return visits to Harvard (in 2001 and

2003), both times attending HIHE's "Seminar on Advancement Leadership for Presidents," a program cosponsored by the CASE that focused on strategic leadership of the institutional advancement function. As a result, during the 7 years of the Lomax administration at Dillard, seven of his administrative colleagues attended an HIHE program.

"Given my own experience at the Harvard Seminar for New Presidents, I decided to send several members of my administrative team to the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education," President Lomax noted when asked to comment on the Dillard/HIHE relationship. "Dillard benefited immensely from these experiences. Our leadership team is more experienced and knowledgeable, and Dillard's administrators are now more engaged with colleagues from across the country."

The university's leadership structure reported substantial benefit from being able to employ a common set of theoretical frameworks and shared ways of analyzing and exercising institutional leadership. HIHE, in turn, derived considerable educational benefit from the presence of several recent institute alumni at one institution, a situation it took particular advantage of during the 1997–1998 academic year.

At that time, HIHE faculty member Jim Honan was interested in developing new instructional materials to support a series of planning sessions he taught in multiple HIHE offerings. He was particularly interested in identifying a suitable site for a new case study that would illustrate the leadership challenges associated with developing and implementing new planning processes within a campus culture that was historically unfamiliar (and potentially uncomfortable) with the concept of strategic planning. Given HIHE's familiarity with the Dillard situation and President Lomax's change agenda there, the campus was viewed as a prime candidate for this case study project.

During the 1997–1998 academic year, Jim Honan and HIHE case writer Jerrold Roy launched the process, and produced a 16-page case study titled "Strategic Planning at Dillard University." (The project was made possible through the continued generosity of the Bush and Hewlett Foundations.) Professor Honan took immediate advantage of these new instructional materials by teaching the Dillard case in that summer's IEM program to very positive reviews. As an added twist to his teaching of the case, Honan invited both President Lomax and Vice President of Institutional Advancement Love Collins to attend the IEM session at which the Dillard case was presented. This approach enabled IEM participants to benefit from both the instructor's treatment of the case from a strategic planning perspective and from the "real world" perspective made possible by the involvement of two case study protagonists via lively in-class discussion.[13]

The HIHE/Dillard relationship is a compelling illustration of the mutual benefits derived from forging a powerful partnership. On the one hand, Dillard has enhanced its leadership capacity in systematic and strategic ways.[14] While on the other hand, the Harvard Institutes have learned a great deal about the challenges confronting HBCUs, translating these insights into productive revisions to institute curricula and the improvement of instructional resources available to both HIHE and the larger higher education community.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

As part of its systematic institute evaluation and assessment process, HIHE obtains participant feedback at the conclusion of each institute. Information gathered includes curricular quality, instructional effectiveness, and the quality of delivery of the many logistical and planning aspects associated with each program. Using a five-point rating scale, the HIHE feedback forms begin by asking participants to assess their ''overall experience'' at HIHE. Though a combination of factors ultimately serve to define a participant's overall Harvard experience, we have found that this first question is a good general barometer of program effectiveness and attendee satisfaction.

HIHE program satisfaction among participants, as measured by responses to this ''overall experience'' question, has historically been very high. As a general benchmark, HIHE faculty and program planners expect to see at least a 90% participant satisfaction level (i.e., 90% of institute participants give their overall program experience the highest possible rating) for each program offering.[15] Should the overall experience measure ever dip below 90%, all aspects of institute content, planning and delivery undergo a thorough and comprehensive review to identify areas needing revision.

In addition to general measures of program satisfaction and effectiveness, HIHE postprogram survey instruments yield a wealth of additional information. Of particular interest to program planners is the value derived from the HIHE experience as individual participants return to their home campuses and begin to apply their insights to the idiosyncrasies of their own institutional settings. Typically, multiple benefits – both personal and professional – are reported by institute participants. It should be noted that these findings are usually reported in equal measure by both majority and minority administrators.

Enhanced Content Knowledge: Participants appreciate being exposed to new leadership theories, models, and methodologies, which they believe will

enable them to reassess their own leadership practice in ways that will enhance their professional competence, confidence, and effectiveness.

Developing a Network of Peers: Participants value the opportunity to seek advice and counsel from other similarly situated colleagues at a broad crosssection of higher education institutions. They report that the sense of camaraderie and networking generated during the institute is of great help in minimizing feelings of isolation often experienced in their own campuses or in their own geographic regions.

Personal and Professional Reaffirmation: The HIHE experience provides a useful sense of consolation and support. The fact that administrators share many common concerns with colleagues from around the country, coupled with the realization that they are not "alone" in facing particular challenges, is typically both eye-opening and liberating.

Practical Application: HIHE's "real world" perspective and focus on practical applications is considered particularly relevant to institute participants. Given the high level of administrative turnover at many institutions, participants often report that ideas and insights presented at an HIHE program will prove helpful in providing much-needed leadership continuity and will assist in the management of leadership transitions on their home campuses.

Multi-Faceted Learning Experience: Since many participants indicate that they wear multiple administrative "hats" at their home institutions, HIHE's broad-based curriculum, which addresses a wide spectrum of leadership issues, is considered especially appropriate and applicable to their professional circumstances.

Opportunity for Reflection and Renewal: Many institute participants express genuine appreciation for the chance to "be a student again." The retreat-like structure of the HIHE experience is seen as providing a very useful (and welcome) "total immersion" opportunity, which is very conducive to both personal reflection and professional renewal. The need to "recharge one's professional battery" is often neglected by busy higher education administrators. Yet the opportunity provided by HIHE to undertake an experience that many liken to a "mini-sabbatical" is greatly valued and fondly remembered by large numbers of institute alumni.

NOTES

1. Additional HIHE program information is available at www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe by selecting the "Higher Education" option.

2. Over the many years, HIHE has developed an extensive collection of higher education case studies. To my knowledge, the HIHE case study collection is the largest such resource on earth (current holdings exceed 200). Used in all HIHE programs, these cases are also available as instructional materials to higher education faculty members and practitioners elsewhere. See www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe for additional information and to review a current case study catalog.

3. In the mid-1990s, the size of the average MLE cohort had dipped to the low 70s. By the end of the decade, institute enrollment had rebounded to the 90s in response to several revisions in program content.

4. In the mid-1990s, demand for MDP grew so strong that program organizers opted to offer two separate, though simultaneous, program "sections." With this approach, MDP was able to accommodate 154 participants in Summer 1995 and 166 in Summer 1996. Double sections were discontinued thereafter, due largely to the excessive demands (both administrative and pedagogical) created by working with such large participant numbers.

5. Harvard Ed School faculty member Arthur Levine and HIHE staff members Clifford Baden and Sharon McDade were important early contributors to program creation and development.

6. Eligibility criteria for the seminar were quite clear – only presidents who have been named but not yet assumed office or who are in the first year of their tenure may participate.

7. Faculty of color who have played particularly instrumental roles include Harry Edwards (Harvard Law School), Jim Cash (Harvard Business School), Claudine Malone (Harvard Business School), Carlos Cortes (University of California, Riverside), and Charles Willie (Harvard Graduate School of Education).

8. The application process for IEM, MDP, and MLE provides institute candidates with two different opportunities to apply. The "early decision" review cycle employs a mid-November application deadline, with decision letters being sent to all applicants in mid-December. The "regular decision" round of review has a mid-February application deadline, with notification letters being mailed in mid-to late-March. The Harvard Seminar for New Presidents process operates on a "rolling" admissions basis. Applications for this seminar can be submitted throughout the academic year, with admission decisions being communicated within 3 weeks of receipt of all required application materials.

9. Claflin University and Dillard University have each sent five Bush-Hewlett fellows to IEM since the inception of the scholarship program. Huston-Tillotson College and Philander Smith College have each sent four, while Fisk University, Hampton University, Stillman College, and Spelman College have all sent three.

10. Plan for Social Excellence, Inc. web site (www.pfse.org).

11. The Cheyney University symposium included an informative presentation by Gary Orfield, Professor of Education and Social Policy at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

12. Additional information about AIHEC and its member institutions is available at www.aihec.org.

13. President Lomax and other Dillard administrators have continued to be actively involved – through both in-class participation and via videoconferencing – during the teaching of this case study. For the Harvard Graduate School of

Education, an added benefit of this collaboration has been the ability to use the Dillard case in both executive education institutes and masters/doctoral program courses.

14. The longer-term institutional benefits of Dillard's plan to foster administrative "bench strength" became particularly relevant in February 2004 when President Lomax announced his departure from Dillard to become the President and CEO of the United Negro College Fund.

15. Using feedback obtained from Summer 2003 participants as a case in point, 94% of Seminar for New Presidents attendees gave their institute experience the highest possible rating. The corresponding percentages for IEM, MLE and MDP were 92%, 93%, and 89%, respectively.

REFERENCES

The Institute for Educational Management, 1965–1973. (1973). *The Institute for Educational Management, 1965–1973*. Cambridge, MA: Institute for Educational Management, Harvard University.

This page intentionally left blank

PART III:
THE NEW LEADERS: PROGRAMS FOCUSED ON MINORITIES

This page intentionally left blank

HANDING ONE ANOTHER ALONG: THE CREATION OF AASCU'S MILLENNIUM LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE

Rosemary Lauth

Distinguished anthropologist Margaret Mead knew the power of a few dedicated people to make real change happen. Few question her intellect or her effect on American culture. Observing the successes of the Millennium Leadership Initiative (MLI) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), it is clear that Mead was right: a dedicated few can transform the lives of many.

Novelist Walker Percy would take it a step further: We have a responsibility to transform the lives of others, he felt. As he wrote at the end of his novel *The Moviegoer*, we are responsible for "handing one another along."

That is just what happened in the creation of the MLI when a group of dedicated presidents and chancellors decided – as leaders, as teachers, as stewards of the nation's youth, and as human beings – to hand one another along by reaching out and bringing along the next generation of talented leaders.

Over the last decade, a small cadre of African-American presidents and chancellors of state colleges and universities asked what they could do to

help minorities and women achieve similar positions in higher education. They wondered what the next generation of leaders would look like if the pipeline did not expand to let underrepresented populations achieve the highest leadership offices. Their concerns were well documented in the research, but solutions evaded them – until July 18, 1998, when they decided to stop talking and start taking action.

On that date, at the Summer Council of Presidents of the AASCU, these leaders conceived what would be called the MLI, a program to help others not only achieve the presidency of colleges, but perhaps more importantly, to succeed once in the office. Their vision was to create something new to shift the status quo and impact generations of leaders and students to come.

This chapter tells the story of their vision made real and explains the influence a few committed individuals continue to have on many who come after them – the ones they are "handing along."

UNDERSTANDING THE CHALLENGES

A change process requires passionate and committed change agents. The creation of the AASCU MLI had many "founders" in the late 1990s, including: Marvalene Hughes, at the time, president of California State University Stanislaus; David Carter, president of Eastern Connecticut State University; F.C. Richardson, then chancellor of Indiana University, Southeast; Gladys Styles Johnston, at the time, chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Kearney; James C. Renick, then chancellor of University of Michigan-Dearborn; Charlie Nelms, at the time, chancellor of University of Michigan-Flint; Edward B. Fort, then chancellor, North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University; Hazo W. Carter Jr., president of West Virginia State University; Wendell Rayburn, at the time, vice president at AASCU; and David B. Henson, then president of Lincoln University (Missouri).

These initiating presidents were soon joined by other committed visionaries such as; Muriel Howard, president, Buffalo State College, State University of New York; Portia H. Shields, then president, Albany State University (Georgia); Mickey Burnim, chancellor, Elizabeth City State University (North Carolina); Horace Judson, Grambling State University (Louisiana) and at the time, State University of New York College at Plattsburgh; Daniel O. Bernstine, president, Portland State University (Oregon); John T. Gibson, then president, Alabama A&M University; and Frank G. Pogue, president of Edinboro University of Pennsylvania.

These founders asked several core questions:

- What is different about the needs of minority candidates?
- Why aren't current professional development programs serving these individuals?
- What would help these candidates assess their skills and acquire those they are lacking?
- Who is best suited to inform them?
- How would they recruit talented veteran presidents willing to share their insights, help with career decisions, and forge meaningful connections with future presidents?
- How could they best prepare minority candidates to succeed in an executive search system?
- Who could advise how to navigate the complexity inherent in one's first presidency?

It is one thing to know the system but another to communicate the nuances of planning a complex career strategy. The challenges facing people of color, those with ethnically diverse backgrounds, and females were different from those of white males and it was important to acknowledge that different measures were needed. To effect real change and move from strategy to plan, they did what many good leaders do: they turned to their presidential colleagues and to the AASCU for assistance.

On Abraham Lincoln's birthday and at the brink of the new millennium – February 12, 1999 – a group of these passionate presidents and chancellors convened at the AASCU headquarters in Washington, DC, to address their concerns and to begin planning to do something about it. They had observed qualified minority candidates who consistently failed to survive the pathway to the presidency. They shared anecdotes and similar experiences, analyzed their observations, and drew conclusions that shaped their plan. With a shared vision and determination, these experienced leaders launched the journey that became known as the Millennium Leadership Initiative.

ARTICULATING A SHARED VISION

The founders envisioned that the MLI would be the premier leadership development program in higher education with an emphasis on preparation of minority candidates for college and university presidencies. MLI would change the landscape of higher education through its high-level,

comprehensive preparation program. It would expand the pipeline for diverse individuals qualified to lead this country's colleges and universities.

The founders linked the intensive professional development Institute to a year-long mentoring component. Skill sets would be assessed prior to and during the Institute. Protégés at the Institute would spend full days immersed in the curriculum built around core competencies and areas of expertise required for professional advancement. They would assess, learn and share. They would define and rethink their plans. They would benefit from information, advice and criticism. They would leave the Institute as part of a new community of supporters – a network of colleagues and presidents to assist them.

DESIGNING AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY

Reaching our Target Audience

To focus primarily on those groups traditionally underrepresented in the ranks of president or chancellor, MLI targeted its marketing to African-Americans, Hispanics and Latinos, Asian-Americans, and Pacific Islanders as well as women. Broad, general advertising in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* attracted individuals in top-level administrative positions in our nation's colleges and universities. Advertisements invited senior administrators, at the level of dean or above in public and private institutions, to apply for acceptance into MLI. Print promotion was expanded to include leading publications with minority readership:

- Black Issues in Higher Education
- Asian Week
- Hispanic Outlook
- Women in Higher Education

Several associations provided web links to promote MLI through their professional development opportunities, including the American Association of Higher Education, National Association for State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.

It was soon clear that, although advertising was helpful, the most effective promotion was direct communication with AASCU member presidents and the network of academic vice presidents, provosts and MLI graduates. Asking presidents and chancellors to nominate individuals they thought

would benefit from the MLI experience proved highly effective. Today, most applications come from individuals encouraged to apply by AASCU member presidents and from MLI graduates who share the word of MLI success with colleagues. The past success of the program fuels its future relevance and usefulness.

From 1999 to 2004, promotional efforts reached out to include African-Americans (68% of MLI graduates), Hispanic and Latinos (5.5%), Asian and Pacific Islanders (3.9%), 1 Native American (0.6%) with Caucasian women and men comprising the balance (22.3%). Through 2004, 49 African-American women, 74 African-American men, 2 Hispanic and Latina women, 8 Hispanic and Latino men, 5 Asian-American and Pacific Islander women, 2 Asian-American and Pacific Islander men, 1 Native American man, 28 Caucasian women, and 12 Caucasian men have graduated from MLI.

Assessing the Leadership Potential of Applicants

All aspects of MLI are designed with one goal: to help candidates gain the information and experience they need to succeed. The application process captures both details of candidates' professional experience and poses questions about their views of leadership. To be eligible, applicants must have the endorsement of an AASCU president or chancellor or a former AASCU president or chancellor. In addition, they must currently be at or above the level of a college or university dean or have equivalent administrative professional experience within or outside the academic community. Participants may come from the public and private sectors and all must demonstrate potential for presidential leadership. A subcommittee of AASCU presidents and chancellors screens applications, determines eligibility, and decides which applicants to accept into the MLI class each year. James C. Renick, chancellor of North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University, leads the selection subcommittee activity enforcing the selection criteria so those accepted into MLI are at the right level to benefit from the experience.

CREATING A LEARNING COMMUNITY

The Initiative consists of a 4-day professional development Institute followed by a year of mentoring with a president/chancellor or a former president/chancellor. The Institute's highly customized curriculum helps

participants assess skills, enhance existing abilities and target areas for improvement, gain tools for advancement, receive assistance to develop career strategies, and become linked with presidential advisors and mentors to guide them through the next steps, including the executive search process.

The specific sessions of the Institute curriculum vary each year but the basic components remain constant. Early programs that used commercial leadership assessment tools were replaced with sessions on specific topics deemed uniquely essential for presidential preparation. This change was made because participant feedback revealed that assessing one's leadership style and learning the latest leadership trends were not as valuable as specific core curriculum elements that relate directly to the position of institution president. In fact, according to participants, nothing compared to the intensive personal time the AASCU presidents invested in the protégés.

ENGENDERING THE "PAY IT FORWARD" CULTURE OF THE INSTITUTE

A typical Institute begins with an orientation during which the presidential faculty explain the culture of MLI, offer assistance, and define expectations. One message important to the Institute is that the presidency is not for everyone and that even if one determines that the presidency is for him or her, the individual may not be ready. MLI's Institute invites protégés to reflect actively on whether the presidency is the path that best suits them. After the MLI experience some may choose the presidency as their goal, but others will not, an equally valid and valuable decision. MLI is designed to build awareness so participants can focus on their goals, target where they are in their career and determine what steps are necessary for assuming the next rung on the ladder. This self-reflective element is incorporated into all aspects of the Institute.

Marvalene Hughes, emerita president of California State University, Stanislaus, has provided leadership for curriculum development since the beginning of MLI and she orients individuals who are new to the Institute. In her orientation, she references *Pay It Forward*, which serves as a keynote for the MLI culture. This popular 2000 film puts forth the notion that "sometimes the simplest idea can make the biggest difference," and asks if it is possible for one idea to change the world. The movie plot revolves around the concept of paying a favor not back, but forward – that is, responding to

good deeds not with payback, but with new good deeds bestowed on three new people totally unknown to the giver.

The movie themes parallel the culture of MLI on several levels. Many people invest in each small class of participants. AASCU member institutions provide financial support long before participants are chosen for the Institute class. Presidents and chancellors put forward names and nominate candidates from both the public and private sectors. Presidents and chancellors donate their time on MLI committees, serve as expert faculty and advisors at the Institute, and/or function as mentors after the Institute.

The support system is much larger than the numbers of presidential faculty each year or the annual institutional supporters who contribute financially to MLI. In most cases, the beneficiaries do not know the benefactors. The protégés learn which institutions have invested in them after they are accepted into the class. In addition, and most importantly, it is made clear that once one benefits from MLI, the expectation is that when one is able, they must "pay it forward" and help others – hand others along, in other words. This obligation is not just implied. It is expected. This spirit of generosity dominates the Institute, sets the tone for MLI, and very much defines its culture.

DESIGNING RELEVANT CURRICULAR COMPONENTS

The Institute curriculum continues to evolve over time and in reaction to stakeholder feedback. The core elements of the curriculum include:

Executive Search: MLI uniquely spotlights the special challenges minority candidates often face in the executive search process. Presentations cover a wide spectrum: the basics of working with executive search firms, composing a letter of intent, writing an effective cover letter and resume, evaluating and "decoding" position descriptions, and interview etiquette and techniques. Highly regarded executive search firm executives and experienced presidents offer frank and practical advice to avoid pitfalls inherent in the executive search system. Also, minority presidents with extensive experience in being recruited and interviewed offer candid advice and practical counsel.

The theoretical is supported by hands-on exercises led by search firm executives who provide information, knowledge and valuable insights. Major firms send their finest representatives, including:

- Academic Search Consultation Service, Ann Die Hasselmo and Barbara Taylor
- A.T. Kearney, Jean A. Dowdall
- Education Management Network, Division of Witt/Kieffer, Dennis M. Barden and Gary J. Posner
- Greenwood & Associates, Inc., Janet Greenwood
- Heidrick & Struggles, Charles Knapp and Ellen Brown
- Korn/Ferry International, Monisha G. Kaplan
- Perez-Arton Consultants, Maria M. Perez

Experienced presidents lend their practical perspectives and balance to the exchanges. The executive search component consistently receives high ratings and is considered immensely valuable by participants.

Executive Contract: Negotiating the executive contract is a critical area for presidents and chancellors. Raymond Cotton, vice president for higher education, ML Strategies, LLC, provides an overview of trends, offers practical advice and checklists, and outlines strategies for designing compensation strategies and portfolios at the level of the presidency.

Financial Management: Financial management is a major programmatic focus. Marie McDemmond, former president, Norfolk State University (Virginia), vividly imprints the importance of understanding financial management while underscoring critical skills essential to managing as a successful president. This half-day financial management workshop is comprehensive and consistently rated highly by participants.

Advancing the Institution: Advancement and fund-raising are core components of the path to the presidency and of the MLI curriculum. MLI programs on these topics have included presentations by John Lippincott, president, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Millie Garcia, president, Berkeley College, New York and Berkeley College, New Jersey, as well as Freeman Hrabowski, president, University of Maryland Baltimore County, and that institution's advancement expert, Sheldon Caplis, vice president for institutional advancement. Judith Ramaley, assistant director for education and human resources, National Science Foundation, and Gail McClure, vice president of Programs for Youth and Education and Africa Program for the Kellogg Foundation, have brought perspectives from outside the academy to better convey the role of the president in institutional advancement.

Communication: Communicating the institutional message and working with the media are integral parts of the MLI curriculum. Ruben Armiñana, president, Sonoma State University (California) and a former newspaper

journalist, offers frank and honest insights into the art of communicating one's message to advance the institution. From his unique vantage point, he explains the relationship between the president and the media and suggests ways to use it to further the mission and goals of the institution. Colleen Bentley-Adler, director of public affairs for The California State University, and media trainer/image expert Carol Ivy, president of Up Your Image, lead the protégés in interactive exercises and taped video interviews. The tapes of these issue-specific interviews are first self-critiqued and then critiqued by colleagues and by the trainers. Advance assignments lead to productive learning opportunities so protégés acquire skills, polish presentation techniques and acquire confidence in communicating their messages for the benefit of the institution. Participants consistently give these exercises the highest possible rating in their evaluations.

Advocacy: A new addition to the Institute is a workshop on working with Congress and handling governmental relations. The session provides insights into building and maintaining effective ties with government and offers an overview of how to prepare for, and execute, an effective visit to Capitol Hill. Protégés arrange appointments in advance, complete their visits and critique their experience with senior staff and presidents. Muriel Howard, president of Buffalo State College, State University of New York, and Edward M. Elmendorf, senior vice president, Government Relations and Policy Analysis at AASCU, lead this component, which was so well received that it will remain a primary focus as long as the Institute is held in Washington, DC.

Leadership Perspectives: Veteran presidents and chancellors and other respected leaders offer lessons on leadership. The focus of these programs might include practical advice along the lines of "if I had known then what I know now." Themes such as servant-leadership, a phrased coined by Robert Greenleaf, emerge in many of the lectures on leadership by presidents and chancellors. Presidential presenters remind aspiring presidents and chancellors of the true source of their power and the ultimate responsibility they have to those they lead. MLI presentations on leadership often emphasize the difference between the presidency and the person in the presidency. Approaches include wide-ranging lectures on the meaning of leadership, as demonstrated by the following examples:

Thomas C. Meredith, then chancellor, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, provided a concise list of suggestions for prospective presidents, including practical and ethical "do's and don'ts." His advice appeared deceptively simple yet its wisdom was deeply complex.

David C. Carter, president of Eastern Connecticut State University, offered 10 succinct lessons he had learned in his over 15 years in the

presidency. They included lessons that dispelled myths and shattered fantasies about the office, and that offered practical advice for advancing the university's mission – as well as heartfelt encouragement to serve, survive and endure in the presidency and in life.

Betty Lentz Siegel, president of Kennesaw State University (Georgia), co-founder of the International Alliance for Invitational Education and co-creator of the Center for Invitational Leadership, is a visionary leader who often contributes to the success of the Institute. Themes of support, of the essence of community and of the value in giving of one's self are central to her approach to leadership. Siegel's groundbreaking book *Becoming an Invitational Leader: A New Approach to Professional and Personal Success* serves at the Institute as a catalyst for discussion of work/life balance in the role of president or chancellor.

According to Parker J. Palmer, author of *Let Your Life Speak* and *The Courage to Teach*, "Invitational leadership is a concept whose time has come, a way of being congruent with the democracy's deepest principles, to say nothing of common sense. At a time in our history when both common sense and democratic values are under assault, we need (Siegel's) excellent book, which explores a form of leading and living that can help us right what is wrong" (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. back jacket).

As these examples show, MLI's focus on presidential leadership highlights the challenges, both professional and personal. Presidents offer personal portraits as illustrations of what one might encounter in the position. Institute programs highlight the need for professional and personal balance in one's career, and particularly once in the office of the president.

As soon as MLI graduates started to enter the ranks of presidents, the Institute invited these new presidents to return to MLI and make presentations, offering their best advice and understanding to the protégés from the perspective of people who have recently been where they are. For example, Livingston Alexander, president of the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford (Pennsylvania), provided a realistic picture of what all candidates for the president should know when in their first search and offered cautionary notes for the uninitiated. As a new president, Gregory H. Williams of The City University of New York City College, emphasized the importance of learning to navigate the executive search process and shared suggestions for doing so. Dorothy Leland, president, Georgia College and State University, stressed the opportunity MLI provided and suggested ways to maximize the benefits. J. Michael Ortiz, president, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, looked back at his rich Hispanic heritage and shared impressions of how those memories filtered through and affected him

the first days of his presidency. Kofi Lomotey, when president of Fort Valley State University (Georgia), described his inauguration and early days as president, commenting on the influence an institution can have on a region and its people. Dana A. Mohler-Faria, president of Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts), stressed the importance of working with one's mentor to learn and to grow. Joanne Glasser, president of Eastern Kentucky University, paid tribute to those leaders who shaped her vision of service and shared her vision of leadership as opportunity. Rodney Smith, president of Ramapo University (New Jersey) and then president, The College of the Bahamas, first spoke of mistakes made in the journey of his first presidency, and returned another time to the Institute to share personal observations of the importance of family and friends in times of crisis.

Guest speakers from outside the academy also reinforce lessons in leadership. The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton, U.S. House of Representatives (D-DC), offered insights into the struggles she faced on her journey to serve her constituents and her nation. Her message of strength and determination, of support and of public service, paralleled the MLI leadership lessons from presidents and chancellors.

Diversity and Leadership: Diversity and cultural sensitivity has remained a critical topic at every Institute, with leaders such as Robert Suzuki, former president of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, providing their insights. Suzuki shared lessons of strength and dignity, speaking of his personal struggles as an Asian-American progressing through the academic and administrative system to the chief executive officer in higher education. Rose Y. Tseng, chancellor of the University of Hawaii at Hilo, offered glimpses of a multicultural campus in an economic development region between East and West. Beheruz N. Sethna, president of the State University of West Georgia, documented research tracking the gaps in the career advancement pipeline for all minority graduates as they move through academic and administrative ranks into higher education presidencies. Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor emerita, University of Nebraska at Kearney, spoke of growing up as an African-American woman in segregated America and the role education played in shaping her intellect, broadening her horizons and opening her heart to tolerance.

Governing Boards: Working with governing boards and understanding the complexities of governance are explored in various sessions from different vantages. Some who have revealed strategies and successes include: Debra Farar, former chairperson, The California State University Board of Trustees; Ralph K. Shelton, chair, North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University Board of Trustees (and president, Southeast Fuels, Inc.);

and Gerald L. Truesdale, M.D., chairman, North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University Board of Trustees (and physician, Greensboro Plastic Surgical Associates, P.A., North Carolina). They have provided protégés with invaluable information on techniques they have used in working effectively to help their presidents and chancellors. Sitting presidents have shared the panel with their board members and offered advice concerning effective board relations and differences in state governance structures.

Relevant Literature: MLI offers an extensive list of suggested reading and relevant publications in the field of higher education leadership. The following are materials that often support the curriculum.

- *Presidential Succession and Transition: Beginning, Ending, and Beginning Again*
    Dr. John W. Moore with Dr. Joanne M. Burrows
- *Board & President: Facilitating the Relationship*
    Dr. Edward M. Penson
- *Becoming an Invitational Leader: A New Approach to Professional and Personal Success*
    Dr. Betty L. Siegel and Dr. William W. Purkey
- *No Equal in the World*
    Dr. Joseph Crowley
- *Presidential Search Guidelines and Directory*
    Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
- *Making Partner: A Mentor's Guide to the Psychological Journey*
    Harvard Business Review
- *The Well-Informed Candidate*
    American Council on Education

BEYOND CURRICULA TO NETWORKS

Advisors Focus the Conversation

Integral to the Institute are consultations with presidential advisors in which the protégés' professional development plans are critiqued. These sessions have evolved from one-on-one private sessions of short duration into small group sessions with advisors that take place over a longer time period. Marked by high interaction and candid discussion, these consultation sessions surface in participant feedback as one of the most unique and powerful

elements of the Institute. Not only do the protégés receive expert advice from their presidential advisors, but they receive peer feedback and support, developing relationships with class colleagues who often become staunch supporters.

The term "advisor" helps differentiate this function from that of the "mentor" who is assigned after the Institute. In these small groups of three to four people, presidents, acting as advisors, offer an individualized review of the protégés' curriculum vitae and an honest assessment of their professional development plans. They help them target their goals and map out the steps needed to achieve them. Advisors might suggest areas in which the protégé lacks experience as well as ways to acquire it.

The advisors are tasked with helping the protégés answer four basic questions: "Where am I now?," "Where do I want to be eventually?," What do I need to do to get there?," and "What's my first step on that journey?" Some instructive questions advisors use to focus the discussion include:

- Define your current position and level of responsibility.
- Define your next desired level.
- Decide if the track you are on is the appropriate track for future growth.
- From what you have heard so far in the Institute, what are the skills or experiences you need to start or continue working on?
- How will you accomplish this work? (Advisors help protégés see ways to achieve their goals through both traditional and non-traditional channels)
- What do you perceive as the greatest external challenge to your progress?
- What do you perceive as the most significant internal obstacle?
- How do you plan to address these challenges or obstacles?
- What opportunities in your environment can you use to help you progress?
- What is the best type of mentor to help you achieve these steps in the next year?

The inclination is for protégés to ask advisors to review their resumes or profile their experiences and advise them on what to do next. Rather than simply answer that question, advisors make the protégés work to target their next specific level of professional responsibility and decide the steps to achieve it, seeking the working group's input when appropriate. Advisors steer the discussion so the protégé emerges with a more coherent professional development plan. They also connect protégés with presidential colleagues who can help them realize their next steps.

Mentors Deepen and Continue the Dialogue

The learning does not stop when the Institute ends. Rather, each protégé is assigned a volunteer presidential mentor to deepen and continue the dialogue. These mentors are volunteer presidents/chancellors or former presidents/chancellors, who act as professional role models and offer practical advice on career advancement.

Under the leadership of F.C. Richardson, chancellor emeritus, Indiana University Southeast, mentor assignments are made using institutional characteristics as well as personal preferences of both mentor and protégé. Considerations for matching protégé and mentor might include: academic discipline, geographic location of the mentor's institution, size or type of institution, strength or expertise in a specific area, race/gender or other dimensions of diversity, practical considerations, and personal preferences.

Presidential mentors are assigned a month after the MLI Institute and officially continue at least through the next year. In that year, they are expected to maintain regular contact with their protégé, including face-to-face meetings. Their role as mentor includes, but is not limited to:

- Inviting the protégé for a campus visit designed as an experience to "shadow the chancellor," including meetings with senior staff and possibly community leaders.
- Providing the protégé with advice and assistance to identify career development and leadership opportunities in higher education.
- Serving as a liaison to connect the protégé to other people and resources as needed, thereby assisting to prepare the protégé to assume a leadership role in higher education.
- Helping the protégé refine and implement the professional development plan for the next career stage.

Mentors are provided with the protégé's vitae, MLI application and professional development plan (revised after discussion with each one's presidential advisor at the Institute). The protégé initiates contact with the mentor and the two agree upon the method and frequency of contacts. Availability of time is of critical importance to presidents and chancellors. Protégés soon learn that finding the appropriate way to communicate with their presidential mentor is essential for a successful relationship.

The mentoring process is varied, depending on many factors, including what the protégé feels he or she needs from the relationship. For instance,

one graduate and mentor had weekly phone meetings every Sunday night at a specific time. Other protégés call their mentors at particular decision points or when they need specific advice. Many maintain contact with their presidential mentors through electronic means and connect via phone when appropriate. Some are able to visit their mentor's campus and witness first-hand a day in the life of their mentor.

Mentors are asked to provide mid-year progress reports and a final evaluation concerning this yearlong mentoring relationship. MLI recognizes that this aspect of the program is not as consistent as it needs to be and is seeking funding to enhance the mentor component and strengthen the program. Specifically, funding will allow more protégés to spend time on their mentors' campuses, ideally, a week in the fall and a week in the spring. During each of the two 1-week visits, presidents will allow protégés to shadow them for the entire week, to accompany them to most meetings, and to join them for meals throughout the week, often with other administrators present. In such a way, protégés will have a daily opportunity to talk privately with presidents about critical issues such as: how to work with a Board of Regents, how to work with the legislature, how to develop strong professional relationships with the press, how to build strong campus/community relations, and how to align as a team an executive council of several vice presidents, each with her or his own agenda. In other words, in these visits, the presidents will educate the protégés on the critical issues that presidents and chancellors must deal with on a daily basis. Chief campus leaders agree that there is no substitute for actually "walking the walk" of the president.

Additionally, a plan is needed for a stronger evaluation of the mentor component. Future plans include hiring an external professional evaluator, an expert in assessing academic programs both quantitatively and qualitatively, to conduct both formative and summative evaluations of the mentoring component. Formative evaluations will be used to improve the planned mentoring program and to solve any problems at a very early stage. A summative evaluation, at the end of the year, will be used to advise of the project's annual success and to assist in future planning.

When protégés graduate and leave the Institute, one thing is clear. Their support network consists of much more than one presidential advisor and a mentor yet to be assigned. It includes the entire MLI presidential faculty, the other faculty experts, fellow protégés in their MLI class, and presidents of institutions that provide financial support to the Initiative and the senior staff of AASCU.

OUR RESULTS

MLI is a young program. It is selective and the scale is small in comparison to many other leadership development programs. The small class size is a strong advantage for the program since it allows for a one-to-one ratio of protégé to president at the Institute.

In the 6 years since the first MLI Institute in 1999, 181 individuals have graduated, including 22 men and women who achieved the presidency. After that time, two more presidents were appointed. This means that at a table of 10 protégés at the Institute, in most cases at least one of them will achieve the presidency in a relatively short time. The following presidents and chancellors came through MLI:

- Livingston Alexander, president, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford (Pennsylvania), MLI '01
- Tony Atwater, president, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. MLI '03
- Michael Battle, president, Interdenominational Theological Center (Georgia), MLI '02
- Stanley F. Battle, president, Coppin State University (Maryland), MLI '02
- Betsy Boze, CEO and dean, Kent State University Stark, OH, MLI '02
- T. J. Bryan, chancellor, Fayetteville State University (North Carolina), MLI '00
- Don Cozzetto, 2003–2004 interim president, Northern State University (South Dakota), MLI '00
- Mildred Garcia, president, Berkeley College, New York and Berkeley College, New Jersey, MLI '99
- Joanne Glasser, president, Eastern Kentucky University, MLI '00
- Ervin Griffin, president, West Virginia State Community and Technical College, MLI '99
- Billy Hawkins, president, Texas College, MLI '00
- Melvin Johnson, president, Tennessee State University, MLI '01
- Walter Kimbrough, president, Philander Smith College (Arkansas), MLI '02
- Dorothy Leland, president, Georgia College & State University, MLI '02
- Kofi Lomotey, former president, Fort Valley State University (Georgia), MLI '01
- Keith T. Miller, president, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, MLI '00
- Dana Mohler-Faria, president, Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts), MLI '99
- J. Keith Motley, former interim chancellor, University of Massachusetts-Boston, MLI '00

- Michael Ortiz, president, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, MLI '99
- Una Mae Reck, chancellor, Indiana University South Bend, MLI '01
- Rodney Smith, president, The College of the Bahamas, MLI '00
- DeLois P. Weekes, president, Lester L. Cox College of Nursing and Health Sciences (Missouri), MLI '99
- Gregory H. Williams, president, The City University of New York, City College, MLI '00
- Mary Wyatt, president, Roanoke-Chowan Community College (North Carolina), MLI '00

Approximately, a third of all graduates have advanced significantly in their careers since participating. In addition to the 22 presidents and chancellors, graduates have achieved the following positions since participating:

- 14 provosts and vice presidents or vice chancellors
- 15 vice presidents or vice chancellors
- 1 provost
- 2 vice provosts
- 1 associate provost
- 2 assistant vice presidents
- 4 associate vice presidents
- 6 deans
- 1 vice dean
- 1 assistant dean
- 1 executive director
- 1 office director
- 1 consultant for the education system of Puerto Rico
- 1 group vice president for public affairs for a major healthcare corporation
- 1 national higher education association executive vice president

SUCCESS STORIES

The best way to understand the success of the MLI is to hear from the participants themselves:

> *Most effective, most inspiring, most complete experience in professional development I have ever participated in as an attendee or presenter.*
>
> Rickey McCurry
> Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement and CEO, SIU Foundation
> Southern Illinois University

…the workshop was quite intense and the best professional development experience I have encountered since I received my Doctoral degree. The faculty was excellent. I really felt their passion for their profession and the desire to empower the protégés. This was an experience that I will cherish the rest of my life. It really exceeded my expectations! Thank you.

Irene H. Johnson
Dean of School of Graduate Studies
Alcorn State University (Mississippi)

This has truly been the most rewarding professional development opportunity I have experienced in my adult life. What has been most fascinating for me is how quickly I have been able to transfer many of the lessons learned to my daily work activities. And I am not even a university president yet! Thanks ever so much for the total MLI experience. I look ever so forward to the mentoring phase of this Initiative. This program met all my expectations as they relate to the next level of higher education leadership – the presidency.

Loren Blanchard
System Vice President for Academic Affairs
The University of Louisiana System

Participating in MLI has truly transformed my professional life. I now have the most beneficial support network imaginable – mentors, colleagues, and the MLI staff. My confidence in my ability to advance in higher education has been magnified by each and every participant. Thank you all sincerely.

Ira K. Blake
Interim Dean, College of Education
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania

The experience of this initiative will last for decades. My career, and who I am as an education leader, has been re-affirmed with great vigor and excitement. Thank you for the experience and the opportunity the MLI provided to me.

W. Wayne Brumfield
Vice President for Student Affairs
The University of Louisiana at Monroe

I am pleased to say that I had no disappointing experiences, only enlightening and expanding ones, both interpersonally and intellectually. You at MLI have clearly done considerable homework to produce such a comprehensive and coherent Institute. The balanced perspective between theory and reality was extraordinary, and could only have been achieved through the contributions of presidents, past and present. And, the genuine nurturing of our potential to join and contribute to MLI's leadership family has enriched my own confidence in ways I never dreamed imaginable!

Paul Barrows
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison

I have attended several leadership development programs throughout my career, by far MLI was the best.

Rodney Smith
President, The College of the Bahamas

My feelings about the Millennium Leadership Institute are very personal. I attended other leadership programs before I participated in the Institute. The other programs were excellent but MLI concentrated on my personal development. From start to finish MLI treated me as if the next step was actually a presidency while the other programs were simply business. The unique characteristics of MLI rest with the core of presidents who are willing to give their time and energy to participants in the program.

Stanley Battle
President, Coppin State University (Maryland)

Words cannot convey nor describe the intellectually enriching and professionally unparalleled quality of MLI.

M. Christopher Brown II
Senior Vice President, Research and Policy, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Overall an outstanding experience, by far a better experience than comparable leadership programs.

Kofi Lomotey
Former President, Fort Valley State University (Georgia)

The Institute was exceptionally well planned and covered the very topics needed for those aspiring to become presidents and chancellors. In my mind, the Institute appears to be the pathway for minority administrators at majority institutions.

Livingston Alexander
President, University of Pittsburgh at Bradford (Pennsylvania)

Thanks so much for such an excellent and life-altering experience. The curriculum was well planned and executed. My life will never be the same.

Madelyn Hunt
Executive Director, General Studies and Director of McNair Scholars
Lamar University (Texas)

Absolutely top notch! A milestone of my career.

Eduardo Ochoa
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Sonoma State University (California)

A wonderful enriching growth experience. A time and opportunity to put flesh on the skeleton of one's future and walk proudly to success as a senior officer and/or president. It will be with me for life – "Life Changing."

Donnie Perkins
Dean and Director of Affirmative Action & Diversity
Northeastern University (Massachusetts)

The work of MLI is critical. Most presidents today are chosen either from the ranks of sitting presidents or are provosts. Recent studies show there are few persons of color serving as presidents or provosts around the country. If there are few women and persons of color serving in the positions that create the pipeline for presidents, then it is clear there will be few women and persons of color selected as presidents. The willingness of sitting presidents

and former presidents to assist the MLI students as they pursue their career goals is unmatched by almost any training program I have seen in higher education.

Gregory H. Williams
President, The City College of New York

This is the best-kept secret in higher education.

Wendy J. Thompson
Special Assistant to the Chancellor
Tennessee Board of Regents

Obviously, the MLI has met a very real need in the higher education community. With consistently high evaluations and powerfully positive testimonials such as these, it is clear that the Initiative founders were right to channel their passion in such an important way. And, if this chapter is successful in telling the story, MLI will not remain the "best-kept secret in higher education," but will become a tool for others to sharpen their skills and lead our nation's higher education institutions.

PROGRAM SUPPORT

The AASCU MLI works to help individuals from underrepresented populations into the top leadership positions in higher education. The ultimate goal is the highest office – the presidency. However, MLI benefits others on their career path and ultimately strengthens all of higher education.

AASCU's member institutions support MLI through volunteer financial contributions. Presidents and chancellors as well as presidential faculty support MLI by raising funds, nominating candidates, screening applicants, serving as faculty or advisors at the Institute, and serving as mentors in the year following the Institute. The presidential faculty donates its time and talent. MLI relies on the goodwill of the institutions that provide financial support and the generosity of the presidents and chancellors who donate their time and expertise.

An image articulated by Dr. Robert McNeish best describes the contributions and relationships between these many MLI supporters. McNeish was a science teacher in Baltimore, Maryland, for many years before becoming involved in school administration. Intrigued with observing geese in flight for years, he first wrote about them in "Lessons from the Geese," a sermon he delivered in his church in 1972. In the story, he observed that as each bird flaps its wings, it creates "uplift" for the bird following. By flying in a "V" formation, the whole flock adds 71% greater flying range than if the bird flew alone.

In many ways, the founders of MLI are the geese at the apex of the "V," developing the strengths of others by forming a community of leaders to support one another…to hand one another along.

ASSOCIATION SUPPORT

The AASCU represents more than 430 public colleges, universities and systems of higher education throughout the United States and its territories. Membership is open to any regionally accredited institution of higher education offering programs leading to bachelor's, master's or doctoral degrees and is wholly or partially state supported or state controlled. AASCU schools enroll more than three million students, or 56% of the enrollment at all public 4-year institutions. They continue to be among the most affordable of all 4-year colleges and universities. Undergraduate tuition and fees (resident) in 2003–2004 averaged $4,182.

The AASCU implements the vision of the MLI presidential leadership. MLI draws upon the staff resources of the association at the highest levels in all divisions. AASCU's support of MLI underscores the association's professional development mission and reinforces AASCU's commitment to diversity in higher education leadership.

REFERENCE

Purkey, W. W., & Siegel, B. L. (2003). *Becoming an invitational leader: A new approach to professional and personal success.* Atlanta, GA: A Humanics Trade Group Publications.

This page intentionally left blank

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION: ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION – AN OXYMORON?

Audrey Yamagata-Noji

University of California, Irvine	52%
University of California, Berkeley	42%
Polytechnic University (NY)	41%
University of California, Los Angeles	39%
California Institute of Technology	34%
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	31%
Carnegie Mellon University	26%
Universitxy of Illinois, Chicago	26%
University of Washington	26%
SUNY – Stony Brook	25%

What do the above percentages reflect? No, it is not the percentage of non-White executive/administrative positions at the institution. Yes, it is the

percentage of Asian Pacific American undergraduate students enrolled at these leading higher education institutions. Surprised that the percentages are so high? Take another look:

University of California, Irvine	7%
University of California, Berkeley	9%
University of California, Los Angeles	10%

The above percentages reflect the executive/administrative positions held by Asian Pacific Americans at these institutions. Quite a contrast.

52–7%	University of California, Irvine
42–9%	University of California, Berkeley
39–10%	University of California, Los Angeles

159,888
Another statistic.
This represents the total number of executive/administrative positions in public and private 2- and 4-year colleges in the U.S. as of Fall 1999.

3,332
Another statistic.
This is the total number of Asian Pacific Americans holding executive/administrative positions in public and private 2- and 4-year colleges in the U.S. as of Fall 1999.

2%
An alarming statistic.
This represents the percentage of Asian Pacific Americans holding these executive/administrative positions in public and private 2- and 4-year colleges in the U.S. as of Fall 1999.

Colleges/Universities
Kauai Community College, Lihue, Kauai
Hawaii Community College, Hilo, Hawaii
Maui Community College, Kahului, Maui
University of Hawaii at Hilo, Hawaii
University of Hawaii at West Oahu, Hawaii

Polytechnic University, New York
Butler University, Indiana
College of DuPage, Illinois
Ohio State Higher Education System, Ohio
Morehead State University, Kentucky
St. Cloud State University, Minnesota
Central Michigan University, Michigan
West Georgia State University, Georgia
Mission College, California
Coastline College, California
Foothill College, California
Imperial Valley College, California
San Jose City College, California
South Orange Community College District, California
West Los Angeles College, California
University of California, Santa Barbara

What do these institutions of higher education have in common? The list is not very long. However, this list of 21 colleges represents most of the major colleges and universities, 2- and 4-year, public and private, in the U.S. that have an Asian Pacific American as a president or chancellor. Even though there are several other proprietary colleges that have not been included, the list is still short. Too short. Unacceptably short. The list represents less than one percent of the total number of presidents and chancellors in higher education in the U.S. If you take away Hawaii and California, the numbers become minute, appearing almost as an anomaly.

So what is wrong with this picture? Asian Pacific Americans comprise between 25% and 50% of students, yet only 2.1% of full time administrators and less than one percent (0.9%) of presidents and chancellors. Although still alarmingly low, there are over 6% African American CEOs and 4% Latino American CEOs according to the American Council on Education with almost 85% Anglo administrators and almost 9% African American and a little over 3% Latino American administrators. As higher education in America strives to embrace issues of diversity and equity, the inequity and under-representation of Asian Pacific Americans in executive/administrative positions is appalling and the need to address this unacceptable reality borders on a crisis.

INTRODUCTION

Quiet
Hard worker
Good at math
Team player
Reserved
Dependable
Humble
Shy
Not leadership material

These are common thoughts, descriptions, and comments uttered by many when describing Asian and Pacific Islander Americans (APAs). Why, as a group, are we typecast so easily? And why does being quiet, reserved, and humble mean that others think we are lacking in leadership skills?

When it comes to education, APA students are often looked upon as the students who raise the curve, take up all the seats in the library, and *always* do well in high school and go on to prestigious colleges. APA educators are often seen as the faculty in math, engineering, information technology, or business schools and not capable of assuming leadership roles. Rarely are APAs expected to be found in management positions, Student Affairs, the humanities, or social sciences.

Time and again, we hear about highly educated and qualified APAs who are passed over for promotions, leadership opportunities, and higher level career positions. Often we hear that APAs fail during the interview process. Other times we hear that APAs simply do not have a "leadership profile" on their campuses.

Certainly, some of this stems from perceptions and stereotypes. More often than not, our actions, or inactions, are misunderstood by others. For example, if APAs do not speak up in meetings, they are viewed as

- Having no opinion
- In disagreement
- Disengaged
- Arrogant or elitist.

Many APAs do not speak up in meetings because they believe, "Don't waste time speaking if you don't have anything more to offer." In interview

Table 1. Comparison of Attributes.

Feel Superior Compared to Anglo Students	Feel Stronger Compared to Other APA Students	Feel Weaker Compared to Other APA Students	Feel Weaker Compared to Anglo Students
Math abilities	Social skills	Math abilities	Social skills
Science abilities	Assertiveness	Science abilities	Assertiveness
Test scores	Leadership skills	Test scores	Leadership skills
Grades	Communication skills	Grades	Communication skills

situations, having been taught that humility is a virtue, APAs often feel that it is rude to brag and subsequently do not always share their skills, knowledge, and accomplishments. Having been taught that hard work will be recognized, APAs have been known to continue to work harder in the expectation that this will be rewarded with promotional opportunities. This does not automatically happen. The notion of marketing oneself – speaking up for one's self and articulating one's accomplishments – does not always come naturally to APAs.

In my own research, I found that Japanese American college students rated themselves differently when comparing themselves to other APA students than to Anglo students. Table 1 demonstrates the differences. Note how there is a direct, inverse correlation wherein Japanese American students feel stronger and superior in academic-related skills compared to Anglos and weaker compared to other APAs. Conversely, APAs feel stronger in social-related skills compared to other APAs than to Anglos.

Through this research, as well as through conducting many interviews and workshop sessions with APAs throughout the nation, it is quite clear that the majority of APAs compete against other APAs academically and in other achievements, yet feel weaker in their abilities to compete socially and in leadership roles compared to Anglo Americans. In academia, as in corporate America, our institutions are managed far more by Anglos than persons of color, especially APAs. Many APAs, either consciously or subconsciously, still believe that we are ''guests'' in America, that Anglos are the Americans, and that they must be defined as Asian Pacific Americans, rather than as Americans. Since they often defer to Anglo Americans, it is fairly easy to understand the dissonance that APAs undergo when seeking leadership roles on their Anglo American-dominated college campuses.

Certainly not all APAs are shy, quiet, and unassertive. Depending on how one was raised, one's generation (length of time in the United States) and other personality factors, there are APAs who do not have difficulty speaking up, openly sharing, and actively demonstrating leadership skills. They do not subscribe to this notion of deference. They are able to openly assert themselves and to work aggressively for their place at the decision-making table.

However, sometimes viewed as foreigners, APAs have struggled historically to establish our place in the diversity landscape of America. Frequently, APAs are left out in diversity dialogs and are not even considered ethnic minorities. In fact, we are often considered "model minorities" – to the point where we have been labeled as "outwhiting the whites" and the minority wedge group on such issues as affirmative action related to college admissions. This has not only been damaging but is highly offensive, and has resulted in a very divisive situation. The negative impact has hurt APAs personally and professionally as they are often misperceived and misjudged.

Enter: "*The Glass Ceiling.*" Time and again, we have learned about the struggles and the fights for APA faculty to be granted tenure, to be appointed president or vice president or even dean. We learn of Anglos, both men and women, and Latinos and African Americans getting appointed to positions of leadership and visibility. We hear account after account of APAs getting passed over for positions, of being overlooked, of being "bounced back." It is the phenomenon of the glass ceiling, whereby the top appears in reach because of the seeming transparency, but the reality is much different. APAs have worked hard to attain academic credentials and to contribute to the field of higher education. For many, not only has there been a glass ceiling, but a "Plexiglas ceiling" – in which many APAs strive for higher level positions, only to be bounced back time and again. The positions and opportunities only appeared to be in reach, and even when encouraged and supported, the APA professionals still have been unable to pierce through. If the ceiling is more Plexiglas than glass, there can be an assumption that the APAs will never break through.

Is the word "leader" an oxymoron when applied to APAs? We think not. We believe that APAs are often misunderstood, undervalued, and overlooked. However, the number of APA educators who presently serve in senior level positions in higher education is less than one percent nationally. Juxtaposed to the high percentage of APA students on college campuses nationwide, this fact points to an alarming disparity and a compelling need to act.

HISTORY OF THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Leadership Development Program in Higher Education (LDPHE) was initiated when Bob Suzuki, then President of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, became critically concerned about the lack of a pipeline of Asian and Pacific American leaders who could move into positions of influence and leadership within higher education. To address this problem, President Suzuki organized a "summit" meeting in 1995 with leading APAs in higher education, including the late Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley Chang-lin Tien and President/CEO of Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP), J.D. Hokoyama.

Envisioned as a vehicle to develop future leaders, LEAP is a national, non-profit organization founded in 1982 to achieve full participation and equality for APAs. LEAP programs encourage individuals to assume leadership positions at work and in the community, to be informed and vocal about policy issues relevant to APAs and ultimately, to become mentors and role models for future leaders. Across the nation, LEAP has become established and recognized as the leading training organization that provides culturally relevant leadership development programs. As a well-established non-profit organization with a strong infrastructure, LEAP's participation in the summit was critical to the development of the LDPHE.

President Suzuki articulated the problem: if we do not focus on the development of our own leaders, there will be a pronounced void of APAs as college presidents/chancellors, vice presidents, and deans. Not only do we face a glass ceiling, we also face a leadership pipeline problem. Although there had been some recognizable success in senior level appointments, the lack of a ready pool of recognized APA leaders and the age factors of our current leadership, revealed that a decline rather than a surge could be projected. In fact, the tracking of the numbers of college and university presidents since 1996 has supported this fear. Based on recent retirements, the net number of APA college presidents, chancellors, and vice presidents has seriously declined. In California alone:

- There are NO APA presidents in the 23-campus California State University System, since the retirement of Bob Suzuki.
- There are NO APA vice presidents in the 23-campus California State University System, since Judy Sakaki became a vice chancellor at UC Davis.
- There is only ONE APA chancellor in the 10-campus University of California System, Henry Yang at UC Santa Barbara.

- There is only ONE APA vice-chancellor in the 10-campus University of California System, Judy Sakaki.
- There are only 7 APA presidents or chancellors (3.8%) out of over 180 possible positions in the California Community College System, since the retirements of Tim Dong, Ron Kong, Neil Yoneji, Evelyn Wong, Jack Fujimoto, and others.

The intent of the LDPHE was to develop a formalized training program wherein we could ''grow our own'' and help to strengthen the leadership pipeline for APA educators. It was important that APAs not be overlooked when it came to making appointments and promotions. The negative image of the model minority has been a major strike against APAs. If others view us as ''having it all'' – raising the curve, taking the key admissions slots at prestigious universities, and winning scholarly awards – then how could we make a case that we need to have a specialized leadership program for APAs? Not only did we have to fight against the glass ceiling, but also we had to fight the model minority label. We knew that it would be difficult to raise outside funds and to convince supporters that this program was important and necessary, but we moved ahead nevertheless.

Initially, the focus was on developing a pipeline for executive level positions. Therefore, we would recruit assistant deans and deans who would be excellent candidates for vice presidents, presidents, and chancellors. That focus changed quickly as we discovered that there was an insufficient pool of mid-level APA managers from which to draw on. Instead of developing college presidents, we had to focus on simply developing leaders – from within the management, faculty, and staff ranks, some of whom desired not to enter the administrative ranks.

One of the primary reasons the LDPHE has been successful was the strong foundation rooted in its inception. Because of the profound respect for President Suzuki and his tireless efforts to support the program, leading APA educators have committed their time and talents to the development and continuation of the program. One of the ironic outcomes was the fact that because our numbers are relatively small, we have not had great difficulty identifying all sitting college presidents in the entire nation: we could practically count them on our fingers. And when we called, they responded enthusiastically and have funded their own costs to participate as speakers and mentors.

Asian and Pacific Americans in Higher Education (APAHE) played a key role. APAHE is the only national, non-profit organization specifically dedicated to advancing APA causes and issues across college campuses.

Founded in 1988, in response to discriminatory admissions practices at the University of California, Berkeley, and the tenure fights of several noted APA scholars, APAHE is the leading, national, higher education organization for APA professionals. APAHE is dedicated to enhancing the educational opportunities for APA students, promoting the recruitment, hiring and tenuring of qualified APA faculty, staff and executives, and creating a better understanding of issues in the public affecting APAs in higher education.

Creating a formal bridge between LEAP and APAHE was natural. At President Suzuki's direction, the two organizations joined forces to develop the model, which would become the LDPHE. LEAP had an extensive and proven background in leadership training program for business executives, employees within technical fields, and at the grassroots community level. Very few educators had participated in LEAP's existing Leadership Management Institute. Education is significantly different from business when it comes to leadership development. Our work in developing the curriculum for the LDPHE rested largely on the existing resources and successful approaches that LEAP was already utilizing, but adapted for APA educators.

Although it took nearly a year of planning, the LDPHE was born in the spring of 1997 and the first class of participants was welcomed in June of 1997. The absolute dependence on LEAP to take the lead in developing the curriculum and providing the administrative support was imperative. APAHE had the contacts within higher education, but LEAP had the infrastructure – an office, staff, and ongoing programs. We crossed our fingers and hoped that we would have sufficient participation. We knew we faced some struggles with recruitment of participants. Nevertheless we had 25 in our first class.

Many APAs do not recognize that they are leadership material. Those who are already in leadership positions do not always believe that they need any further training. Some APAs are simply reluctant to ask for institutional support to attend the program, or prefer to pursue more mainstream types of leadership programs. As anticipated, we faced these challenges and more, from 1997 to the present.

The leadership development model that has been most successful is one that is based on developing practical skills rather than relying on theoretical models. We have been most successful by focusing on interpersonal skills, interviewing skills, and communication skills. Based on the feedback from college presidents and chancellors, and other senior level college administrators, many Asian Pacific Americans possess the academic credentials and technical knowledge to move into higher level positions, but lack the

assertiveness, communication, and general leadership skills to be selected for higher level positions. Being able to sell oneself is, at times, a foreign concept to Asian Pacific Americans. Taught to be humble, APAs often find it difficult to perform well during the interview hiring process. Being able to speak up for oneself, to take the credit for the success of an accomplishment, and to outwardly demonstrate one's knowledge, do not always come naturally. Also, many APAs find themselves isolated on their college campuses, as one of the few, if only, APAs interested in further leadership development and professional growth opportunities. When there are not many of you on your college campus, role models and mentors are scarce and leadership development appears illusive.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Program Goals

- To provide a structured and supportive environment in which participants can explore leadership profiles and develop customized leadership skills.
- To graduate participants who are more prepared and confident to face and address issues confronting them in their professional roles.
- To create a ready pool of trained leaders who are able to seize available opportunities by seeking and obtaining successfully higher level positions of leadership within higher education.
- To teach practical skills based on a culturally sensitive modality that builds on participants' strengths and addresses specific challenges.
- To develop an enhanced network of Asian Pacific Americans in higher education who are prepared to address issues of empowerment and inclusion.

Need Analysis

In meeting with APA educators across the nation, they defined for us the critical issues, conditions, and factors that they believe stand in their way of attaining successful positions of leadership, visibility, and influence:

- Racism
- Weak communication skills
- Perception that APA cultural values makes us ''not fit the mold''
- Youthful appearance
- Lack of mentors to show us the ropes

- Pigeonholing/typecasting by other campus leaders
- Inability to understand others' cultural identities and approaches
- Emphasis on competition versus cooperation; dealing with backbiting
- Not playing the political game.

Many of these findings are reflected in the structure of the program: communication skills, understanding APA cultural values, mentoring, and learning how to play the political game. We talk about and address the other issues and develop strategies whereby participants can address stereotyping and inequitable treatment. Certainly, a comprehensive goal for the LDPHE is to combat racism by dealing with issues of invisibility, marginality, and profiling. As we work to change attitudes and approaches on college campuses, we are committed to empowering our APA professionals to be accepted, valued, and recognized as unique individuals and outstanding leaders.

Format

The LDPHE is an intensive, 4-day experience with a format that focuses on in-depth interactions between participants and the program faculty. It is a stand-alone residential program in order to maximize opportunities for networking and the development of critical linkages with others. We have consciously decided to not merge the program with an existing conference or meeting. We ask participants to remain in residence in order to develop the full bonding experience. The program has been housed for the past 8 years at the Kellogg West Conference Center on the campus of Cal Poly Pomona, through the support originally provided by President Suzuki and currently by President Michael Ortiz. Held in a retreat-like setting, it lets participants clearly focus on issues, skill building and relationship development in a venue free from distractions.

Originally held in June, the program now takes place in the second week of July, beginning on a Wednesday morning and ending with lunch on Saturday. Over time, we learned that there was never a perfect time to hold the program. LEAP's Leadership Management Institute is a corporate model and is held over 5 full business days. Although past participants have noted that they would have liked more time, we do not feel that educators would be able to afford or attend an additional day. The present format includes only a partial weekend day, which has seemed to be a good compromise.

Program Coordination

Henry Gee, Vice President of Student Services at Rio Hondo College in Whittier, California and Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Vice President of Student Services at Mt. San Antonio College in Walnut, California serve as co-coordinators for the LDPHE Program. With extensive backgrounds in leadership development, group dynamics, and communication skills, Henry and Audrey have worked closely with LEAP and LDPHE faculty/mentors to continue to develop and refine the program so that it remains relevant and meaningful. Both volunteer their time to serve as coordinators while also contributing as presenters and mentors. However, Henry and Audrey are quick to admit that coordinating the program enables them to keep their own leadership skills sharp as well as offers them an annual refresher course as they continue to benefit from the wisdom shared by the program speakers and mentors.

Content Overview

The LDPHE features hands-on workshops, mentoring, and interactive dialogs with noted APA educational leaders who help guide participants in developing their personalized leadership career plans and in incorporating new skills and insights to their professional development. The program provides participants with

- Career-building leadership skills
- Insights on the "hidden" career ladder in higher education
- Tools to effectively position yourself as a leader
- Creation and implementation of a personalized Leadership and Career Action Plan
- Valuable relationships and networks among fellow APA professionals in higher education.

The main session topics are:

- The 21st Century Leader: Surviving and Thriving in the Third Millennium
- Understanding Asian Pacific American Values and Leadership Skills
- Developing and Promoting Your Leadership Style
- Effective Communication Strategies
- Interviewing for Success (Mock Interviews)
- Risk Taking: Making Changes Happen

- Mastering the Dynamics of Power: Making an Impact on Campus
- Successfully Surviving Leadership Challenges.

The 4-day schedule focuses on a continual development of essential skills and knowledge:

Day One

The emphasis is on understanding what it means to be a leader, how to lead, the challenges leaders face, and the risks that leaders must take. Inserted into this discussion are the unique issues that face APAs as leaders. Understanding how one's APA cultural values impact one's leadership style is critically important to self-understanding and laying the foundation for further leadership development. It is essential that leaders understand how they are perceived by others and how they would like themselves to be perceived. It is important to not only understand one's values, but how one's values and beliefs impact one's behaviors. Participants are videotaped on day one to capture their "raw state." They are again videotaped for their final presentations on day four in their "developed state."

The program utilizes a workshop format, rather than a lecture format, to guide participants through the many self-development exercises in the program. This format lends itself to much dialog, small group interactions, and practical applications of the material being presented. Participants begin to map out their future career plans on day one as they think about where they are, where they are going, and what they need to do to get to their future destinations.

Day Two

Communication and presentation skills are the main focus of day two. Attention shifts from understanding the conceptual issues to one's ability to present oneself to others and to communicate publicly and interpersonally. Public speaking strategies are presented and participants are afforded opportunities to practice new skill sets.

A critical part of communication is the career interview. We review the essentials of interviewing for career positions and promotional opportunities and then put it into practice through mock interviews. Each participant receives an opportunity to participate in a simulated interview session with

established faculty members and ranking higher education executives. Essentially, they interview in front of the very folks who could hire them! This is a very intensive experience, but it is rated as one of the most valuable aspects of the program.

Day Three

The primary focus of day three is to understand the power dynamics on the campus and the impact that politics plays on how decisions are made and on how opportunities are presented. APA mentors provide personal accounts of their own leadership paths, sharing them through panel presentations as well as individualized sessions. Each participant is matched with a mentor to further dialog and develop a career and leadership direction.

Day one began with developing a framework and a grounding of the dynamics of being an APA leader in higher education. Day two focused on very specific skill sets. By the end of day three, participants are more fully aware of the individual roles they play in advancing and addressing the issues, causes, and concerns of Asian Pacific Americans as leaders within the field of education.

Day Four

The theme for day four is "putting it all together" and "making a commitment." Participants will have spent time developing their future career directions and must make a presentation to their colleagues, which is videotaped. This public presentation serves as their "final exam." We have found that participants are more likely to continue to make progress after the end of the program if they have publicly committed themselves to reaching their personal-professional goals. By the end of day four, participants have a plan and a map that is supported by a host of new colleagues and mentors. A promotional celebration concludes the program whereby participants receive plaques for having successfully completed the program.

PROGRAM COMPONENT DETAILS

Speakers

Featured each day are leading APA educators who serve as inspirational speakers. Some of our featured speakers have included:

- President Bob Suzuki (retired), California Polytechnic University, Pomona
- President Roy Saigo, St. Cloud State University, Minnesota
- Professor Evelyn Hu-DeHart, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island
- Vice Chancellor Judy Sakaki, University of California, Davis
- Vice President Doris Ching, University of Hawaii, Manoa
- Professor Ling-chi Wang, University of California, Berkeley
- Executive Director Carmen Guevara Neuberger (retired), American College Personnel Association, Washington D.C.
- Chancellor Ron Kong (retired), Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, Hayward, California
- President Tim Dong (retired), MiraCosta College, Oceanside, California
- Associate President Patrick Hayashi (retired), University of California, Office of the President
- Chancellor Peter Ku (retired), Seattle Community College District
- Chancellor David Chang, Brooklyn Polytechnic University
- Chancellor Neil Yoneji (retired), Los Angeles Community College District.

Their perspectives are based on experiences as faculty as well as administrators. The speakers generally share their personal and professional stories and how they have faced critical challenges and overcome many obstacles to reach success. Because the speakers' backgrounds vary, both by discipline and style, the participants are exposed to various types of leadership styles, all within the context of APA leaders in higher education. Participants have commented on how much they enjoyed seeing and experiencing a range of styles that have assisted them in understanding how to maximize their own success. One of the greatest lessons learned is the importance of being able to stand for something as a leader.

Patrick Hayashi, recently retired as the Associate President of the University of California, is a favorite speaker. During his tenure in the UC Office of the President, Pat was the highest-ranking Asian Pacific American within the University of California system. With his title and stature and the many demands on his attention, Pat has nevertheless made time in his schedule and has spoken annually at the LDPHE program. He shares intimate details about overcoming the fear of public speaking and learning to deal with his emotions while advocating his beliefs. Getting in touch with one's soul is another important message that Pat shares. From taking risks

challenging the status quo to learning how to paint to express oneself – are all part of fully developing one's full potential as an effective human being.

Leadership Development in an APA Context

J.D. Hokoyama presents his well-known session on "21st Century Leader: Surviving and Thriving in the Third Millennium." Leadership is presented in a context of assimilation of the Asian Pacific American culture.

> An issue that most Americans struggle with at some point in their lives: How far to assimilate, to conform to the notion of what it means to be an American at the expense of their own culture, their own heritage, their own identity.

Included in this presentation is a review of the history and current issues impacting the greater, pan-Asian Pacific American communities in the U.S. Having an opportunity to discuss concerns such as affirmative action, the glass ceiling, and the under-representation of APAs in leadership positions is critically important to the overall leadership development of participants.

Many participants come to LDPHE having had no major ties to the APA community or to any APA organizations or movements on their college campuses. Some will spend the 4 days searching for their own identity and how they fit into the milieu that comprises Asian Pacific America. The great diversity of our ethnic groups provides challenges and opportunities as we attempt to coalesce as a community of APAs.

The uniqueness of the LDPHE curriculum lies in the anchoring of the material in a context of Asian Pacific American cultural values. It is ingrained in us at an early age, and participants are encouraged to seek greater linkages between their thoughts and actions with how they were raised, their beliefs, and their values. Frequently, there are "aha" moments in which participants come face to face with a level of self-understanding and self-awareness of how Asian Pacific American cultural values, practices and beliefs impact their outlooks, approaches, and styles.

Mock Interviews

Participants are asked to come prepared to interview – to know the position they want to interview for and to have copies of an updated resume. College administrators and faculty, both APA and non-APA, are invited to serve on interview panels. To date, all mentors have been Asian Pacific Americans.

For this purpose, however, we feel that participants will benefit from an interview situation which closely mirrors reality. Having Anglo, African American, and Latino professionals assist us with this component has been extremely valuable. Many individuals take this session very seriously and come prepared in business attire. This is especially helpful in both guiding the participant to take the exercise seriously as well as helping the panel lists fully evaluate the candidate's entire package.

Participants are asked several questions through a mock interview process that lasts about 10–15 min. Almost as much time is spent by the interviewers in providing direct feedback to each interviewee. Common pointers include:

- Make eye contact
- Smile and be personable
- Be specific with examples of accomplishments
- Be able to articulate your strengths – what you would bring to the position
- Be more active, rather than passive
- Speak clearly – articulate words and thoughts
- Be able to openly share your achievements and speak assertively about why you are best suited for the position.

Most of us never practice with anyone before going into an interview, let alone get direct feedback from established and successful leaders in higher education. We have received favorable feedback from graduates of the program who shared how helpful the mock session was for them in interviewing for new positions. The way the exercise is structured, participants meet together before and after their mock interviews, which has turned out to be an excellent opportunity for them to develop a supportive network.

Communication Skills

Leading up to the mock interviews, the program focuses on communication skills as they relate to speaking publicly in large and small groups as well as communicating interpersonally. Based upon the feedback, participants benefited from learning how to carry themselves when making public presentations, how to speak with emphasis, and how to use body language to enhance their message. Many of our speakers demonstrate how to do this and speak for themselves about how they overcame their fear of public speaking. LEAP materials are used for this session as well as assistance from professionals in the communications field. As time allows, participants

practice making presentations to groups and formal speeches. The pre- and post-videotaping (days one and four) give participants a firsthand look at how they perform when speaking in front of a group.

Mentoring

Annually, participants find the greatest value of the LDPHE in the direct mentoring by leading APA educators – faculty leaders as well as chancellors, presidents, and vice presidents. The opportunity to learn of the journeys that others have taken on their paths to success is incredibly inspiring. It is amazing how powerful this session is. Participants come away empowered with strategies and a clearer sense of direction. They feel fully supported in knowing how much others care about and share in their success. Some of our mentors, over the years, have been:

- President Chui Tsang, San Jose City College, California
- President Frank Chong, Mission College, Santa Clara, California
- President James Kho, DeVry Institute of Technology, Fremont, California
- Vice Chancellor Judy Sakaki, University of California, Davis
- Vice-President Doris Ching, University of Hawaii, Manoa
- Vice Provost Gene Awakuni, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California
- Vice President Melinda Matsuda, Chabot College, Hayward, California
- Professor Ling-chi Wang, University of California, Berkeley
- Professor Evelyn Hu-Dehart, Brown University
- Professor Gay Yuen, California State University, Los Angeles
- Dean Pat Neilson, North Shore Community College, Boston, Massachusetts
- Associate Vice President Alan Nishio, California State University, Long Beach
- Associate Vice President Howard Wang, California State University, Fullerton
- Associate Professor Brian Tsukimura, California State University, Fresno
- District Director Christine Iijima Hall, Maricopa Community College District
- Associate President Patrick Hayashi (retired), University of California Office of the President
- Chancellor Ron Kong (retired), Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
- President Tim Dong (retired), MiraCosta College

- Chancellor Neil Yoneji (retired), Los Angeles Community College District
- Executive Director (retired) Carmen Neuberger, American College Personnel Association (ACPA).

Each participant is matched with a program mentor. Although reminiscent of "The Dating Game," careful thought goes into matching mentees and mentors. However, participants are constantly reminded that all program faculty are "fair game" such that any class member can seek out any speaker, presenter, mentor as an additional mentor. Approximately an hour and half is provided for the "mentor match" portion of the program. After a flurry of sessions, being able to spend quality time one-to-one or in very small groups is an especially meaningful opportunity. The awesome experience of being individually mentored by high-ranking APA educators has not only been impressive to the participants, but has been a source of personal empowerment.

In fact, many of our mentors have had major impacts on the careers of their mentees. Most notable have been the direct interventions related to the job search process. Being able to review and prepare for the interview has assisted many program alumni to continue to reap the benefits of the program, long after their 4-day class has ended. And how excited we all are to learn of the successes of our participants!

"Navigating Political Waters"

Many APAs are apolitical – by their own admission. Preferring to not get involved in campus politics, many APAs become lost in the political power maze. An important session in LDPHE is "Navigating Political Waters." Many of our folks have shared that they have been blindsided by decisions that were made, passed over for promotions that they rightfully should have had, and caught off guard by end-runs induced by influential individuals and groups on their campuses.

In this session, we also cover the notion of power. Being able to understand the organizational dynamics of one's campus is critically important. Who makes decisions? Who are in positions of power and influence? When is the right time to bring up an issue and whom should you approach? Stimulating discussions and even mapping of campus power structures enables participants to return to campus with a clearer understanding of how

to go about influencing change, asserting oneself, and even seizing some of
the power!

   Participants complete a Campus Organizational Assessment to enable
them to focus on who has power on campus, where they fit in that structure,
and how they can exercise their power and influence on campus and improve
their visibility. The concept of power is one that can feel and sound strange
to many APAs. However, one of the greatest concerns we hear is that APAs
feel taken for granted, overlooked, not listened to, not consulted, and un-
dervalued. Understanding how power and politics work on a college campus
is a critical component to leadership development.

Leadership and Career Action Plan (Personal Strategic Plan)

Participants need to have a plan, a roadmap, of where they are going after
the program. To this end, we begin day one with the development of the
Personal Strategic Plan for Leadership and Career Action. We address it
every day, working on the various aspects, which include:

- Goals for myself (day one)
- Goals 5 years from now (day four)
- Leadership qualities I value
- My leadership qualities
- Perceptions
  1. What others say about me that is positive and negative
  2. What I stand for – my "brand" identity
  3. How I want to be perceived (qualities)
  4. Strategies to change how I am perceived
- SWOT Analysis
  1. Strengths: What am I good at?
  2. Weaknesses: What am I not so good at?
  3. Opportunities: What options do I have?
  4. Threats: What stands in the way? What am I afraid of?
- My Personal Road Map – "final exam"
  1. Where I think I am going – goals for myself
  2. How I plan to get there – steps and strategies
  3. Defining major roadblocks
  4. Plan to deal with potential roadblocks
- Personal Mission Statement – "final exam."

The Personal Road Map and the Personal Mission Statement are melded into the ''Final Exam'' on Day Four. This is the last activity of the program. Participants make presentations in front of the class describing their goals, plans, and personal agendas. Often, this activity becomes a profound source of bonding between participants, knitting together their commonalities, and providing a personal and emotional connectivity into the future.

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

The U.S. Census identifies over 70 different subgroups of Asian and Pacific Americans. In the LDPHE, we have intentionally attempted to have an ethnically diverse pool of participants. Admittedly, there is room for improvement in attracting more South Asians, Southeast Asians, and Pacific Islanders. In the case of Southeast Asians and Pacific Islanders, however, their total numbers in higher education is relatively low, making recruitment of them difficult. Tracking the demographics is complex also because of the ethnic mix of many of our participants with multiple heritages. The wide range of diversity that defines Asian Pacific Americans is clearly demonstrated in our program participant demographics (Table 2).

In terms of gender, participants are significantly more female, with 111 females and only 79 males attending the program.

Certainly a focus of the program has been on the individual serving in administrative roles. Many have felt that we need to increase the level of faculty participation. A goal for us, then, is to increase the number of faculty participants. The title ''staff'' means different things in different higher education systems, making it difficult to interpret the professional background levels of participants (Table 3).

APAHE and LEAP, although established as national organizations, are essentially both headquartered on the West Coast. The two coordinators for the LDPHE are stationed in Southern California. Therefore, the geographical breakdown of participants is notably California-based. Recruitment funds for LDPHE do not exist, which also hampers our ability to fully outreach to other APAs in higher education throughout the nation. We have been criticized for not offering the program on the East Coast. Transplanting the infrastructure for the program at this time is cost-prohibitive. We are working to develop East Coast sponsors to help us offer the program there in the very near future (Table 4).

Table 2.   Ethnicity of LDPHE Program Participants 1997–2004.

Ethnic Group(s)	No.	%
Chinese	69	37
Japanese	33	18
Filipino	28	15
Vietnamese	10	5
Korean	9	5
Hmong	5	3
Asian American	4	2
South Asian Indian	3	2
Taiwanese	2	1
Chicano	1	0.5
Laotian	1	0.5
Singaporean	1	0.5
Tongan	1	0.5
Mixed Race/Mixed Ethnicity		
Chinese Thai (1), Chinese Vietnamese (2), Chinese Anglo (3), Chinese Jamaican (1), Chinese Japanese (3)	10	5
Filipino Anglo (1), Filipino Chinese (2), Filipino Latino (1), Filipino Pacific Islander (1), Filipino Sicilian (1)	6	3
Indonesian Dutch (1), Indonesian Chinese (1), Indonesian Javanese (1)	3	2
Japanese Anglo (1), Japanese African American (1), Japanese Puerto Rican (1)	3	2
Korean African American (1)	1	0.5

Table 3.   Position Level of LDPHE Participants 1997–2004.

Position Level	No.	%
Administration/Management	77	40
Faculty	45	24
Staff	68	36

MARKETING AND OUTREACH

Much of our outreach is on a personal basis. Although we distribute hundreds of program brochures to college presidents, APA mailing lists, and educational groups, meetings with individuals one-on-one or in small groups

Table 4. Geographical Representation of LDPHE Participants 1997–2004.

Region	No.	%
Southern California	72	38
Northern California	88	46
Central California	8	4
Total California	(168)	(88)
Pacific Northwest	2	1
Western Rockies/Plain States	6	3
Midwest	4	2
South	3	2
East Coast	7	4

have proven most beneficial. Clearly, our base is California, but that also is a reflection of the large numbers of higher education institutions which have large numbers of APA students and APA employees. The two program coordinators regularly attend and participate in national professional conferences to publicize and encourage participation in the program. We meet with APA affinity groups and caucuses within national organizations as well: AAHE (American Association for Higher Education), ACPA (American College Personnel Association), NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators), AACC (American Association of Community Colleges), and NCORE (National Conference on Race and Ethnicity). Direct coordination with the parent organizations has been difficult, but informal contacts through these affinity groups have proven valuable. Conference presentations about the program have also been highly successful. We have presented regularly at the annual APAHE conferences, as well as at ACPA, NASPA, and NCORE.

Word of mouth and our established track record are also critical to the continued success of the program. Past participants share their excitement and their experiences with others and encourage their attendance. At the conclusion of each year's program, participants are encouraged to write a letter of appreciation to the individual (president or other supervisor) who sponsored their attendance and to articulate the benefits of the program. On several occasions, the transformation of the individual and the testimony as to the effect of the program on the individual have had such impact that the college president has committed to continuing to sponsor APAs to participate in the program.

Every year there are APAs who contact us to tell us that they do not feel that their campus will support their attendance for LDPHE. Many folks are afraid to ask their president or vice president to attend. They feel embarrassed or unsure about asking for something that appears to be so personal – their own attendance at a leadership program. When we have approached college presidents, however, they have often been extremely interested in nominating, funding, and sending individuals to the program.

Networks

The intentional by-product of the program is a far-reaching network of past participants, program faculty and mentors. The two program coordinators are frequently called upon to provide letters of reference, support for tenure review, and referrals for new positions. You know the network works when you are contacted by a college or an organization, which is looking to recruit APAs, and you are able to personally refer, recommend, and connect it with the program participants. We have ample evidence that program graduates have received new positions based on direct connections made through LDPHE coordinators and mentors.

Via e-mail, many alumni stay in touch with each other, providing an incredible system of support for one another. Local lunch gatherings have also been held in various regions so that past and future participants can connect and continue to support one another. We have been able to provide job search pointers to several program alumni simply by responding to e-mail requests.

A program's greatest success is the promotion of the program by alumni. This has proven to be critically important in the ongoing recruitment of participants each year. We regularly call upon our graduates to refer and recruit participants for the program. In the course of our follow-up work with our alumni, we have determined a need to develop a second tier of the LDPHE. Therefore, for the past 2 years, we have worked to have an informal gathering of program graduates who meet to share successes and concerns in a setting of mutual understanding and support. This group has requested to formalize an ongoing annual follow-on program and plans are now in the works to begin offering this in 2005. This effort runs parallel to the regular LDPHE program in order to capitalize on the availability of resources – both the facility as well as the program mentors and speakers.

EVALUATION AND OUTCOMES MEASUREMENT

Evaluation

Annually, our steering committee meets to review what has and has not worked and to make any modifications in the program. Balancing out sufficient time for key activities has been a large part of our revision to the program curriculum over time. For example, in the first year, we had participants undergo a 360° feedback program. This was highly informative to individuals, but many had difficulty completing the evaluation forms on time in order to be analyzed during the program. It was decided to remove this particular feature from the program in lieu of providing more direct time with mentors.

The mock interview takes a tremendous amount of time, but upon careful evaluation, we feel that this is a critical component. It is rare to have the ability to receive such direct feedback from the interview panelists. Time and again, this effort is reinforced when a college president or vice-president shares with us that they truly would like to hire and promote more APAs, but their interview skills have not made them viable candidates.

Each session is evaluated by participants. Every morning a plus/delta exercise is conducted to review what worked and did not work from the previous day. A substantial amount of time is taken on the final day for participants to provide input and suggestions about the program. Invariably, we hear the comment: the program needs to be longer. However, at 3+ days, we believe it would be difficult to add on another day and maintain the level of participation that we currently have.

The results of the written program evaluation are shown below. We are interested in knowing participants' reasons and factors for attending the program as well as the value of the program and their ratings of each component. In general, it is readily apparent that participants highly value the guest speakers and logistical aspects of the program have room for improvement (Table 5).

Just prior to concluding the program, we host a discussion with participants to enable them to provide us with direct feedback about what worked for them and what did not. This input has been extremely valuable to us in making necessary program improvements. It has also helped to reinforce the particular strengths of the program. Some of the feedback we received this past year was

- Have more organized opportunities to meet/gather outside of the formal schedule

Table 5. Program Evaluation.

2004 LDPHE Program Evaluation (1 = Low; 5 = High)		
	Mean Scores (1 = low; 5 = high)	
	Highest 5 Rankings	Lowest 5 Rankings
Importance of guest speakers' presentations	4.95	
Factor in attending the program: personal desire to broaden my managerial skills	4.76	
Usefulness of the program in my career	4.65	
Overall quality of guest speakers	4.65	
Factor in attending the program: opportunity to interact with other APA participants	4.57	
Factor in attending the program: reputation of program faculty	4.52	
Usefulness of the handouts and materials		2.83
Organization of the registration process: administrative aspects of the program		3.25
Factor in attending the program: cost of the program		3.33
Expectation level when you enrolled in the LDPHE program		3.38
Factor in attending the program: length of the program		3.38

- Make a greater distinction between leadership and authority
- Send readings in advance
- Lack of women presenters
- Leave more time for Q and As
- Add tracks related to enrolling in a doctoral program; dealing with the media
- Have a session on "Life After LDPHE: How to handle going back to campus"
- Have more practice bragging/talking about self
- APAHE should send follow-up thank you letters to college presidents and chancellors thanking them for their continued support

Follow-Up

Informally, each year's class has developed some type of ongoing network. Some of the groups have been able to develop a listserv and post photos and messages within 48 hours of completing the program. Through e-mail, we have discovered that some participants continue to communicate with each

other immediately following completion of the program. The networks developed amongst the class participants appear as important as the mentors assigned to them through the "mentor match" component.

Follow-up surveys with program alumni have enabled us to track the forward progress of our participants. This information is frequently shared and cited as "living proof" of the worthiness of the program. We have found that several program graduates are so motivated immediately following the program that they make successful career moves. Several individuals who were in interim positions were appointed permanently to associate/assistant dean positions. Many made the transition from staff/faculty roles into administrative positions. Another finding was that several participants enrolled in graduate school and completed doctorate degrees, with many studying issues related to Asian Pacific American leadership in higher education! Even though the program's emphasis is not solely focused on increasing the administrative ranks, promotional advancement into management creates a larger pool of potential presidents, chancellors, and other executive level leaders.

Some of the notable promotions from within our very first LDPHE classes are:

- Frank Chong: From Dean to President, Mission College
- James Kho: From Associate Vice President to President, DeVry University, Fremont
- Henry Gee: From Dean to Vice President, Rio Hondo College
- Gordon Poon: From Dean to Vice President, American River College
- Patricia Neilson: From Coordinator to Dean to Associate Director, U. Mass, Boston
- Hue Pham: From Faculty Counselor/Department Chair to Dean, Orange Coast College
- Yulian Ligioso: From College Business Manager to Director of Fiscal Services, College of Marin
- Jocelyn Nakashige: From Manager to Director, Administration of Finance, UC San Francisco
- Julie Wong: From Associate Dean to Associate Vice President and Dean of Students, U Texas, El Paso

One of the exercises on day four of the program is for the participants to write a letter to themselves. In this letter, they are to remind themselves about what they learned and what their goals are. The letter is not read by the program coordinators. Participants insert and seal them in a self-addressed envelope. The envelopes are then mailed to the participants

6 months later. We have found this to be an excellent way for program graduates to continue along their path of development.

Feedback

Participants are asked to write a formal letter of appreciation to the individual who sponsored them to attend the program. Often this letter goes to the president or chancellor. The purpose of this exercise is threefold: (1) to show appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the program, (2) to provide direct feedback to the sponsor about the benefits of the program, and (3) to create an ongoing interest and commitment in continuing to send participants to the program. This component is absolutely critical to the continuation of the program. When class graduates take the time to actually meet with their sponsors and/or to write a strong, personal letter, we find that the institution remains highly committed to supporting the program in successive years. The testimonials speak loudly and clearly about the value of the program and the profound impact that the program has had on the participants, both professionally and personally.

FINANCIAL ISSUES

Funding

Funding is admittedly the most problematic area for us. If APAs are known as the model minority, funding organizations do not believe that they need to finance initiatives to help APAs in higher education. We have attempted to keep fees to a minimum, which means that the program makes no revenue – it is a break-even effort. The reliance on LEAP to provide the infrastructure for the program has been critical. Without a steady base, the program would be lacking in consistency and stability. By having a noted, nationally recognized organization like LEAP as the key sponsor for the program, LDPHE has instant credibility. We are in the process of seeking funding from key donors to help offset the costs of the program and to assist individuals to attend.

Sponsorships

We have been mildly successful in developing a few donors who have been willing to fund scholarships enabling individuals to participate if their

campuses have been unwilling or unable to provide the necessary financial support. Many college presidents and chancellors are willing to find the funds – or direct their administrators to find the funds – within their departments to send their APA employees to the program. The Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, committed to funding five slots over a 5-year period. This demonstrated profound commitment to the program from a campus which has an enrollment of 42% APA students, but an administrative team of only 9% APAs.

Finances

The two coordinators for the LDPHE do not receive a stipend for their work. LEAP pays for its own staff support for the program. Unlike LEAP's corporate training rates, the fees that participants pay cover only the direct charges for room, board, materials, and outside consultants, and the additional travel and/or lodging needed for speakers and mentors. Most of the speakers and mentors pay at least their own travel, which has helped substantially to control the cost of the program. Without the fiscal assistance and support of LEAP, however, the LDPHE could not function.

CASE STUDIES

Howard Wang

Howard received the LDPHE program brochure in the mail. He was not exactly sure how he received it, but admitted that he had received copies previously, although had not attended the program. Howard's university president at California State University, San Bernardino nominated him for the program after having received a letter from Dr. Bob Suzuki, then President of Cal Poly Pomona, encouraging his colleagues to nominate participants for the program.

Howard's main reason for attending the program was to "update my personal and professional skills, and to network with seasoned as well as new professionals in higher education." At the time, Howard was an Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs. He had attempted to move into higher level positions but had not yet been successful. In a self-assessment, Howard felt that he lacked the confidence in his own skills and did not know how to market himself.

Regarding his participation in the program Howard reflected, "I refreshed myself on the current issues for Asian Americans in higher education, and learned a great deal on interviewing skills plus assertiveness skills." Shortly after completing the program, Howard applied for and was appointed as the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs at California State University, Fullerton. Howard believes that he benefited both personally and professionally by "being able to share experiences and learn from others about how to deal with issues facing Asian Americans in both settings."

Patricia Akemi Neilson

When Patricia attended the inaugural LDPHE program in 1997, she was a warm yet tentative woman who was unsure of her next steps professionally. She was a program coordinator for a federally funded project. Soon after her return to North Shore Community College in Boston, Patricia applied for and was appointed to be a Director of a student instructional program. Within a few years, Patricia not only was well on her way toward completing her PhD and writing her dissertation, but she was also appointed to an instructional Dean position. In 2002, Patricia was granted her EdD from University of Massachusetts, Boston, where she completed her dissertation on "Career Paths of Asian American Senior Administrators in Higher Education: An Inquiry into Under-Representation." Patricia has been subsequently appointed to the APAHE Board of Directors and now serves as a mentor in the LDPHE program.

When Patricia was in the LDPHE program, she was videotaped making a public statement during our communication skills session. It was extremely difficult for her to speak in front of others. Over the 4 days of the program, the transformation began. Over the next few years, the transformation was so evident that program mentors did not even recognize her, since she had grown so much professionally and personally. Her self-confidence and ability to speak up for herself became readily apparent. Her college began to rely on her more and more, not just for her technical knowledge, but for her leadership abilities. Patricia became instrumental in directing her college to make improvements in diversity and community relations. That notable experience enabled her to make critical connections and to be recognized by folks at U Mass, Boston, who successfully recruited her to their campus as their new Associate Director, Center for Collaborative Leadership. An individual who was very unsure of herself in 1997, Patricia is now helping to direct leadership programs at a major university just 7 years later!

FUTURE EFFORTS

We know the program has been successful. However, we have had some difficulty balancing the diverse levels and backgrounds of the participants. For example, it can become problematic to have a veteran dean in the program next to a younger support staff person who has only been in the position for a few years. Some of the key issues and concerns facing younger and more newly appointed educators can differ greatly from more established veterans who have hit the glass ceiling and need specific guidance in addressing their career advancement.

Given adequate funding, we would like to initiate a leadership development effort for the young professionals who are just entering higher education – whether in staff level positions or newly hired faculty positions. Additionally, we have had requests to replicate the program in other communities across the country. With a very limited budget and a small staff, this has been problematic to date. We are hopeful that by 2006 we will be able to host an East Coast LDPHE session.

We are currently developing a follow-on session for program alumni. With almost 200 alumni, we constantly receive requests for past years' participants to be able to come together, renew their networks, continue to address critical issues, and obtain a refresher course. In 2003 and 2004, alumni sessions were held parallel to the regular program. This posed a logistical issue and we needed to split the time of program staff and mentors. Alumni found the daylong session to be very valuable, especially when it came to brainstorming about how to resolve difficult situations they were facing on their campuses. Openly sharing concerns and receiving feedback and support are extremely valuable to ensure the continued leadership development of our APA Leadership cohorts. The interest shown by past participants in continuing their affiliation with LDPHE is continued proof of the worthiness of the program.

We plan to conduct more extensive program evaluation and research that will more fully measure the impacts and benefits of the program. Additionally, we wish to conduct a more thorough longitudinal and follow-up study on past participants. Informally, we have been able to stay in touch with about 80% of the participants. From this experience, we have documented the tremendous impact the program has had. The most compelling success statistics are the accomplishments of program alumni. Several participants were inspired to continue their educational pursuits and have successfully attained master's degrees and doctorates. In fact, several alumni have focused their research on leadership issues related to

APA professionals and have conducted their studies via the LDPHE framework.

Although our numbers are low, and although many might view Asian Pacific American leadership as an oxymoron, our successful experience with the LDPHE leads us to believe that we are on the right track toward developing a ready pipeline of trained and effective APA leaders. We firmly believe that Asian Pacific Americans have a tremendous ability to contribute to higher education if provided with equitable opportunities to serve in leadership roles. Our continuing goal is to make Boards and CEOs aware not just of the LDPHE Program but of the imperative to diversify the leadership ranks of their institutions.

Examples of Feedback

In one short week I was fortunate enough to discuss the critical issues facing the Asian American students, faculty and staff in higher education, and potential strategies for dealing with such concerns. I also had a chance to interact with fellow participants, as well as the mentors who were personable and shared their insights on how to navigate the political arena of university environment and the many obstacles that await us.

Participant, Class of 1997

This training truly was a valuable and rewarding experience for me. I have a better understanding of leadership opportunities in higher education, as well as a greater sense of pride in my own culture from learning of the journeys that people of Asian Pacific heritage have taken to serve as leaders on university campuses across the country. As a result of my participation I have an increased sensitivity to students of Asian heritage, I am more confident with what I can bring to the table as a leader, and have an increased commitment to seeking out opportunities to further enhance and share my leadership skills as I serve my campus, community and profession.

Participant, Class of 2002

In addition to direct training in the micro-skills associated with good leadership, this workshop afforded me the opportunity to meet with a number of Asian American leaders in the field of Higher Education. I was given the chance to speak directly with presidents, chancellors, faculty and administrators and address issues that are uniquely related to Asian Americans in higher educational institutions.

Participant, Class of 2000

Dear President,

I just wanted to express my appreciation and thanks to you for sponsoring my attendance at the Leadership Development Program in Higher Education (LDPHE) held at Cal Poly Pomona in July. I have attended a number of leadership training and development programs in the past, but found this program to be especially valuable in

that it addressed specific issues and strategies relevant to Asian Pacific Americans in higher education.

I listened with rapt attention to President Bob Suzuki speak eloquently about his career and his pioneering efforts to promote diversity on college campuses. Each of the participants was matched with a mentor, whom we met and established immediate rapport. Over the course of the four days, we established a strong bond with our fellow participants.

I came away from this program inspired and reinvigorated. I hope that you will consider sponsoring future participants in the years ahead. It is the only program that I am aware of that addresses leadership development among Asian Pacific Americas in higher education. Thank you again for your support.

Participant, Class of 2003

LDPHE was an eye-opening experience for me. I found out, through LDPHE, that job security does not equal power, and that in order to become a leader, one must take initiative. It was an experience of a lifetime and the feelings can't be described. One must attend to know what I'm talking about.

Participant, Class of 2001

In spite of potential differences, the commonality of interest, drive, integrity and sincerity brought us together like a group of children at summer camp. However the pace of the program was more akin to a boot camp.

Participant, Class of 2001

LDPHE is truly the most uplifting and memorable professional development I have participated in thus far. It is through this program that I am encouraged to aspire to higher levels of leadership within higher education, for LDPHE instilled in me the important role I have as an Asian Pacific American on a college campus. Our professional presence in higher education is not only important for students, but aspiring APA professionals who are working to 'make their mark' as leaders in higher education.

Participant, Class of 2000

Frankly, at first I was a little skeptical whether four days were necessary, but at the end of the program, I could not help wondering if four days were actually enough.

Participant, Class of 2001

I have learned so much from the outstanding speakers and distinguished mentors. It was one of those experiences that will continue to influence me for the rest of my career—an opportunity of a lifetime, indeed.

Participant, Class of 2001

I think that what struck me about LDPHE is how few APAs there were in positions of influence and power in higher education. I attended LDPHE because I felt stuck in my job. The program gave me the opportunity to meet other people in the field and those who were interested in management positions. I wasn't quite ready at the time to make any dramatic

moves but in time, I became more confident in my skills because of the encouragement I received in the program.

Participant, Class of 1998

LDPHE really helped me align my career goals with my personal goals. It helped me take a step back from my own "head down, charge to the top of the mountain" approach to career planning, and to put it into perspective with my interests, desires, and values. I realized that I needed to plan for the marathon and not the sprint.

Participant, Class of 1998

The LDPHE was such an amazing program! It is such an important program because we, as Asian Americans, need to support each other and see that our struggles are the same.

Participant, Class of 1999

I believe that I now have a better understanding of the needs of various ethnic communities on university campuses and how to address the confluence of those needs with the goals of our University. I believe that I will be a more effective faculty member and member of the university community because of my participation in this program.

Participant, Class of 1999

When I returned from LDPHE I was much more motivated to follow the advice I usually give to students, which is to research and review your career options and then take action. I conducted some informational interviews, designed a plan for returning to graduate school in the near future to get my Ph.D., and applied for another job on campus that I thought would be a good stretch for me. Just last Friday I accepted the offer and starting next month, I will be the new assistant dean of instruction and student affairs. It's an exciting opportunity for me that I didn't initially think would come knocking so soon. I have much to learn as I join the college's senior management team, but I'm really looking forward to living out my vision of being a successful administrator in higher education.

Participant (Career Counselor), Class of 2003

Over the next few years following the program, I have called on my LDPHE mentor, whether considering or prepping for a promotional opportunity, going through tough times, bouncing off an idea, or just having lunch. This relationship has been priceless, receiving valuable advice, nurturing, support, encouragement and guidance. The LEAP/APAHE Program enabled that special kind of connection, which would have been difficult to establish elsewhere.

Participant, Class of 1997

I hadn't experienced the LDPHE format in past experiences at other APA conferences. I had a preconceived notion that this would be another lecture/information gathering conference. LDPHE from the very start engaged each of its participants in an intensive, soul-searching and a self re-construction process that left many, if not all of us, re-energized and re-committed to our sense of purpose in working at a higher education institution.

THE KELLOGG MSI LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM

Jamie P. Merisotis and Kelley Aveilhe

Since joining forces in 1999 as the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), and the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) have made the commitment to promoting greater collaboration and cooperation among colleges and universities that serve large number of students of color. In no area is the need for that collaboration more evident than leadership development. The next generation of leaders for minority-serving institutions (MSIs) will play an essential role in educating the rapidly growing African American, Hispanic, and Native American communities that make up the nation's emerging majority populations. These populations will be key drivers of the nation's economic growth and social advancement in the coming decades.

The term ''MSI'' is routinely used to describe those institutions identified by federal legislation as either established by charter or evolved by student population and focused on serving ethnic groups that have suffered the historic vestiges of segregation and/or educational deprivation. These institutions include Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). In addition to providing a quality education, most MSIs provide postsecondary education opportunities specifically tailored to students

who have traditionally been denied access to adequately funded elementary and secondary schools, especially low-income, educationally disadvantaged students. MSIs also foster cultural values and traditions, promote civic and community responsibility, and produce citizens who are exceptionally attuned to America's increasingly diverse population. Many students of color also find that MSIs provide an educational and cultural experience that cannot be replicated at other institutions (Merisotis & O'Brien, 1998).

The core mission of the institutions in the Alliance is to provide a high-quality education for all students, but especially for underserved populations. Yet the growing diversity in society brings another set of increasingly complex challenges, including the need for leadership that bridges the political, racial, cultural, and economic boundaries of the communities these institutions serve. Leadership development for the future means adopting new models of leadership. Models that exalt control and authority must be replaced by new visions of leadership as it occurs in the context of minority-serving campuses.

Individually, AIHEC (2004) represents 35 Tribal Colleges in the United States and one in Canada (http://www.aihec.org). HACU's (2004) membership includes more than 200 institutions, located in 14 states, Puerto Rico, and six foreign countries (http://www.hacu.net). NAFEO (2004) represents 118 HBCUs and other predominantly Black institutions (http://www.nafeo.org). Each of these individual organizations represents the largest group of institutions in its community and therefore serves as an "umbrella" that speaks for the broad interests in those communities. Today, this coalition represents approximately 350 MSIs in American higher education and serves almost 2 million students of color (Alliance for Equity in Higher Education, 2004, http://www.msi-alliance.org).

The basic objective of the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program is to develop a new cadre of skilled leaders who understand the unique and important context of leadership for MSIs. This objective is decidedly complex because of the diverse cultural characters of the communities being served. And yet one profound lesson of the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program has been that the three distinct communities share many common goals that draw them together and make it imperative that both current and emerging leaders bridge cultural boundaries and strengthen their abilities in key areas. They must excel in their ability to cooperate rather than compete for scarce resources, to join forces to effect policy change at the national level, to collaborate on solving common issues, and to work in partnership with majority institutions.

Over the next decade, many of the current leaders of MSIs will be retiring. Leaders of the Alliance member organizations have pledged to identify and mentor the next generation of presidents and senior executives for America's MSIs. The Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows project provides a unique opportunity to transfer knowledge, expand the horizons of leadership, and foster goodwill across MSI communities. Unlike other leadership programs in higher education, the focus of this project is presidential and senior leadership at MSIs, specifically. Organizers predict that by the end of this decade, at least half of the individuals who participate in the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program would have served or will be serving as a president, provost, or other high-level senior leader at a minority-serving college or university. This ambitious goal exemplifies the high standards that the organizers have imposed on themselves, and indicates the serious nature of the endeavor.

As coordinator and facilitator of the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education, the Institute for Higher Education Policy has played a key role in launching this innovative program. The Institute and the Alliance partner organizations believe that it is likely to be the first of several initiatives to train a wide range of leaders across these three communities. This expanded commitment to leadership development at MSIs will not only have a substantial impact on these communities, but ultimately will have far-reaching consequences for the nation's economic competitiveness, social stability, and cultural richness.

THE KELLOGG COMMITMENT

The Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program was derived from the convergence of two important interests: those of the Alliance, and those of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (WKKF). In 2001, the Youth and Education Unit of the WKKF began consideration of a leadership development program that would complement and support the Kellogg Foundation's ongoing work with MSIs. A leadership development program was envisioned as a capstone to more than a decade of WKKF work with Alliance member institutions. To date, there are no other leadership programs that target MSIs as a collaborative group. Kellogg recognized the strategic opportunity to create a leadership cadre sensitive to the development of cooperative efforts among the MSIs.

During the decade of the 1990s – a rapidly growing period for the Foundation and a time of significant change – more was learned about the success

and persistence of MSIs. In 1992, the Foundation supported a major initiative that created Centers of Excellence at 10 HBCUs. Reports by two task forces, one focused on Native American issues and one on Hispanic issues, highlighted specific areas of work with these groups. As improving the access and success of minority students in higher education was identified as a priority in both task force reports, two other major initiatives were developed. The Native American Higher Education Initiative (NAHEI), started in 1995, focused on tribal colleges, and the HSIs Initiative, named ENLACE, was established in 1999.

The WKKF initiatives that focus on MSIs were new and experimental ventures. The Foundation had never before concentrated funding on these institutions, although scattered and sporadic funding for some minority-serving schools was evident over the Foundation's long history of support for higher education. For example, the oldest of these institutions, the HBCUs, has a history of WKKF grants dating back to 1942. Some HSIs had received support before the federal government created the HSI designation in 1986. However, the Foundation had not previously focused on this emerging group of colleges and universities. TCUs, the youngest institutions, had the least contact with WKKF. For the first time at WKKF, there was a strategic spotlight on the development and support of these institutions (The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2004).

The MSI initiatives were uniquely developed to address specific needs of the institutions and their students. At the same time, the programs provide lessons and experiences that improve the plans and frameworks for each successive initiative. For Kellogg, the lessons learned from work with these minority institutions highlighted both the common issues and the differences among the institutions, their students, and communities.

One major concern was about competition, rather than collaboration, among these institutions with regard to foundation and government support. The WKKF Board of Trustees and others urged that ways be found to bring the groups together in order to capitalize on some of their common experiences and needs, build understanding of differences, and explore opportunities for cooperation, especially related to federal policy issues and funding. At that same time, a new organization, the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education, resulted from the coming together of the groups to create more collaborative working relationships.

The Alliance provides a formal structure and coordinates opportunities for dialog, information and resource sharing, strategic policy planning, and program development among the MSIs. Through the Alliance and other efforts, the MSIs identified a number of cooperative areas of

work: technology, national higher education policy related to institutional support and student financial aid, teacher education, remedial education, preparation and recruitment of minority faculty, and leadership development. Among this list of common interests, leadership development is repeatedly cited as a major concern. The institutions recognize that to address the other identified areas, they would need an array of effective leaders.

In the Fall of 2002, the Alliance announced its historic national leadership initiative with the support of a 4-year, $6 million grant from the WKKF. The announcement marked the success of months of discussion and planning to develop the accepted proposal and signaled the beginning of a new level of cooperation.

Executives of the three Alliance-member organizations signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Institute for Higher Education Policy to formally set up the new program known as the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program. The Memorandum of Understanding was created between the three member associations of the Alliance with the Institute for Higher Education Policy as manager and fiduciary agent.

IMPLEMENTATION

The program capitalized on what had been learned from past Kellogg Foundation programming, as well as from the leadership programs for women and minorities that were prevalent in mainstream institutions during the 1980s and 1990s. Those programs tended to focus on individual leadership development, where participants were encouraged to adopt models of leadership that exalted control and authority. Frequently, little or no attention was paid to context and its effect on the lives and actions of the potential leaders.

In contrast, organizers of the MSI Leadership Fellows program embrace the critical dimensions of context, process, and succession. The program capitalizes on the rich opportunities of interdependence by linking leadership generations and utilizing seasoned leaders to transmit their knowledge. These leaders also mentor their successors through active learning experiences. Groups of future leaders, rather than individuals, from each of the institutions participate in purposeful activities where they test competencies, take risks, manifest values, work collaboratively, and simultaneously receive support, counsel, and validation from more experienced leaders.

A diverse set of resources that function at varied levels is needed to facilitate the development and implementation of the program. Thus, a

project team was developed to design and implement the program. The team includes a program manager employed by the Institute for Higher Education Policy in its role as Alliance coordinator; dedicated staff at AIHEC, HACU, and NAFEO responsible for coordinating the organizations' efforts in the planning process, interacting with consultants, and communicating with the community represented by the organization; senior advisors who bring high-level experience at MSIs to provide overall guidance on the program development and curriculum content; and the CEOs of the organizations.

In addition, the Alliance partners decided to convene a National Advisory Board (NAB) at the conclusion of each year of the program. The NAB identifies priorities for senior leadership development in each of the three communities, provides feedback on program design, and assists in promoting the program in the minority communities. The NAB has two members each from the NAFEO, HACU, and AIHEC Advisory Boards, and four members appointed by the Institute for Higher Education Policy. Among those recruited to serve on this important group are past and present MSI leaders (in conjunction with the three member organizations), leaders of other national minority-focused organizations, and directors of organizations and institutions involved in leadership development in higher education.

Once the skeleton of the program was confirmed, application materials were printed and a promotional package was developed to recruit the first cohort of Fellows. The Alliance created a single application form that all three groups could use, as well as general application procedures which would be individually tailored by each of the three groups. Each organization established a set of benchmark criteria to consider for Fellow selection. These include, but are not limited to, degree, role within the institution, and experience at an MSI. Each organization added special components to the application packet for its program. Included is additional clarifying language in the instructions, and more detailed information for the nomination or application forms to reflect specific community interests. In general, however, the application packets are quite consistent.

The central MSI Fellowship website at http://www.msi-alliance.org was created to provide a portal to the websites of the three programs and it directs visitors to one of the three partner sites where applications for that program can be obtained. Applications are sent to every MSI President in the nation. This encourages prospective Fellows and their nominating Presidents to work together beginning as early as the application process.

In its first 2 years of operation, the program has been in high demand, with many more applications than available slots. The caliber of the

candidates has been high and they come from a diverse range of geographical and professional backgrounds.

The first priority of the program is a formal commitment to participate, including a Fellowship Agreement and a Learning Plan created to achieve that commitment. Several items are also included to give applicants guidance in developing their proposals; three general themes (Planning/Strategic, Day-to-Day Concerns, and Principles of Leadership) and a few of community-related subtopics are included as examples in the specifications for a Learning Plan Prospectus. Another component of the program is the Fellowship Agreement, which defines the requirements and expectations of Fellows, mentors, and current presidents (nominators). The Fellowship Agreement makes provision for return of the Fellow to his or her MSI following the Fellowship, and formalizes his or her commitment to serve at an MSI in the future. The Fellow and his or her mentor also sign a Learning Agreement, based on the Fellow's proposed area of concentration.

THE CURRICULUM

The Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program is different from other leadership programs because it focuses development and training on leadership skills that are particularly successful in the minority communities and the environment of MSIs. The program is also unique in that it contains two dimensions. The first is a leadership development component that pairs Fellows with mentors who are current presidents at MSIs. The current presidents and Fellows spend an academic year working together on a specific institutional development project mutually agreed upon by the two individuals. By bringing these two generations of leaders together, the unique role and purposes of MSIs and the common challenges they confront are addressed by the best of the current and future leaders.

The second dimension of the project is to convene the current presidents and other experts and Fellows on a regular basis. These meetings focus on issues that relate back to the specific, campus-based institutional development projects organized by the mentors and Fellows. The meetings also allow for common discussions and strategic organizing in key areas of national interest, both for the U.S. broadly and for MSIs in particular. Seven to eight of these meetings take place per year, including joint seminars of all 30 Fellows and seminars that include just the individual component groups of ten in each community.

For all the topics in the curriculum, the partner organizations strive to cover and reinforce the learning and leadership skills involved. These topics include Membership Associations and Advocacy Organizations; Legal and Regulatory Issues; Board Relations and Cultivation; Information Technology; Senior Staffing; Time Management and Priority Setting; Serving as an Effective Change Agent; Crisis Management and Conflict Resolution; Gender Conflict and Gender Roles; Ethics, Personal Motivation and Vitality; and Public Speaking and Advocacy.

Over the course of the program year, Fellows engage in a series of seminars, meetings, and group-learning activities designed to offer a wide array of experiences and skills. These activities fall under three general thematic headings:

Planning/Strategic Issues
Day-to-Day Concerns
Principles of Leadership

The issues addressed in each area are illustrated below. As the list of topics was developed, it was not intended to be inclusive and final, but rather a starting point for defining the major topics dealt with in the program. As such, the curriculum list has evolved as the program continues, based on evaluation, Fellow feedback, and other observations. The topics that are covered during the program year reflect months of deliberation and consensus-building among the members of the project team.

Planning/Strategic Issues

Vision and Mission: All presidents need skill at articulating a vision for the institution and providing the leadership to operationalize that vision – developing a roadmap for the institution. Training in how to develop and convey a vision, and how to turn that vision into a mission statement and actual strategic plan of action for the institution, are an important part of the general program design.

Government Relations: Fellows should understand how to be actively involved in the policy debates at the federal and state levels. Rather than a generic introduction to the legislative and regulatory processes, the program offers an opportunity for Fellows to be trained in the practical issues of communicating with policymakers and effectively advocating for their institution and community.

Institutional Accreditation: Understanding the specific issues that need to be addressed in regional accreditation is essential for most MSIs. Improving senior leaders' understanding of the self-study process has significant benefits for strategic planning and visioning for institutions. Officials from the relevant accrediting agencies (like Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the North Central Higher Learning Commission, etc.) are involved as guest speakers/trainers in program seminars.

Financial Management: A comprehensive understanding of institutional finances is key to the success of a president. Discrete program elements address several important topics, including fund-raising/development, investment, and institutional budgeting – both operating and capital.

Membership Associations and Advocacy Organizations: Fellows learn what the various associations of institutions and leaders do, and how they can serve specific institutional needs. AIHEC, HACU, and NAFEO serve as the primary examples, along with the many One Dupont Circle organizations and their affiliates. Advocacy organizations that serve MSI communities, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Native American Rights Fund (NARF), and the National Council of La Raza (NCLR) are addressed separately.

Legal and Regulatory Issues: Employment and personnel law are commonly relegated to staff or outside legal counsel, but too often these issues ultimately come back to test the leadership skills of a president. Understanding the responsibilities of the institution as an employer is essential. Similarly, the growing level of federal regulatory requirements – from OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) to the new SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System) standards for foreign students – also is important.

Board Relations and Cultivation: Presidents usually serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees or Governors that have hired the president. Fellows explore an array of issues involving board leadership, including managing board relationships, recruiting new board members (if applicable), and board meeting management and structure.

Day-to-Day Concerns

Information Technology (IT): Presidents often face two somewhat contradictory problems in dealing with IT – insufficient information that is relevant to the decision-making needs of a senior leader, and too much technical information that can confuse and frustrate that decision-making process. Key issues addressed include planning for technology needs, paying

for technology, and distinguishing between infrastructure concerns (like hardware, software, and networking) and application issues (such as IT as a teaching and learning tool, distance learning, and training).

Deferred Maintenance: The physical infrastructure of MSIs is one of the many concerns that unite these institutions. Determining how to address an often-daunting list of deferred maintenance needs is an important skill for Fellows to learn.

Senior Staffing: Hiring and firing are two of the most difficult challenges that college presidents must confront. The president needs to understand not only how to get the right people, with the skills necessary to help the institution succeed, but also how to *keep* those people. Attention is paid to identifying and nurturing talent, creating consistent reward structures, team-building, and encouraging collaborative leadership to promote the recruitment and retention of effective personnel. The unsuccessful candidates – those who need to be fired – also must be dealt with using the conflict resolution skills noted below. Reorganization and restructuring is approached keeping legal implications in mind.

Principles of Leadership

Time Management and Priority Setting: When should the president step in, and when should others be making decisions? How can the president avoid undercutting his or her own senior staff? Fellows learn these skills from Mentors and through the advice and guidance of seminar trainers and facilitators.

Serving as an Effective Change Agent: As the individual who must articulate and operationalize the institutional vision and overall strategic planning, it is important for presidents to understand how to effectively serve as an agent of change for the institution. Presidents and other senior leaders must cultivate an understanding of shared institutional values and philosophies, as well as an ability to recognize inconsistencies and work to correct them.

Crisis Management and Conflict Resolution: Dealing with crises and conflict is an ongoing concern for senior leaders in each MSO community. Hands-on training in crisis-management techniques, including some case studies/actual scenarios, helps Fellows in dealing with the inevitable crises and conflicts that emerge.

Civil Rights and History of Racism: The program addresses the history of racism, injustice, and oppression, with emphasis on how these issues impact

minority communities and MSIs. Civil rights, both in a historical and contemporary perspective, is highlighted as a key issue in understanding how to navigate institutional leadership.

Gender Conflict and Gender Roles: As senior leadership in higher education continues to evolve, a president's understanding of, and sensitivity to, gender concerns is critical to a harmonious institutional climate. The program involves components that will make future presidents and senior leaders better prepared to address these changing roles.

Ethics: Fostering a culture of ethics and integrity is one of the most critical issues of leadership. The president of the institution must be a symbol of ethical principles, and must be able to articulate her or his vision of those values effectively.

Cross-Cultural Learning: As an Alliance project, the MSI Leadership Fellows Program provides an ideal opportunity to learn from one another's experiences. The history of the three institutional movements and their current status provides an excellent foundation for future collaboration and learning.

Personal Motivation and Vitality: Burnout is a common reason for the decline of effective presidents. Recognizing the signs of impending burnout and finding ways to "keep it fresh" are important to the long-term success of a senior leader.

Public Speaking and Advocacy: Few prior experiences on campus prepare an individual for the persistent public speaking and advocacy demands that are required. Personal training and skills development in this area can ease the transition to the presidency and are covered in the program.

FIRST YEAR CASE STUDY

The historic inaugural year of the program in 2003–2004 may be instructive in characterizing the program's unique content and qualities. The program was officially launched during the first week of August 2003 in Washington, DC. Organizers devised a weeklong orientation that included the annual Leadership Fellows Institute. This week featured both the beginning of the three independent programs and the initial joint meeting and overlapping activities that are addressed under the MSI Leadership Fellows Program. Thus, a full schedule of seminars, workshops, and interviews was established that would become an introduction and first meeting for each new class of Fellows.

The Institute Week began the learning process with lessons about important issues and responsibilities of leadership, and also built camaraderie among the Fellows and provided an overview of the program, while remaining flexible enough to allow for interaction, networking, socializing, and cultural exchange. The orientation week was launched with a gala reception and dinner for the Fellows that included cultural components reflective of the three communities. This coming together of the three communities was a symbolic and emotional launch to the program.

The Institute Week's formal seminars began with an overview of the Kellogg MSI Leadership Program presented by the CEOs of NAFEO, AIHEC, and HACU, with the Institute for Higher Education Policy focusing on all three types of institutions. Speakers also gave an overview of the three associations and why they came together as the Alliance. These discussions of the history of the three institutional movements and their status offered different perspectives on the history of racism and its impact on minority communities, MSIs, higher education in general and the nation itself.

Cross-cultural collaboration across the three groups was maintained throughout the Institute Week, while still integrating the unique program content of each cohort. In addition to general sessions of the full class of 30 Fellows, time during the Institute week was set aside for the three groups of cohorts to separate into their individual, small groups of ten Fellows to study program content unique to their institutional community. The full class of Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows then reconvened each day for lunch and dinner in small, mixed groups to foster networking and participate in content discussions. Evening discussions typically centered on specific assignments such as the implications of affirmative action decisions in the Supreme Court.

Following the Institute Week in Washington, DC, Fellows attended and participated in several conferences hosted by the three Alliance member associations in various locations including the AIHEC Spring Meeting, the HACU Capital Forum, and the NAFEO National Conference. The Fellows also attended three joint seminars, which included the opportunity to spend time on campuses representative of each group. In Bismarck, ND, for example, the Fellows attended seminars and toured the campuses of both United Tribes Technical College and Sitting Bull College (SBC) on the Standing Rock Reservation. United Tribes is housed on a campus that has seen former life as a military fort for the 7th Cavalry, as an internment camp for Japanese Americans and German prisoners during World War II, and as a Bureau of Indian Affairs facility. At a joint meeting in Miami, FL, Fellows visited an HSI, Miami Dade College, and an HBCU, Florida Memorial College.

The final joint seminar for the inaugural class of Kellogg MSI Fellows took place in Mexico City in June 2004. This seminar included a visit to Ibero-American University and an opportunity to exchange ideas with leaders from the indigenous schools of Chiapas. The final seminar linked what the Fellows had learned about issues covered earlier in the program with the global context for higher education.

Included in the Mexico City meeting was a formal graduation exercise. Fellows reflected on their accomplishments from the year. They observed that they not only had learned a great deal from the formal aspects of the program, but also had developed relationships and networks that would continue well beyond its end. Several Fellows arranged independent on-campus exchanges and independent research on MSIs. Mutual commitment was a frequent topic of conversation during this final session.

The graduation ceremony brought the fellowship experience full circle for the Fellows, allowing them to be exposed to a variety of experiences that reflected the three cultures and communities of institutions. The ceremony included a gospel music tribute, a native honoring ceremony, and a celebration of traditional Mexican music. A spiritual blessing also was offered by the same spiritual leader who launched the program 9 months earlier in Washington, DC.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

An experienced evaluation team was engaged to track both the formative and summative outcomes of the program. The evaluation team members included persons familiar with the MSI colleges and universities and their leadership dynamics and needs. It also included individuals with expertise in leadership development, evaluation design, and program analysis.

In terms of the evaluation process, one evaluator was assigned to each of the three groups of institutions to give focused attention to assessing the selected Fellows and leadership outcomes based on the issues and cultural context of the institutions. Information gathered through these focused assessments is pooled and integrated into the collective leadership development process for the project. The evaluation provides feedback, including pre- and post-interviews with Fellows, analysis of impact of all program activities (such as planning period, selection of Fellows, and training and mentoring process) assessment of organizational and structural operation of the project, analysis of outcomes of the project with other similar leadership projects, and materials for reporting to the Foundation and other constituencies on a regular basis.

The evaluation design is informed by a research-based framework of best practices and expectations for outcomes and program implementation in higher education. The evaluation gives special attention to benchmarking the project against programs designed for working with the target audiences. While the researchers did not find any program that is exactly like the MSI Leadership Fellows Program, there are many leadership development programs in higher education that allow for benchmarks and expectations for the types of outcomes that might be expected in this program.

Various tools were developed and used in the evaluation process. For example, preprogram surveys involve individually tailored materials that are broad enough to cover a diverse set of pertinent elements, and specific enough for relevant issues about the community to be raised. Working with the Alliance, the evaluation team created a 4-year process for assessing the project. The Year One evaluation includes assessment of the program planning process and feedback on issues that surface, resolution of issues, processes for selection and deployment of staffing, development of selection process and its implementation, and readiness for implementation. Evaluation of subsequent years includes assessment of implementation activities and progress of the Fellows in accessing and benefiting from the activities. An overarching assessment is made each year on movement toward the project's long-term goal.

The evaluation team's conclusions and observations about the first year of the program are far-reaching. The core finding was that the program is a complex one, breaking new ground in leadership development for higher education.

At the same time, the evaluation offered several important lessons about the groundbreaking nature of the program and its potential long-term impact on leadership development at MSIs over the coming decade. Key findings were:

- Fellows were complimentary of the overall program goals and understood the potential impact of the project on their lives and their institutions.
- The Fellows responded well to the selected speakers at joint and individual seminars.
- Overall, Fellows felt privileged to be part of the program, and believed they had a responsibility to be open and frank about their experiences.
- Across all three cohorts and the group as a whole, Fellows cited the development of networks of colleagues as one of the most beneficial aspects of the program.

All Fellows found the interactions with their cohort peers important to their professional development. The group also identified campus visits and the mentoring/internship program as beneficial to their development.

LOOKING AHEAD

The success of this first historic collaboration shows that the prospects and future agenda of the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education are proactive and far-reaching. The Alliance partner organizations have already demonstrated their unified commitment to educating the nation's emerging majority populations, and initiatives such as the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program will be critical to the success of future collaborations.

This program framework includes a milestone that was conceived by the Kellogg Foundation staff: a symposium to coincide with the Kellogg Foundation's 75th Anniversary Celebration in 2006. The 2006 symposium will convene all of the classes of Fellows, other members of the MSI community, participants in the Alliance, policymakers and analysts, and representatives from the WKKF. One focus of the symposium includes sharing best practices and lessons learned from the MSI Leadership Fellows Program.

The Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program is a powerful example of how a collective national initiative that focuses on leadership development can bring the Alliance communities together to develop the next generation of senior leaders to shape the nation's future. Program supporters stand committed to working as one to develop and implement the program, making it the best opportunity for professional advancement and growth for these future senior leaders. The program does this by offering a high-quality approach that proactively addresses the leadership priorities of MSIs and aggressively serves the interests of minority communities. Working together, Alliance members believe that this new leadership at MSIs will create more coordinated and effective efforts to increase educational opportunities for all Americans who have been denied access to a quality higher education.

To become a long-term sustainable program, greater capacity is needed at NAFEO, HACU, and AIHEC, as well as at the Institute for Higher Education Policy. This includes the ability to designate staff to work on Alliance initiatives, and the capacity of the organizations to engage in other activities that will enhance the visibility and credibility of the Alliance and its partner organizations. The intent in creating the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows program is to develop a group of effective, successful senior-level leaders for MSIs. In order to sustain these efforts, the Alliance

will implement a strategy for acquiring long-term additional funding for the future (Merisotis & Goulian, 2004).

Effective leadership is one of the most critical human resource needs of the African American, American Indian, and Hispanic communities as we move forward into the 21st century. The Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program has helped to show that the quality and character of rising MSI leaders will drive the unified agendas of the nation's emerging majority populations, and will help to strengthen the bonds that unite us as Americans.

REFERENCES

Alliance for Equity in Higher Education. (2004). Retrieved October 19, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.msi-alliance.org.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC). (2004). Retrieved October 19, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.aihec.org.

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). (2004). Retrieved October 19, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.hacu.net.

Merisotis, J., & O'Brien, C. (Eds) (1998). Minority-serving institutions: Distinct purposes, common goals. *New directions for higher education* (Vol. 102). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merisotis, J., & Goulian, K. (2004). The alliance for equity in higher education. In: B. V. Laden (Ed.), *Serving minority populations*, *New directions for community colleges* (Vol. 127, pp. 89–96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). (2004). About NAFEO. Retrieved October 19, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.nafeo.org.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy. (2004). *Leading the way to America's future*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Equity in Higher Education.

LATINO LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING CHALLENGES

Thomas R. Martínez and Patrick L. Valdez

For over three decades, the call for Hispanic and minority leadership development has grown in recognition, and perhaps even in acceptance. Much has surely been said, written, and accomplished. But, clearly, we are nowhere near the level of theoretical development and understanding, nor empirical examination, necessary to inform our practice.[1] And, clearly, widespread, adequately funded, specialized efforts and programs to carry out Latino(a) leadership development are few and far between.[2]

The purpose of this broad essay is both practical and conceptual. The immediate intent is to highlight strengthens and recent success of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)–Kellogg Leadership Fellows Programs, a model leadership development program in the higher education arena. This unique leadership development initiative is capitalizing on HACU as a hub of Hispanic higher education leadership to bring together well-established and emerging administrator/leaders to share experiences and to dialog on the critical substantive and conceptual challenges confronting Latino(a) higher education development. And, to not lose sight of the contemporary history of challenges and experiences Latino(a) administrator/leaders have generally had rising up in public

institutions, this paper seeks to help frame or offer conceptual understanding of these challenges and experiences.

Thus, this paper shall review the design and progress of the HACU–Kellogg Leadership Fellows Program (HKLFP), a key partner in the overall Kellogg Minority Serving Institution (MSI) Leadership Fellows Program. This higher education leadership development initiative is quickly emerging (or some would say, has emerged) as the premier forum for Hispanic higher education executive leadership development in the nation. In a number of key respects, this program is utilizing and building administrative/leadership professional development models most relevant to the preparation of Latino(a) institutional change agents, i.e., those focused on making their colleges and universities more responsive to the higher educational needs and values of Hispanic and other historically underrepresented students.

This paper serves to highlight the continuing need for well-grounded, and aggressive initiatives for Latino(a) administrator/leadership development. This is especially important, given rapidly changing demographics and the continuing need to define and examine, in theoretical and empirical senses, the roles played by Hispanic, women, and other underrepresented minority group members, now rising up organizational ladders and challenging our public institutions to embrace the diversity and higher participatory ideals upon which this nation was founded.[3]

HACU–KELLOGG LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM: CONCEPTUAL STRENGTHS

Before leading the reader through a discussion of a general conceptual base for Latino(a) leadership development, and into the specific curriculum design of the HKLFP, we will begin by highlighting the conceptual strengths of the HKLFP. The program is distinct in that it emphasizes: (1) transformational leadership and institutional change perspectives especially relevant to Latinos in Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs); (2) the articulation of key issues and the generation of case studies on Latino(a) educational leadership experiences and the needs of underrepresented students/communities; (3) practical, concrete experience, through its leadership/practitioner-driven nature; and (4) the need to derive conceptual meaning from practice, through reflective dialog among Fellows and presenters, and thus, contribute to Latino administrator/leader theory building. In these regards, the HACU program stands on its own merits.[4] However, as a point of

comparison, it stands with distinction against other nationally renowned higher education leadership development programs and institutes, for example, against those of the well-established Harvard Graduate School of Education's Institute for Higher Education Leadership.

In the articulation of key issues and the generation of case studies, the program intentionally seeks to identify and articulate how higher education policy and organizational arrangement impact underrepresented students. Discussion and case studies generated by HACU Fellows and other Latino higher education leaders tend to revolve around the issues, which mostly challenge contemporary public institutions of higher education serving socioeconomic and culturally diverse populations. In order to promote quality education for all students, these often gravitate to the substantive issues of student access, affordability, student retention and success, responsiveness to the needs and values of our growing cultural diversity, and public funding/support for higher education.

For example, for many in California, especially for minority higher education administrator/leaders, the State's and the public's apparent abandonment of its Master Plan for Higher Education is a major topic of concern – particularly as it is a harbinger for change nationally. This abandonment of commitment to support broader access, affordability, and quality higher education comes at precisely the time that Latinos(as) and other minorities are coming to dominate the college age population. Substantive issues and case studies utilized by such programs as Harvard's tend to focus on administrative, operational, and technological change, as well as marketing and other issues which, while relevant to all public and private institutions, are not driving the social–political debate in higher education in nearly the same fashion.

Lastly, while the HACU program rigorously seeks to be theory-based, the program places paramount value on the articulation and exploration of the concrete experiences of its participants. The experiences of the Fellows, and the conflicts they encounter as rising Latino(a) administrator/leaders are the legitimate and necessary substance for discussion and problem-solving exercises. Notably, the program is "president-heavy," meaning that learning from and with top Latino and Latina practitioner/leaders is essential. Only by beginning with examination of the experiences and conflicts encountered by Latino practitioners in higher education can the program effectively contribute to eventual theory building. By contrast, institutes such as that of Harvard are largely faculty-driven and content-based with participants having limited exposure to college and university presidents, and other top practitioner/leaders. As one HACU Fellow said, "This was better than the

Harvard….Program because of its practicality for university administrators and because it dealt with Minority Serving Institutions'' (Overton-Adkins et al., 2004, p. 20). While there is need for content and theoretical grounding, HACU consciously seeks to fully utilize and explore both deductive and inductive reasoning as the basis for effective action and learning.

LATINO HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: HACU AT THE FOREFRONT

> The future of the nation really depends on how well we prepare leaders.
> Antonio Flores, President and CEO, HACU

In the field of higher education, Latinos(as) have played a major advocacy role. In Latino(a) higher education advocacy, and now in Latino(a) higher education leadership development programs, HACU has truly emerged as the national leader. For two decades, and currently under the direction of President and CEO Antonio Flores, HACU has served as a hub for connecting and advocating nationally for colleges and universities, which serve high proportions of Latino(a) students. It is unparalleled in its success in advocating for resources and legislation on behalf of federally designated HSIs. More recently, it has utilized its strong position to more directly engage in the professional development of emerging Latino higher education administrator/leaders. HACU's emphasis upon HSI President involvement, and thus, Hispanic President involvement, makes it exceptionally well-positioned to carry out this role.

In 2002, HACU developed the HKLFP to prepare the next generation of Hispanic senior leaders at HSIs. That same year, the American Council of Education (ACE) reported that 3.7 percent of all presidents in the nearly 4,000 colleges and universities in the U.S. was Hispanic (Harvey, 2003). Hispanic representation increases to one-third of the chief executive officers (CEOs) at the nearly 300 HSIs[5] across the nation. However, as HSI's enroll over 50 percent of Hispanic college students in the nation, it is clear that the proportion of Hispanic presidents remains disproportionately too low even at HSIs.

The vast majority of Hispanic presidents are at 2-year colleges, and the number and proportion at 4-year universities is minimal. For Latinos and Latinas rising to community college presidencies, many have come up the student services ranks, where Hispanic are more likely to have begun their

careers in higher education. The dearth of Hispanic serving as presidents of colleges and universities is even more alarming if we consider the Hispanic pipeline challenges of low high school, college, and graduate school success rates.

In 4-year institutions, the most common route to the presidency is through the ranks of academic affairs. Most presidents have earned a doctorate, rise up the faculty ranks, and worked their way up the academic affairs administrative ladder: department chair, dean, and vice president/provost. In short, the typical president has the accumulated academic credentials and experience. While there is no guarantee that even the most traditional route will lead to the presidency, some research suggests that it's even more important for Hispanic to have earned such credentials (Haro & Lara, 2003). Unfortunately, the percentage of Hispanics among all people earning college degrees gets smaller as the level of academic degree gets higher: Hispanics (who in 2003 comprised 13 percent of the U.S. population) earned 10.1 percent of associate degrees, 6.4 percent of bachelor's degrees, 4.6 percent of master's degrees, 4.9 percent of first-professional degrees, and 3.2 percent of all doctoral degrees awarded in 2002 (US Bureau of the Census, 2005). Add to this the very low number of programs aimed at preparing Hispanic leaders and the low number of Hispanics who participate in established and well-known existing leadership programs, such as Harvard's Institute for Educational Management (IEM) and the ACE Fellows Program, and a great deal of work needs to be done at every level to insure that a large pool of Hispanic educational leaders exists in the future. As we ponder these data, the question ''Where will the future Hispanic presidents come from?'' should move the higher education community to action.

HACU–KELLOGG LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM DESIGN

To address challenges that Latino administrators face on their way to obtaining a presidency, the HACU developed the HKLFP. The Program is part of a collaborative effort under the aegis of the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Program, a multi-year Kellogg-funded initiative aimed at increasing the number of senior leaders at MSIs. As a benefit of this collaboration, several times a year HACU Fellows engage in joint training sessions with Fellows from programs directed by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) representing Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

(NAFEO), representing Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Consequently, graduates of the HKLFP are not only prepared to be successful HSI administrator/leaders, but, even more importantly, are encouraged to be "transformational" leaders prepared to handle the challenges facing today's diverse higher education community. As so aptly stated by Bea Espinoza, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Morton College and HACU Fellow, during the program's inaugural August Summer Institute in 2003, the HKLFP and Kellogg MSI "*bring together [experiences] I don't think I would have received out of a book…by the end of this program I think I'll be much more globally sound, networked, and understand the issues in a much larger picture.*"

The curriculum for the HKLFP emphasizes the moral seriousness, broad vision, responsible leadership, and the problem-solving skills required of these individuals as they seek to make their institutions more responsive to the needs of Latino(a) and all underrepresented populations. The assumption is that their roles are non-traditional and necessarily those of institutional change agents – thus adding to the already immensely challenging task of reconciling conflicting values and demands within traditional higher education institutions. The year-long program seeks to create a setting for critical relevant dialog, as well as personal reflection, on the leadership required to make HSIs more responsive to Hispanic and all underrepresented student populations.

APPLICATION, SELECTION, AND CURRICULUM DESIGN

> You can't major in being a president of a university.
> Eliseo "Cheo" Torres, Vice President for Student Services, University of New Mexico

HACU's Executive Director for Leadership Development, Patrick Valdez, is responsible for linking and coordinating the more general MSI curriculum elements with the more Hispanic-specific HACU portion of the curriculum, as well as implementating the recruitment and selection process. Application packets are mailed to the presidents of all HACU-member institutions. In keeping with HACU's emphasis upon securing HSI president involvement and commitment, to help insure that the required "release time" necessary to participate in the program is granted, and that the program's goals and objectives are supported, each applicant must be nominated by the president of his or her college or university. Applications are reviewed by a selection

committee comprised of nationally known higher education leaders serving on the HKLFP Advisory Board, and by HACU staff. In all, they choose 10 Hispanic Fellows each year to participate in this intensive program.

Selection of the HACU fellows is based on the applicant's potential impact on his or her institution, qualifications, learning plan, achievement of an appropriate academic terminal degree, essays and recommendations, and any publications, honors/awards, and memberships earned. However, heavy emphasis is placed on those applicants with a demonstrated record of successful Hispanic higher education advocacy.

The general curriculum outline is the product of the Kellogg MSI Leadership Fellows Senior Advisers, Kellogg MSI National Advisory Board, (including the CEOs of HACU, AIHEC, and NAFEO), and the HKLFP Advisory Board chaired by Tomás A. Arciniega, California State University, President Emeritus.[6] Topic areas include both broad issues related to higher education in the U.S., issues specific to MSIs, and issues unique to each minority group.

The HACU–Kellogg curriculum elements focus on key and traditional functional areas in higher education administration and leadership, and on the unique and non-traditional experiences of, and challenges faced by, Latino(a) higher education administrators and leaders. These include:

- Structure and History of American Public Higher Education, Contemporary Legislative and Political Issues Impacting HE, and HSI/MSI Issues and Perspectives
- Nature of Leadership/Transformational Leadership: Theory and Practice
- Development of Effective Hispanic Higher Education Leadership Roles as Institutional Change Agents
- Latino and Latina Leadership Development (Gender Issues, Perspectives, and Challenges), which includes a deliberate effort to call upon a mix of strong Latino and Latina presidents to serve as presenters, thus encouraging the full expression of gender-based experiences and perspectives
- The Building of an Effective and Competent Management Team, committed to the fulfillment of an appropriately unified and/or integrated institutional vision.

The curriculum also addresses key functional areas of higher education leadership and administration:

1. Academic Affairs/Institutional Vision, Mission, and Policy Planning
2. Governance-Trustees (single and multi-campus systems) Accreditation, Faculty Senates, and Legislatures

3. Contemporary Issues in Public Policy Direction in HE Finance – Financial Management and Budget Decision-Making
4. University Advancement, Development, Fundraising, and Community Relations
5. Student Affairs: Structure, Mission, Strategies, and Hispanic/underrepresented Student Access and Retention
6. Business and Administrative Services/Information Technology/Collective Bargaining.

The Program's year-round curriculum further seeks to include opportunities for:

- Presentations by key HSI Presidents and other top higher education leaders.
- Key reading: classic and contemporary literature both traditional and emerging Latino(a) writings, theory, and practice (sociopolitical, legal, and administrative contexts).
- Engagement of Fellows in intensive full- and small-group discussions and problem solving.
- The preparation and examination of working papers that explore the roles and challenges of effective HSI higher education leadership.
- Opportunities for Fellows to develop Case Studies for presentation and discussion. Case Studies are prepared before arrival at the summer orientation, and require that the Fellows offer a structured analysis of a policy or organizational problem which they currently face. The study must include a Problem Analysis: points of conflict (value conflict), analysis of the broader context, and articulation of the desired outcome, and key decision points for consideration. In addition, the Fellow must articulate the local case study or problem as it reflects a general challenge in higher education institutions and/or a traditional (dominant culture), non-traditional (Hispanic culture) education conflict.
- The summer program concludes with each Fellow declaring a "Personal Leadership/Action Agenda" for the upcoming fellowship year. It is intended that the Fellows leave the 1-week summer program with a better developed sense of their personal Hispanic leadership agenda/statement of purpose, and a personal long-term strategic action plan.
- Lastly, the HKLFP includes a strong mentor component. Fellows select and/or are matched with current, former, and retired HSI Latino and Latina presidents – each a recognized and outstanding leader on matters of underrepresented student advocacy. Fellows thus have the rare opportunity to engage in a year-long personal and critical dialog with an HSI

president, e.g., visiting their campus, comparing the administrative and fiscal structures, gaining exposure to policy and legislative issues, and critically discussing Latino(a) leadership challenges. And, beyond the professional development value to the Fellows, mentors serve as important contributors to the program occasionally serving as program presenter/faculty, offering assessment and feedback on program and curriculum design, and serving as key resources connecting the Program to Latino(a) and other state and national higher education networks.

It is further hoped that the HKLFP will lead to the generation of a uniquely relevant body of case studies in Hispanic/HSI Leadership development, and the stimulation of related academic research and publications. For example, one key case study which has emerged is that of Tomás A. Arciniega (2003), prepared with Thomas Martínez, entitled ''Mapping the Organizational Change Terrain: The California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) Example.'' This short paper outlines what is surely an exceptional example in transformational leadership and a prime case study in institutional change. Located at the southern end of California's San Joaquin Valley, CSUB was established in 1970 and is the only 4-year institution of higher education within a 100-mile radius of Bakersfield. CSUB's service region is rural-agricultural, low-income, fast-growing, and increasingly ethnically diverse with a historically low college-participation rate for all segments of its population. It has a large Latino farm-worker community. Thus, what CSUB does to educate young leaders in this socioeconomic and ethnically diverse service region is of paramount importance and a great example of a Hispanic president's success – one of many discussed throughout the fellowship.

UNIQUENESS OF THE HACU LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM AND KELLOGG MSI LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM

It's bringing together three communities of color that have been historically marginalized in systems of education in the United States.

Venida Chenault, AIHEC Fellow 2004

As noted above, training is conducted under two different formats: Kellogg MSI joint training sessions and individual (AIHEC, HACU, NAFEO) training sessions. During the joint training sessions, fellows discuss the

broad issues related to higher education in the U.S. and issues specific to MSIs. These issues are considered generic to higher education. That is, a president at any university should have knowledge of them. During the individual training sessions, Fellows discuss the issues that are more characteristic of the type of institutions the Fellow represent. HACU Fellows, therefore, address topics and issues that are more prevalent within HSIs. These often include: higher education affordability; undocumented and immigrant student issues; Latino student access, retention, and graduation rates; and Hispanic student and community demographic trends.

Largely due to its ongoing national role in its HSI legislative advocacy role, and its emergence as a key networking forum for Latino and other HSI presidents, HACU is uniquely positioned to carry out this Fellows Leadership Program. HACU-specific Fellows training sessions are conducted four times annually beginning with a week-long Summer Institute, held in Washington, DC, each August. Other training sessions are scheduled in conjunction with the: HACU Annual Conference, held each October, most recently in Miami, Florida, and in Anaheim, California; HACU governing Board meetings held annually in February in San Antonio, home to HACU's corporate offices; and HACU's Capital Forum, held in Washington, DC, each March. In 2004, the year's closing training session was held in Mexico City. Due to these regularly scheduled meetings, the HKLFP has unusual access to top Latino(a) presidents, elected officials, and other national leaders often already attending HACU annual meetings, including former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and Founder and CEO of AmericanCity Vista, Henry Cisneros, who graciously and conscientiously shared his time and broad leadership experiences with the first- and second-year HACU Fellows cohorts.

Some of the topics covered throughout the year are summarized below:

Vision and Mission: This session addresses the importance of developing and institutionalizing a vision of the future and the overall organizational mission. Special emphasis is placed on a leader's responsibility to craft and articulate a vision appropriate to its context. For example, in the CSUB study above, what some critics labeled Tomás Arciniega's "Latino Agenda" was truly a vision which opened up the university to all segments of its service region. In this case, Hispanic and general community interests were creatively reconciled into a unified mission and vision of access for all qualified students.

Leadership and Change: Current Latino(a) college and university presidents shared their experience and perspective on responsible leadership, particularly as the leadership is driven by transformational focus.[7]

Again, the emphasis here is on critically reflecting on the experiences of Latino(a) higher education leaders as they are challenged to make their institutions more responsive to all students. Interestingly, in a recent presidents panel discussion with HACU Fellows, rather than asking the traditional questions – "What is leadership?" "How can one initiate institutional change?" – the questions were more culturally appropriate: "As a Latino(a) president, what's in the *coraje* that drives you?" "Why must you do what you do?"

Articulating their *coraje*, here loosely translated as a driving sense of anger turned into courage to act, led these presidents to base their discussion of leadership and change in personal value contexts. One renowned Latina community college president, Rita Cepeda of California, spoke of the personal pain she felt during these tough budgetary times knowing that some of the neediest and most vulnerable students would be denied access to her campus. She spoke of how this realization drove her leadership and institution change perspective.

Board Relations, Shared Governance, Policy, and Strategic Planning – This session deals with how leadership and relationships come together and the key relationships a president must manage in order to be successful.

Hispanic-Serving Institution Development – This session focuses on qualitative definition of the HSI role. That is, what does it mean, beyond meeting the federal designation criteria, to be a Hispanic "Serving" Institution?

Student Success: Access and Retention (Programs and Services: Policy and Program Issues, etc.) – The discussion addressess the president's policy role in establishing student service expectations, ensuring the development of mechanisms in order to attain these expectations, and guiding assessments of the results. It also focuses on establishing academic and support policies appropriate to diverse student populations and how diversity impacts the institution, now and in the future.

Critical Issues in Higher Education Policy – HSI presidents share their thoughts on some of the issues and challenges facing higher education in general and HSIs especially.

Case Studies – The Case Study is an opportunity for HACU Fellows to prepare a case for presentation and discussion. Each Fellow offers a structured analysis of a concrete policy or organizational problem which he or she currently faces. Case studies presented by the Fellows tend to focus on conflicts which emerge and reveal traditional institutional and non-traditional (Latino) educational values and points of view.

Development, Fundraising, Grants, and External Funding – This discussion focuses on the presidential priorities, decisions, and obstacles relative to a

successful advancement program. Special focus is given to corporate fund-raising and grants.

Presidents' Panels: "The Challenge of Latino Leadership" – This session allows the participants to interact with an outstanding panel of Latino and Latina presidents. The session seeks to bring focus to Latino(a) roles and challenges and to develop a Latino(a) leadership action agenda.

National Policy Perspectives/Advocacy Groups in Higher Education – Mentor/presidents share views on national policy perspectives of Latino(a) education as reflected in the policy advocacy work of key national associations, such as: the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of Higher Education, the American Association of University Presidents, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

HACU Fellows Presentation: Reflections on Campus Visits – HACU–Kellogg Fellows share their experiences and insights about their visit to their mentor's campus. Fellows share copies of their itineraries, report their observations and how the visits contribute to, reinforce, and/or influence their understanding of higher education issues and leadership.

HACU Capitol Forum – During HACU's Capitol Forum in Washington, DC, Fellows participate in sessions focused on HACU's legislative agenda and the national budget cuts facing HSIs. Fellows visit Capitol Hill and the offices of their local representatives to advocate for HACU's recommendations to the Higher Education Act. In many cases, Fellows are able to meet directly with their congressional representative. The 2004 HACU Fellows cohort held a private meeting with Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-California), and the 2005 HACU Fellows cohort met with Chairman Robert Menendez (D-New Jersey).

As HSIs are relatively new in their designation and existence, it is important that HSI leaders understand national legislative processes. As federal funding for higher education diminishes, HSI presidents have to be skilled at navigating choppy political waters.

MENTOR COMPONENT

One of the primary areas which needs to be addressed is the individual's [fellow's] belief that they can do the job. Most administrators of color face this and it is important that this be reinforced to those seeking to become administrators.

HACU Mentor 2004

Mentors are an important component of the HKLFP. Through the mentors, HACU Fellows can learn and experience, firsthand, what it is like to be a president. Current and past HSI presidents are invited to participate in the program. Mentors and Fellows are matched on the basis of their specific skills and strengths and areas of mutual interest. In no case was a HACU Fellow paired with the president of his/her institution.

Mentors must attend specific meetings or events to fully support the HACU Fellow; however, the time commitment may vary from mentor to mentor, depending on the needs and interests of the HACU Fellow. Specific commitments include: attending an orientation session with the Fellow at the HACU Annual Conference, and participating in a 1-day training session with the Fellow in San Antonio; inviting the fellow to visit his or her campus, no less than one visit per year; and communicating with the Fellow on a regular basis (weekly or monthly) via telephone, site visits, or e-mail.

Mentors provide specific guidance, advice, and evaluative feedback to the HACU Fellow in the following areas: development of a concept paper and personal action plan, discussion of reading assignments and other literature, and discussion of current issues and trends in Hispanic higher education and at HSIs.

REFLECTIONS OF A FIRST-YEAR PROGRAM

> It helped me move comfortably into my new position as a provost.
>
> HACU Fellow 2004

HACU's Fellows program has become the premier forum for Hispanic higher education leadership development and interaction in the nation. As noted earlier, the general and specific strengths of the HKLFP are many. The substantive discussion involving established higher education leaders and HACU Fellows during training meetings have been wide-ranging and insightful. Discussions have covered a variety of issues, many related to policy and legislative matters that impact student access, affordability and relevant/quality instruction. These discussions have given HACU Fellows the opportunity to dialog with such prominent Latino(a) higher education figures as Dolores Fernandez of New York, Maria Sheehan of California, Manuel Pacheco of Arizona, Eduardo Padron of Miami, Tessa Martínez-Pollack of Texas, Christine Johnson of Colorado, and Ricardo Fernandez of New York.

The Fellows themselves have driven much of the core discussion, as they share common experiences, perspectives, and individual strategies as institutional change agents. A mark of the progress of the program may be that, more and more, the Fellows have asked to meet alone, absent program presenters, to dialog on their own substantive issues, seek constructive advice from one another, and offer each other guidance and counsel.

Thus, strengths of the program include the opportunities to interact with top higher education leaders; explore, share, and articulate one's own concrete experiences; and, to build mutually beneficial colleague networks among the Fellows. As one Fellow stated, "…the program afforded me the opportunity to meet and develop professional relationships with a number of sitting presidents, leaders of higher education associations…and most importantly my fellow cohort members.…I believe these relationships will last a lifetime." Another added that such program interactions "built significant confidence in sharing [my] ideas and developing plans.…" (Overton-Adkins, p. 19).

Since completing the HKLFP in 2004, HACU Fellows have been promoted to: Vice President of Academic Affairs at Cal-Poly Pomona, Vice President of Academic Affairs at Morton College, and Provost at New Mexico Highlands University.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As the HKLFP grows and expands, a focus of the program is to illuminate and explore Latino and Latina leadership issues and perspectives. This is still an emerging, yet an essential task. Some Latina higher education leaders, such as Cha Guzman of Texas, Sandra Trujillo-Holman of California, and HACU Fellow Felicia Casados of New Mexico, are among those who have raised our sensitivity to and have reminded us that approximately two-thirds of our Hispanic student population at HSI's is female. Thus, the pipeline for higher education leadership development is primarily Latina. Seriously examining gender-based issues is an essential element of our leadership development challenges.

Thus, the HKLFP is truly a work-in-progress. It is a dynamic program with a bold vision, and the fact that so many Latino(a) presidents and other higher education leaders have lent themselves to this initiative speaks well for its quality and prospects. It also speaks to their recognition of the critical need for, and shortage of, such unique, relevant, and well-grounded Latino(a) higher education leadership development efforts. Given their rapid growth in the population across the United States, in a very real sense,

Latinos and their educational development are essential to the nation's continued growth at all levels. Competent and committed Latino(a) higher education leaders are a necessary, but only one contributor to this effort.

NOTES

1. For a brief review of theoretical and empirical literature on the role and experiences of Hispanic and other minority public administrators-leaders, see Herbert (1974), Martinez (1991), and Martinez (1997).

2. Hispanic and Latino are used interchangeably, although Latino(a) is specifically used to highlight reference to leadership development involving both male and female perspectives.

3. For classic discussion on the theoretical and conceptual challenges of active representation and participatory behavior within the administration of public institutions, see Kingsley (1966), Krislov (1974), Krislov and Rosenbloom (1981), and Meier (1968).

4. As the curriculum of the HKLFP emphasizes the principles of institutional change, experience-based problem-solving, is practitioner-driven, and seeks to generate conceptual meaning through dialog, it tends toward a ''problem-posing'' pedagogy, e.g. see Fiere (1970).

5. HSI's are non-profit, accredited colleges, universities or districts/systems in the U.S. or Puerto Rico where the total Hispanic enrollment is at least 25 percent of the total enrollment.

6. HKLFP Advisory Board members are: Tomás A. Arciniega, CSU President Emeritus; Maria Sheehan, President, College of the Desert; Tessa Martínez Pollack, President, Our Lady of the Lake University; Salme Steinberg, President, Northeastern Illinois University; Ricardo Fernandez, President, Herbert Lehman College; Eduardo Padron, President, Miami-Dade College; and Max Castillo, President, University of Houston, Downtown.

7. For one president's discussion on transformational leadership, see Arciniega (2000).

REFERENCES

Arciniega, T. A. (2000). Reflections on the nature and importance of institutional change. In: B. Kellerman & L. Matusak (Eds), *Cutting edge leadership 2000* (pp. 1–4). College Park, MD: The Center for the Advanced Study of Leadership, The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership, University of Maryland.

Arciniega, T. A. (2003). Mapping the organizational change terrain: The California State University, Bakersfield example. An unpublished case study prepared for and presented at the HACU Kellogg Leadership Fellows meeting, August.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Haro, R., & Lara, F. (2003). Latinos in administrative positions in American higher education. In: J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (pp. 156–165). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Harvey, W. (2003). *20th Anniversary minorities in higher education, annual report, 2002–2003*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Herbert, A. W. (1974). The minority administrator: Problems, prospects, and challenges. *Public Administration Review, 34*, 556–563.

Kingsley, J. (1966). *Representative bureaucracy: An interpretation of the British civil service*. Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press.

Krislov, S. (1974). *Representative bureaucracy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Krislov, S., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (1981). *Representative bureaucracy and the American political system*. West Port, CT: Greenwood Press.

Martinez, T. R. (1997). The Herbert thesis revisited: A critical commentary. *Public Administration Review, 57*, 363–365.

Martinez, T. R. (1991). The role of Hispanic public administrators: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *American Review of Public Administration, 21*, 33–55.

Meier, K. J. (1968). Representative bureaucracy: An empirical analysis. *American Political Science Review, 69*, 526–542.

Overton-Adkins, B., Burkhardt, J., Chahin, J., Dorrah, H., Martinez, M., & McLeod, M. (2004). Creating the next generation of leaders for minority serving institution 2003/2004 exit survey. Kellogg MSI Leadership Program, November.

US Bureau of the Census. (2005). *Degrees earned by level and race/ethnicity: 1981–2002*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

EVOLVING A LEAP FOR LATINOS: LESSONS LEARNED

David J. León and Thomas R. Martínez

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, Leon published "Building a LEAP for Latinos in Higher Education." This article arose from his experiences participating in a national higher education leadership development program sponsored by the Leadership and Education for Asian Pacifics (LEAP) in the summer of 2001 (Leon, 2003). This long-established program seeks to enhance leadership development among Asian-Pacific Americans in higher education institutions. In the course of the 4-day LEAP institute, Leon was inspired to create a similar program for Latinos. This goal became a priority when he discovered that few such programs existed and that Latinos were seriously underrepresented in most national higher education leadership programs (e.g., ACE Fellows Program, Harvard Institutes for Higher Education, AASCU's Millennium Leadership Institute, Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration).

This paper describes the genesis and evolution of the Hispanic Association for Colleges and Universities (HACU) Latino(a) Higher Education Leadership Institute (LHELI), whose purpose is to provide a regular forum for discussing and serving the administrative and leadership development needs of the small, but growing critical mass of Latinos and Latinas rising

up career ladders in higher education institutions across the Southwest and the nation.

At the outset, Leon had to find a sponsor for the institute. He considered his own university, but felt a national association would bestow more visibility and creditability. Leon eventually approached Dr. Antonio Flores, President and CEO of the HACU. He spoke informally with some members of the HACU Board of Directors, and all were supportive and enthusiastic. Meanwhile, since Leon knew he could not plan and execute the institute alone, he enlisted the assistance of his colleague Dr. Thomas Martínez. A long-time professor of public policy and administration, Martínez had a background in the theoretical and substantive field of leadership development and had participated in a number of national higher educational leadership programs.

In March 2002, Leon sent a proposal to Dr. Flores, which included the documentation of need, detailing the paucity of Latinos in current leadership programs, a tentative agenda/curriculum outline, and a base budget. In August, he received initial acceptance of the program as a 1-day pre-conference institute at that year's annual HACU national conference. This left less than 2 months to plan the institute and attract participants.

What follows is a summary of elements in the design, implementation, and ongoing refinement of this leadership development institute – a true work in progress. As such, it outlines some basic lessons learned (tips) and questions to consider in the development of other such institutes. Thus, this is essentially a case study highlighting practical considerations for others seeking to develop similar leadership training forums.

While there exist recognized, well established, and significantly funded national leadership development programs, a broad review of them suggested that: (1) some are excellent, but have not attracted significant participation by Latinos or by other minorities; (2) few focus primarily on the unique social-political leadership issues, conflicts, and challenges confronting many Latino(as) in higher education; (3) while some purport to serve a broad audience, in substance some draw heavily on case studies and exercises more appropriate to private rather than public college and university settings; and (4) while many do a fine job at presenting traditional theoretical approaches and methods, few seek to explore theoretical thinking and methods which may be more appropriate to Latinos and Latinas in higher education. Although this LHELI might currently be viewed as a relatively modest program in terms of size and resources, it is driven by a desire to be more responsive to the needs here outlined.

The First Institute

In August 2002, the HACU President and CEO sent a letter to all member institutions announcing the creation of the HACU LHELI. It encouraged the participation and included an application form which asked two questions: Why are you applying in this institute? What do you hope to gain? Among the responses:

> Participating in this endeavor will address some of the salient professional development needs confronting Latino administrators and faculty in post-secondary education.
>
> I was asked by my institution to represent them in order to learn more about recruiting and retaining minority students and faculty.
>
> This will be my first experience with HACU. I hope to learn about the organization and gather information the institute has to offer about Hispanic representation in our community.
>
> I hope to be able to identify a group of mentors from the leaders participating in this institute. It has been found that those with mentors are more likely to reach their goals.

The LHELI-curriculum design covered a set of core topics and exercises, including: (1) introductory discussion of the issues facing Latino(a) leadership, including the challenges of non-traditional peoples operating in traditional institutions; (2) demographic data on the success of Latino students in colleges and universities on key access, retention and success measures; (3) career development issues and exercises appropriate for those operating in student services and academic affairs settings; (4) discussion of policy issues and administrative trends in higher education; and (5) most importantly, the opportunity to hear from and interact with a panel of top Latino and Latina college and university presidents committed to making their institutions more responsive to the unique educational needs of Latino and other underrepresented students.

The first institute lasted a full day and included several morning and afternoon sessions. It opened with a panel on the demographic trends of Latinos in higher education. The first panelist set forth nationwide data, and the second discussed case studies of Latino administrators whom he had interviewed. The 34 participants gave this panel high mark. Using a scale from 1 (disagree with positive assessments) to 5 (strongly agree), 82% rated the panelists agree or strongly agree.

In the late morning, we gave attendees a hands-on exercise. We divided them into small groups (academic affairs or student affairs), and asked them to describe their vitas, discussed the career paths in the different parts of higher education, and developed an action plan for their careers. We selected team leaders based on their experiences or current administrative

positions. Participants rated the small group discussions slightly higher than the opening session, with 85% giving them an agree or strongly agree. During lunch, both Dr. Antonio Flores and Dr. Jose Vicente, Chair of the HACU Governing Board, welcomed participants warmly.

Our much-anticipated afternoon panel included HACU college and university presidents. Each discussed his or her own path to the presidency and offered insights about climbing the administrative ladder. The President's Panel was our biggest hit. All participants rated it agree or strongly agree.

In the last session, we asked the participants to reflect on the day's events. In the evaluation, we gave participants three open-ended questions.

First, we asked them to comment on one or two of the most valuable aspects of the institute. The majority found the small group discussions the most valuable, followed by the President's Panel. Among the comments:

> It was very helpful to hear views of other participants as well as insights of team leaders.
> The small group discussion facilitated very personal connections. The experiences/ paths followed by the presidents on the panel were an inspiring point of sharing.
> I really enjoyed interacting with my small group. I also enjoyed the presidents' panel.... I enjoyed hearing their own stories re: pathways.
> The discussion with all the presidents. It was an eye opener and a great experience to listen to them.

Second, we asked them to cite the one or two least valuable aspects of the institute. The participants offered specific recommendations, most of them focused on the morning's small group discussions. Comments included:

> Resume writing [was] too basic for the level of the participants.
> Specific topics [such as development, budget, community issues, student issues] might have been a better way to divide the group [instead of academic affairs and students affairs].
> Switch tables to meet more participants.
> Wanted feedback on our resumes. The table I sat at got into discussions and never addressed the resumes.

Despite their high ratings of the demographic panel, the attendees said:

> The presenters could have done a better job presenting information instead of reading their papers.
> The general demographics information could probably be less emphasized since we are familiar already.

The last question asked participants to recommend one or two improvements to the institute. Most suggestions again focused on the small group discussions, and included:

> Concentrate on skill building – facilitate mentoring, networking, connections.
> Extend group discussion time incorporating time for sharing with larger group.
> Individual one-on-one assistance with resumes, experience review, interview skills, etc.
> Allow longer time for small group discussions.

Participants also expressed concerns about gender, stating:

> Need a particular focus on Latina issues?
> Provide opportunity for dialogue and representation for Latina issues/concerns/expertise.
> Try to include gender in each panel equally.

Another set of comments dealt with possible new topics, length of the institute, and follow-up, and included:

> Get an ally from a research level institute to come in because the issues are different. And please add another from a private, liberal arts environment.
> Two days with the first day focusing on experiences of VP's and Presidents, 2nd day on case studies and solving problems.
> Hope to keep up with the members who attended through email or list serve.
> Focused on senior level administration on the academic side too much. Maybe a track for entry level to focus on mid level administration.
> Pair mentors with mentees and revisit in a year to reflect.
> Develop clear guidelines and a statement of purpose.

The participants' comments were useful in helping us plan our agenda for the next year.

The Second Institute

As a result of participants' comments, we made several changes for the next year's institute. First, we lengthened it from 1 to 2 days. We dropped the prior year's segment on the demographic data on Latinos, since participants seemed familiar with it. We also added a panel on Latinas in higher education and another on development, and extended the small group discussions.

However, the attendance was disappointing. Our first institute attracted 34 participants, but the second drew only 19. Cost was one likely factor. Since we extended the institute we had to double the fee. At the same time, potential participants stated that their institutions were curtailing travel due to state budget crises.

This year we began with the presentation of case studies. Over half the attendees (63%) rated it valuable or very valuable. (We changed the ratings,

substituting "valuable" for "agree," for instance, and "very valuable" for "strongly agree.")

In the late morning, after a break, we had a hands-on session and divided the participants into student affairs or academic affairs groups. Less than half of both groups (42%) indicated that the sessions were valuable or very valuable.

After lunch, we continued with a new session on Latina administrators in higher education. Only slightly more than half (57%) thought this panel was valuable or very valuable to them professionally.

We offered another new panel on development, fund-raising, grants, and external funding. It proved a surprise hit. All but one of the participants (95%) rated this panel valuable or very valuable.

On the second day, we offered a morning panel entitled Student Success: Access, Retention, and Graduation. Almost all (84%) participants deemed this panel valuable or very valuable.

In response to comments from the previous year, we gave attendees an opportunity to present a case study of their own. We asked them to succinctly analyze the problem and explain its context. The discussion group focused on articulating larger principles at work. Most (78%) found this valuable or very valuable to their careers.

After lunch we presented another new panel entitled Emerging Issues in Latino Leadership, and asked panelists to talk about these challenges in the context of their own institutions. Attendees liked this panel somewhat less than the two preceding, with about two-thirds (68%) finding it valuable or very valuable.

The anchor for the institute and our most successful panel from last year was the President's Panel. We deliberately scheduled it in the end and, as before, it was extremely popular. Most (90%) rated this panel very valuable.

In the evaluation we again posed three open-ended questions to attendees. First, we asked them to identify positive aspects of the institute. They said:

> I really enjoyed the diverse group. Lots of experience combined – learned a lot. Participants, presenters and mediators are all role models for what I aspire to see.
>
> _____ was wonderful. His comments in the Latina workshop were most enlightening. Fundraising was excellent including the President's Panel.
>
> Developing relationships with other Latinos.
>
> Great networking forum. Lunches provided informal sharing opportunities.
>
> Having an opportunity to share experiences openly with like-minded leaders, both present and future.
>
> Personal advice from the Presidents.

Second, we asked participants to state the least positive aspects of the institute. Among their comments:

> I did have a question about the target audience. I suggest clarifying that.
> Too little time devoted to the broad issues.
> Too heavy on the lecture format.
> Each day was a bit long. End at 3:30 or 4 p.m. would be better.

Finally, we asked participants to recommend changes for the next year. They suggested the following:

> Focus + plan: focus the workshops w/clear learning goals that are given to presenters and participants.
> How about creating an institute or fellowship for those of us who are Directors to become Deans, VP's, etc.
> Grant writing/grant resources. Resume postings.
> Discussion on Faculty Recruitment.
> More contact (direct) with real life situations w/presidents and provosts.
> Readings ahead of the session.
> Recruiting male Hispanic students to higher ed. campuses.

In the main, participants rated our second institute favorably. However, the participation rate was low, and we therefore decided to return to our original 1-day format.

The Third Institute

Twenty-three people attended the third institute, a slight improvement from the second year but still short of the first year. We decided to drop the case studies of Latino presidents and present the ACE study of university presidents to give participants an overall view of the issues of moving up the administrative ladder.

We began the morning with a new panel entitled "Latino/a Leadership: Core Values and 'Coraje' That Drive Us." We posed two questions: Why do we do what we do and what makes us different? Most (86%) participants rated this panel agree or strongly agree. (We had returned to the "agree" terminology.) This would prove the second highest rating of the day, after the President's Panel. Next, we divided the participants according to their present positions for the hands-on workshop. Most (78%) rated this session agree or strongly agree.

After lunch, the student model programs received a slightly lower rating than the two previous panels. Participants (73%) rated them agree or strongly agree. The approval rating for the next afternoon session entitled

Emerging Issues in Leadership continued to slide. Participants (69%) rated this agree or strongly agree. Our final session of the day, the President's Panel, stopped the decline. It rated higher than our first morning session with all but one of the participants (96%) giving it agree or strongly agree.

At the end, we gave participants the same three open-ended questions. Regarding positive aspects of the institute, they said:

> The report presented in the beginning set the stage, i.e., American College President.
>
> Excellent presentations. They truly know/have their hands on the pulse of issues affecting Latinos.
>
> Exposure to a variety of perspectives – very well represented. Convenient because it was offered in collaboration with HACU conference.
>
> Getting the opportunity to speak with the presenters in roundtable and one-on-one. Getting advice regarding possible career and education tracks.
>
> Learning about critical issues that need attention.
>
> It was extremely helpful to hear personal stories and suggestions from current administrators. It was also great to hear about other student success programs. I am leaving with exciting ideas for my own campus.
>
> Since I am new to the university experience and to my position, I find that what I'm hearing is both eye-opening and invaluable. All aspects of the day have been enlightening.
>
> Sharing of personal experiences from the 'Big Wigs' [President's Panel] allows for inspiration.

Among the least positive aspects were:

> The career development workshop didn't provide me any insight on staying or moving 'on track.' Too much anecdotal talk about personal life experiences and leadership styles. I was hoping for more 'practical' and/or theoretical understanding of the Presidency.
>
> Not having the handouts [PowerPoint presentations] in front of us so that we can take notes.
>
> Lack of visuals and handouts of model school success programs.
>
> Too much talking heads. Not enough time to get into any meaningful discussion.
>
> Need to discuss more issues on Hispanic recruitment.
>
> The lack of dialogue due to time constraints.

Finally, participants made these recommendations for next year's program:

> Address the issues of the glass ceiling when you work for institutions that are white, conservative, traditional/conventional.
>
> A book of the handouts.
>
> Focus on a skill set like planning or fundraising 101.
>
> Find a way to do a 2-day session.
>
> Limit the background allotted time at the beginning of the career workshop so that there's more time for questions and answers.
>
> Offer some hands-on experience on working with budgets or opportunities to hear actual cases of challenging situations and how the administrators or Presidents handled

them. Create a session titled 'A Day in the Life of President' and let them explicate how they presided and managed.

Lessons Learned

By the end of our third institute we had learned many lessons. The institute is open to all interested participants, and to its credit it had clear appeal to a wide range of individuals with a wide range of specific needs. That is, the institutes have attracted Latino(a) higher education faculty, staff, and administrators who are at early, middle and advanced stages of their careers. On the one hand, this has allowed a diverse set of participants to interact and to learn from each other. On the other, each grouping does have different career development needs and substantive interests. In reality, there is clearly a need for a differentiated set of leadership development forums. However, the institute presenters, given current constraints, have to find ways to acknowledge and speak to these differences while capitalizing on this unique forum opportunity. The institutes are a work in progress and we will continue to make changes in the agenda, the sessions, presenters, and handouts. At the present time, we will continue to offer the institute for only 1 day.

Why did the first Institute do better than the others? First, of course, it may have tapped into latent demand. Few had ever participated in such an institute and those most eager for it responded. Moreover, the HACU President and CEO wrote a letter to all HACU members asking them to participate. It was a powerful recruiting tool. Formal letters or e-mailblasts to all HACU members should be a standard practice in future outreach efforts.

Over time, we cut down on the data presented in the institute. Instead, we gave handouts to the participants. We are considering sending participants material before the institute, so they can read it in quiet and maximize their useful time at the institute.

We are seriously contemplating other improvements as well:

- The hands-on workshop needs a serious overhaul. Instead of dividing the participants based on position (academic affairs versus student affairs), we may wish to emphasize themes, such as resume writing, development of a career plan, and writing a winning cover letter.
- The development panel was one of the highest-rated in the second year, and should be a regular feature of the institute.

There is clearly a need for multiple national as well as local leadership development forums to serve the needs of a broad audience of Latinos and

Latinas currently moving up career ladders in higher education. This particular institute is but one example.

Ultimately, of course, we all learn by doing. We have learned a great deal by conducting these institutes over 3 years, and we look forward to making them more and more useful to Latinos(as) rising in academia.

REFERENCES

León, D. (2003). Building a leap for Latinos in higher education. In: D. León (Ed.), *Latinos in higher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 193–205). London: JAI-Elsevier Science.

NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED: THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM 1992–2002

Anonymous[1]

The California State University (CSU) Executive Leadership Program (ELDP) was started with good intentions. The higher education executive and administrative pipeline required diversity to fulfill its equity obligation. The need was apparent on its face. In the 1990s, most of the CSU Office of the Chancellor (CO) and campus executive leadership was Caucasian and those in department chair, director, associate vice president, and dean positions were largely white. People of color were also underrepresented in faculty ranks, the usual starting place for executive positions. Its student population was still majority white, but demographics would soon change that, and Latino activism was raising issues of underrepresentation at all levels.

THE GOOD DEED

A group of CSU Latinos brought up the idea of a fellows program at a meeting with the then Chancellor Barry Munitz in 1991. During his tenure as Chancellor, Latinos had met with him from time to time to bring to his attention the many problems of Latino underrepresentation in higher education. The Chancellor agreed that there were too few Latinos in executive positions and organized a program with 2-year fellowships, fully funded by the Chancellor's Office, known as the California State University Executive Leadership Development Program (CSU ELDP).

It was always described as a "pilot" program and at first targeted Latinos. Later other underrepresented groups were accepted into the program. In its few years, the program had a total of 16 fellows, most of them Latino. The CSU system internal documents state that ELDP was intended to provide "selected individuals extensive executive learning experiences in the California State University (CSU) Office of the Chancellor (CO) and in the state and federal offices of governmental relations" (CSU Memorandum, 1993). The executive fellows attended the Harvard University Institute for Educational Management, national conferences, and were parceled out to various CSU offices; however, only the first cohort of fellows had access to the Chancellor. They were then sent to campuses that agreed to provide them with an experience similar to the fellowships run by the American Council on Education, which meant that they would be placed in academic positions and identified as fellows. All of this was done in the *hope* that the fellows would subsequently be appointed to executive positions in the CSU.

The Chancellor urged the Presidents to support this program. The CSU system internal document states that "the program was developed in response to the commitment by the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor that the California State University assume a significant role in achieving diversity, and the urgent need to develop a diversified pool of qualified candidates for executive positions in academic administration, campus presidencies, and senior positions at the system level" (CSU Memorandum, 1993).

The fellows generally accepted the program with high hopes of advancing their own careers and making a difference in the CSU. They were confident in their qualifications and their ability to benefit from the experience. They went into the program enthusiastic about their future in the CSU, confident that they would be future deans, vice presidents, and executives. Even the

most cynical relaxed their guard and joined in the hopes shared by the staff of the Chancellor's Office.

Although problems were yet to surface, when they did, they were viewed not as systemic matters, but problems of the individual fellows. Thus there was little urgency to alert the new cohorts or change program strategies. Individuals in the earlier years who had problems were perceived as the authors of their own ill fate.

Today, only one of the 16 fellows is in an executive position in the CSU and the consensus is that person was on track for a deanship, having served as an associate dean, even without the program. This person returned to her home campus and a deanship. Two of the fellows advanced to administrative assignments as a consequence of the fellowship, but left the CSU after unsuccessful tenures in those jobs. All but two of the rest who returned to their home campus eventually left for other higher education systems because of an inability to find CSU assignments. The two who stayed have not obtained promotions. The obvious conclusion is that, not only have fellows not been successful in the CSU, but also most of these highly qualified individuals had to leave the CSU in order to advance. How could this happen in the largest higher education system in the country?

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU ASSUME?

The good intentions of Chancellor Barry Munitz and the CSU were grounded on a number of assumptions that turned out to be problematic. The most troubling was that the presidents would support the program, but that was not to be. Some presidents chose to ignore it for reasons of their own, including not agreeing with the program methodology. Other presidents refused to nominate anyone from their campus to attend.

Of those campus presidents who did nominate, some used the program as an opportunity to help remove scholars from their campuses who, for whatever reason, the president or other influential campus administrators wanted gone. It appears that several were Latinos who were raising questions about the dearth of diversity in the CSU pipeline. They were ultimately professionally killed by the faint praise of being nominated for the program. Once sent off, the campus leadership believed that these people would go elsewhere, and thus their problem people would be permanently removed.

Ironically, being nominated for the fellowship program created resentment and anger toward the fellows among their colleagues. There was

resentment that these selected individual were given special treatment. This hostility often was expressed openly and got back to the fellows. In some cases the fellows were personally vilified.

The CO did not anticipate these emotional reactions and finally the CO had to persuade campus presidents to take back their people. Of the fellows who did not get advanced assignments and ultimately returned to their home campus, few got their old jobs back. Several were given demotions, such as less prestigious titles, assignments, or influence. Returning to their home campus was perceived as failure of the individual. All failed fellows however, kept their previous salaries. What is unknown because of lack of study is how their future salaries were influenced by the demotions. One would suspect that their salaries remained stagnant until they left the CSU.

Another assumption was that there were people of color in the pipeline with the requisite budget and line experience, so that by enriching their experience and "filling in the experience gaps," they would be made good enough to apply to dean and vice presidential positions. This did not occur. The number of people of color in the CSU, Latinos in particular, who had risen to line and budget assignments was very small, and few were at or above a deanship. Thus some of the likely candidates for fellows were academics with little administrative experience. Indeed, most fellows were middle managers or faculty.

The two fellows who were appointed to higher-level campus positions as a consequence of the fellowship lost their jobs after a few years. Some suspect this was because of their lack of substantial line and budget experience, which made their "honeymoons" short-lived and their first mistakes omens of failure. Lacking the budget and line experience to prepare them for their new jobs, they made junior level mistakes in the senior level jobs – acts not easily forgiven by faculty who already resented the "unearned promotions." The hostility toward the fellows because of "special treatment" appears to have further aggravated the institutional preference for non-minority executives. At the very least, *there is no evidence that the CSU ELDP assumed a significant role in achieving diversity, nor met the urgent need to develop a diversified pool of qualified candidates for executive positions* in CSU campus academic administration, campus presidencies, and senior positions at the CO system level.

LESSONS LEARNED

This book on lessons in leadership is a good place for this tale, for there are several apparent lessons learned as a consequence of the CSU ELDP failure:

- Proponents of diversity are misguided when they attempt to "fix the individual," assuming that will "fix the institution."
- White privilege is so embedded in higher education culture that one "program" can not create the social change necessary for equal treatment of people of color.
- One can only make some good out of the bad.

While there is the impulse to blame the fellows for their lack of advancement in the CSU, and it may be true to some extent, it does not fully explain the failure of the ELDP. Fixing the "individual" was the focus of the CSU ELDP, as it had been of an earlier apparently failed CSU CO mid-level Administrative Fellows Program, which we will not discuss here. It is introduced to point out that ELDP was not the first attempt to diversify the academic pipeline. ELDP, aimed at a higher administrative level and with seemingly well-qualified fellows with PhDs and scholarship backgrounds, could not address the resistance of the higher education system itself, nor could it respond to the impetus to punish these fellows for their high profiles.

It became clear that the most important aspect of the pipeline problem was not necessarily the paucity of people of color in it, but the resistance of the higher education system to bringing people of color into the pipeline, to nurturing those in entry-level positions, to mentoring for advancement, and to promoting those already in the system to positions of higher power and influence. It is remarkable that no discrimination complaints came out of the fellows program, but as is often the case, ambitious and talented people tend to move on rather than file a complaint that too often results in negotiations that require their exit anyway.

There is little evidence after 12 years since the inception of the ELDP that the CSU has elevated the numbers of people of color into the administrative pipeline. The gatekeepers – the faculty, administrators, and academic senates that make the hiring decisions – have had ample opportunity to change these numbers, but they have not. It is not surprising, since it has long been conventional knowledge to minority faculty that white faculty tend to "reproduce" themselves, meaning that they tend to elevate white scholars with similar track records as their own in the search process.

Making screening committees more open to people of color, particularly those with research interests and preparation different than their own, has not been a priority for campuses and the CO. Thus, over time, even with the occasional inclusion of people of color in search committee, little institutional change has taken place. In part, faculty of color have not raised this

issue in academic senates or the faculty union, although some individuals have broached it in their department hiring committees, often meeting with frustration. It is a high-profile and risky venture for people of color and whites alike. Until diversity and equity becomes a hiring imperative across all campuses, it is doubtful that the pipeline will be diversified. Note that the percent of Latino faculty in the CSU has not improved in the last two decades. The number of tenured Latinos is 442, in the largest higher education system in the country. The percent of CSU Latino faculty is 5.457% of all tenured faculty (http://www.calstate.edu/faculty_staff/demographics.shtml). Thus the pool of people who can rise to executive levels is relatively miniscule.

An interesting phenomenon has occurred in the last 5 years. On many campuses, recent searches have resulted in more "international" faculty being hired than US-born people of color among the faculty ranks, the normal starting place for the executive pipeline. On some campuses, recent hiring of international faculty exceeds the hiring of domestic Latinos. This is consistent with the observation of many people of color that foreign scholars are much more palatable than "domestic" people of color. Internationalizing the campus this way results in a pipeline of no more benefit than before, at least for people of color. Sadly, "domestic" people of color are not seen as partners or equals in the struggle to respond to the huge and dramatic increase of diversity in our student population.

People of color are at a power disadvantage. Race and culture are still a force in higher education – it is conventional wisdom that most Caucasians do not tend to network for or with people of color. The obvious reason is that minorities are not usually in positions of power that would make them valuable as allies. Without these bonds, few whites understand what drives minority activism about diversity and equity. Thus, whites tend to feel uncomfortable with activism. For many people of color, activism is a form of "giving back" to their community. Many feel strongly that their opportunities are a result of the struggles of other people of color and their allies who came before. Since there are still problems, to many it is only reasonable to advocate for social change so that more people of color can access the opportunities that higher education offers.

People of color tend to be defamed for their activism. It is common to vilify them as favoring their own kind when raising issues of underrepresentation, even when they support efforts to address the underrepresentation of other minorities and have long been advocates for the richness of difference. While it is understandable that the impact of advocacy can be threatening to those in authority, even if the intent is not, it is professionally painful to be maligned. In many cases, it has career-breaking implications.

The political tides make advocacy misunderstood. While always controversial, affirmative action advocates have had to deal with the backlash that resulted from Proposition 209, the Prohibition Against Discrimination or Preferential Treatment by State and Other Public Entities, which amended the California Constitution in 1996. Proposition 209 eliminated the state's Affirmative Action Program on the basis of race, color, ethnicity and national origin. It is not surprising that any effort to reach out to the underrepresented is seen as inappropriate and tantamount to breaking the law. Many minority educators have had to explain to others that Proposition 209 does not mean that minorities cannot be hired.

Embedded and denied white privilege influences the decisions to recruit, screen, and hire people of color. White privilege allows one group of people, white men in particular, to enjoy the benefits of social relationships that favor them above others. It grants them an immunity, an advantage unearned but rather bestowed by the virtue of their birthright. Because of white privilege, they are taught to see racism only in individual terms, and are blind to the systematic dominance society confers to their group. It takes an awareness and intention on the part of the privileged to go outside their level of comfort to understand their privilege. It takes vigilance to understand what drives the activism of people of color and how the privileged stifle the activists. Unfortunately there are still too few people alert to the ravages that privilege causes people of color. Those white colleagues who strive to undo the adverse impact of privilege have earned loyalty among faculty of color. These are allies in the struggle to diversify the faculty ranks on campuses. Regrettably, there are still too few who see the many ramifications of their privilege. What is also regrettable in the case of ELDP was that the earliest warning sign of privilege, the positions taken by the Presidents, was not seen as an indicator to reframe the CSU intent. Later as the evidence of privilege – refusal to mentor fellows, for example – mounted, no one tried to reform the program, but instead it was allowed to die because of "budgetary problems."

On reflection, it seems astonishing that those associated with ELDP were naïve about social change, accountability, and institutional intransigency. Why, when all involved were scholars, steeped in the culture of evidence, did no one involved in the program, including the fellows, insisted on a process and outcome assessment? Were they seduced by *hopes*? Only the bad experience has given participants the wisdom in hindsight to see the enormity of the problems. None of the fellows were ever formally asked by the CSU to assess their experience during or after their fellowship. No one asked the ELDP Fellows to write a formal written report on the outcome within

2 months of their return to their home campus, as is the practice in some fellowships.

The CSU ELDP was an effort for the CSU to "grow its own" and only marginally modeled the ACE Fellows Program. It is evident now that the real mentoring offered to ACE Fellows by Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Provosts was missing in the ELDP. Placement in some offices was like detention. The teachers did not want to be there, but someone had to do it, so fellows were given little mentoring and even less access to valuable learning opportunities. Unlike ACE, ELDP did not plan for the expectation that campuses would welcome the fellows back. Perhaps if the CSU had partnered with ACE or others, there could have been a more skilled, experienced perspective on how to do it better, and perhaps more economically.

The CSU can also benefit from reviewing the best practices of other institutional fellowships. If it is to become serious about the goal of sustained investment to diversify the higher education pipeline, it can learn why things go right with fellowships, how to better detect and encourage campus support from every level. There is a growing body of knowledge about the value of diversity, which can inform practice. Informed practice must be the imperative to such politically charged ideas as diversifying the campuses, particularly in light of the perceived and real restrictions of California's Proposition 209.

Of course, there is also the gnawing possibility such change will not come willingly. There is a saying among Mexicans, about how things are done: *por la buena o por la mala*, by the good or by the bad way. One might say that ELDP was a good deed executed in a seemingly uninformed fashion and with an unwillingness to deal with the barriers that rose along the way. It must be noted that neither of the two attempts at providing centralized professional development programs worked for the CSU and that neither of these programs were formally evaluated.

It would serve the CSU well to commission an independent assessment of ELDP and the earlier administrative program and to use the lessons learned, if for no other reason than to address the inevitable. The student population of the CSU has changed dramatically. The CSU is a minority-serving institution. Whites represent 46% of the total student population. Latinos are almost a quarter of it (www.calstate.edu/AS/stat_reports/2003–2004.html). Unless the CSU addresses the diversity of its faculty and executives, the growing diverse student body will thrust it upon the CSU.

Salvaging what they can from the program is what is left to the fellows harmed by the experience. It is widely accepted by the fellows now that those who ultimately viewed the 2 years as a personal and professional sabbatical

gleaned the best outcome from the program. It also did lead to advanced assignments outside of the CSU for those who left. They benefited as individuals and inexplicably the CSU was willing to pay thousands of dollars to "train" them, but let them leave without any effort to recoup the "investment." At least one of the participants did move up within the CSU academic administration. The rest reflect on the individuals who helped them along the way. They made new friends, new allies. They were heartened by their experiences at Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management. A few made the professional decision to stay where they were rather than seek advancement in a system that branded them. These fellows have had to overcome ELDP. For them, intellectual and emotional understanding and acceptance came out of working through the bitterness of dashed hopes.

The ELDP alums ultimately fall back on the activist imperative that drives them. People of color are the majority population in California, yet they are under-represented at every level of higher education. Latinos in particular comprise one third of the population, and in a few years will be the majority population. A sizable part of that emerging majority is already here. They will enter kindergarten in a few years. Every day more babies of color are born. It is more important than ever that people of color in the CSU remain active, smart change agents, so that children of color will be prepared to go to college and become university professors, academic executives – and Chancellor of the CSU.

NOTES

1. Backlash for participating in the program was bitter, and repercussions for writing about the program threaten to be as painful. Thus, with apologies to the fellows, this article is written anonymously and with a prayer that the hunt for the guilty does not injure the innocent.

REFERENCES

California State University. (1993, November). Memorandum. The Executive Leadership Development Program.

The California State University. (Fall, 2002). Profile of CSU Employees, Office of Human Resources. Retrieved 10-24-04 from the World Wide Web: http://www.calstate.edu/faculty_staff/demographics.shtml

The California State University. (Fall, 2003). CSU *Enrollment by Ethnic Group*. Retrieved 10-19-04 from the World Wide Web: www.calstate.edu/AS/stat_reports/2003–2004.html

This page intentionally left blank

FINAL THOUGHTS:
THE CULTIVATION OF PROMISE

David J. León

The previous pages have profiled eight leadership programs. All have a similar mission: to prepare the next generation of higher education leaders. They also share similarities in curriculum, approach, and style. How do they differ? They last for greater or lesser lengths of time, place more or less emphasis on mentoring, and have different core animating ideas, such as Millennium Leadership Initiatives (MLIs) "handing one another along." And in the main, traditional programs examine diversity as part of their curriculum, while the new leaders programs incorporate diversity throughout. Is one model better than another? The answer depends on the beholder.

In the turbulent 1960s and 1970s, minority college students and their white allies demanded changes in higher education. They wanted to see improvements in the curriculum and more minorities as faculty and staff. Rarely did they call for the hiring of a minority president because they realized – and rightly so – that few were qualified to hold these posts. Yet the inequality was still there, and over time leadership programs have shifted focus in response to it.

Moreover, colleges and universities across the country have become far more diverse, although major problems remain. For instance, there is a serious gap in the college completion rates for minorities compared to whites. Most faculty are still white and male, and since most administrators come from the faculty, the pool of eligible minorities for administrative

posts will remain small. At the same time, America's population is changing. By 2050 it is estimated that minorities will comprise half of America's population. Diversity is not an option in this environment.

What does the future hold for leadership programs? In conversation with the program directors I found that all are committed to diversity. Both program models offer preparation and insights for aspirants who wish to move up the administrative ladder. At this point, participants – minorities and whites – have a wide choice of options. They can attend a program, which discusses diversity as a program component or one where diversity pervades the curriculum. I don't see the emphasis of these programs changing in the near future.

I do worry about the racial and ethnic divide among the participants in the various programs. One can view it as a sign of success or a focus of concern. For instance, Harvard's program is largely white despite its best efforts to recruit minorities. Most minority-focused programs do not enroll whites at all, while some do. Do white aspirants not apply to minority-focused programs because they feel these programs aren't useful to them? Conversely, do minority aspirants not apply to traditional programs because they feel the curriculum irrelevant? And do minority-focused programs not believe it important to recruit whites?

Despite these questions, leadership programs are likely to grow in higher education, simply because they offer such valuable preparation for future presidents and administrators. And the programs are probably more valuable for minorities than whites, because minorities are less likely to have the connections and receive the wisdom of prior generations that can set them up for these positions.

The future of higher education depends on many factors, but these leadership programs – traditional and new leaders – may well play a vital role.