Major Accomplishments of the Gleazer Years

- Community college leaders became more committed to the movement and began to coordinate their activities.
- Community colleges flourished and began to promote the importance of lifelong learning.
- AACC began to focus on how colleges could best serve an increasingly diverse student population.
- Acceptance of the council system set the stage for the future AACC.
- Community colleges began to be partners in U.S. higher education.
- The Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges, a system of agreements that enables service members and spouses to easily transfer college credits while deployed, was created.
- Support from W.K. Kellogg Foundation drove AACC’s development.
- The Kellogg Foundation’s support of AACC and of the Kellogg fellowships in universities provided the leadership constituency that built today’s community colleges.
CAREER HIGHLIGHTS

POSITIONS HELD

1958–1981  President and CEO, AACC
1946–1957  President, Graceland College (now Graceland University)
1980–2010  Adjunct professor, Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin

EDUCATION

- EdD, Harvard University
- MA, education, Temple University
- BA, University of California–Los Angeles
- AA, Graceland College

HONORS

- B. Lamar Johnson Leadership Award, League for Innovation in the Community College
- Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (appointed by President Carter)
- Edmund J. Gleazer School of Education, named in honor of Gleazer by Graceland University
- Graceland College Alumni Distinguished Service Award, Graceland College
- Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters, Graceland College
- James F. Nickerson Medal of Merit, Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges
- Leadership Award, AACC
- Lifetime Achievement Award, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida
- National Board of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (appointed by the secretary of the U.S. Department of Education)
- Outstanding Lifetime Contribution to Higher Education Award, American Council on Education
There are thinkers and spokesmen needed in this junior college field as it grows in stature and maturity. We need men and women who not only occupy roles of leadership in junior college activity but who can speak to the nation with reason and competence. I am expressing the hope that busy administrators can somehow find ways to rise to this need.

—Edmund. J. Gleazer, Jr. (1959)

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., began as AACC’s executive director April 1, 1958. His title was changed to president in 1960. The period from 1960 to 1967 saw a boom in growth and development both in junior colleges and in AACC, as was evident in increased participation and support from member colleges as well as individuals: In 1960, new community colleges were opened at the rate of 20 per year; by 1967, that figure was 50 per year. Early into Gleazer’s tenure, it was time to reassess AACC’s role, goals, and objectives.

In August 1959, W.K. Kellogg Foundation made a 5-year financial commitment to help AACC strengthen and expand its professional services. AACC placed a new emphasis on analyzing, summarizing, and distributing the results of research and experimentation and on providing leadership to institutions, state departments of education, and local communities in the planning of community college programs. In the next decade, 500 community colleges were established. Gleazer described the impact on AACC as follows:

“Where can we find a president?” “We have a new community college district and want to open up next fall.” “What legislation can you recommend at the state level for sound community college development?” The questions came from all over the country as community colleges sprouted, seemingly from out of nowhere. Sources of information were few. The Office of Education, manned by two professionals, S. V. Martorana and Grant Morrison, provided some assistance. The Kellogg-funded Junior College Leadership Programs in 10 universities were just getting under way and would in time serve as centers for research and development. Few states had a state-level office for junior colleges. The demands on the association to provide information and assistance were almost overwhelming.
In the face of the need, the Kellogg Foundation made an additional commitment of $337,600 to step up AACC’s information services. AACC added to its staff a public information officer and director of publications. The Junior College Journal, (renamed Community College Journal in 1967), which had been edited at the University of Texas, was brought into AACC’s Washington office.

In his 1961 report to the AACC Board of Directors, Gleazer described the potential for international expansion of AACC’s activities:

There are many evidences now available that the community college concept with its role of democratizing opportunities for education may be most useful (with local adaptation) to many countries abroad. We have had frequent contact with the State Department, Agency for International Development, Peace Corps, and the Institute for International Education as a result. Several conferences led to a meeting with representatives of these agencies in New York. The Institute for International Education is now proposing that [AACC] be associated with it in two projects.

In 1961 and 1962, AACC sent a delegation of technical education experts to the Soviet Union for a coast-to-coast tour of its technical junior colleges. During the same period, an invitation from the government of Kenya led Gleazer, among others, to explore the potential for exporting the community college model to that country. The program also sent 65 Kenyan students to community colleges in California and New York. The world was calling on AACC to share its knowledge of community college education.

**Improving Access to Community Colleges for Minorities and Veterans**

**Malcolm X College**

Before the 1960s, at least 20 major cities (including Denver, St. Louis, Cleveland, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, and Miami) did not have community colleges. Just as in places such as Kenya and the Soviet Union, however, the democratization of education was expanding quickly at home, fueled by new audiences seeking access. The demographics of community college students were changing—the proportion of students who were minority, female, or older than age 21 at enrollment was increasing steadily—and the growth in
enrollment reflected increasing demand from these students. Moreover, “The institution's ability to adapt to the needs of racial minorities in the late sixties gave it sophistication and the confidence needed to serve the more mature students who came increasingly in the seventies [which] also led to greater community involvement” (McLennan, 1982, p. 79). By 1971, 30% of full-time enrolled students were not students of color.

Among the many colleges that came out of this new demand for access, Malcolm X Community College in Chicago, formerly Crane Junior College and Herzl Junior College, offers an object lesson in the role of social unrest in the movement's development (see Box 2-1). In 1968, students closed down a number of the college's facilities to demand that the college more accurately reflect the diversity of its population. To some minority students, the community college appeared to be kowtowing to the White population and its cultural demands, keeping minorities “in their place” and out of universities. Some felt that community colleges pushed minorities into the trades. Remedial courses were akin to rubbing salt into the wounds of racial division because they gave no credit and effectively punished students for the failure of their elementary and secondary schools.

In response to student demands, the college was closed and reopened as Malcolm X Community College. In addition, some remedial classes were discontinued and students moved into college-level classes. Colleges like Malcolm X addressed issues of access by offering comprehensive curricula that provided a choice between vocational and technical training and traditional baccalaureate preparation. Along with the Peralta Colleges and the Los Angeles City Junior Colleges in California and the State University of New York Urban Centers in New York City, Malcolm X was selected by the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, under the auspices of AACC, to demonstrate models for extending community college programs and services to out-of-school youth and adults in poverty areas, models that could be tested by other colleges in other cities.

**Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges**

On April 8, 1969, Gleazer visited Alden Dunham of Carnegie Corporation in New York to discuss AACC programs. A few weeks later, Dunham called Gleazer and expressed his great concern that GIs were not using their educational benefits. He asked whether AACC could do something about the problem. As a result of their conversation, Carnegie gave a grant to AACC to extend and expand services of community colleges to military personnel before and after separation from the services. AACC invited the American
Association of State Colleges and Universities to join in the project, and other organizations soon came on board. In 1972, the effort became Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges, a system of agreements that allow service members and spouses to transfer college credits easily as they make progress toward degrees and certificates while deployed.

2-1 Origins of Malcolm X Community College

Founded in 1911 as Crane Junior College, Malcolm X Community College originally served 32 immigrant students living on Chicago’s West Side. Like most early junior colleges, different forces shaped its mission. Some people saw the need for vocational education to prepare the city’s immigrants and poor for employment. Others, including many academics, joined with the college’s faculty in urging Crane to adopt an abbreviated baccalaureate program.

The academics won, but the victory was short-lived. In 1927, Illinois junior colleges lost their state funding, and by 1930, overcrowded and underfunded, Crane lost its accreditation. In 1933, as the Chicago World’s Fair celebrated “A Century of Progress,” Crane Junior College closed its doors, depriving the city’s most needy citizens of education and training.

Clarence Darrow led the fight to save educational opportunity for working people. The city relented, and Crane was reopened as Herzl Junior College, a name that reflected the European immigrant population now enrolled in its classes. Along with Herzl, the city opened two additional campuses: Wilson and Wright. The three branches offered a pre-baccalaureate curriculum built on general education survey courses taught in huge lecture halls to hundreds of students at a time. This approach reflected the premise that there was a common core of knowledge that all educated people should share.

After World War II, Chicago’s city colleges faced immense overcrowding from the effects of the GI Bill combined with increased migration of Blacks from the South. This time, the colleges responded to the needs of their populations by offering “TV College,” underwritten by the Ford Foundation. Satellite campuses were created in offices and high schools throughout Chicago’s diverse neighborhoods to bring pre-baccalaureate education to the masses.

Sources: Edmund J. Gleazer and Dale Campbell, professor, University of Florida—personal communications (2004); see also City Colleges of Chicago (2010).
FOCUSING ON ASSESSMENT AND REDIRECTION

By 1970, the 50th anniversary of AACC, approximately 500 new community colleges had opened, and several important issues had emerged in terms of the directions that colleges were taking. Under Gleazer’s leadership, a review of AACC’s role and its effectiveness in meeting the needs of its members and their students and communities began (see Box 2-3). An audit to examine those issues became an important project in AACC’s history.

Gleazer brought intensive reflection and a broad scope to the project. He concluded that it seemed appropriate to approach the Kellogg Foundation for support, because the foundation had invested heavily in the work of AACC and its members during prior years. AACC had undergone a 10-year development program in which the foundation had played a large part, so it occurred to Gleazer that the foundation would be interested in taking a closer look at AACC’s present and future.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded a $250,000 grant for a project to study trends and consequent implications of the objectives, functions, organization, and administration of AACC. Dubbed “Project Focus,” the study was undertaken by a team of educational leaders including Gleazer; David S. Bushnell, former director of comprehensive and vocational education research for the U.S. Office of Education; and Francis C. Pray of Frantzreb and Pray Associates, the educational consulting firm engaged to do the audit leading to Project Focus. The study had a twofold purpose:

- To examine the long-range goals and present practices of the community and junior colleges and, in the process, to identify the social and economic trends which would influence their future role and functions for the coming decade.
- To study AACC in terms of stated functions and long-range goals to ensure its continued relevance to the needs of its constituents.

Project Focus was undertaken as a “forecast study” intended not to evaluate or examine institutions but to study five specific areas:

- Changes in the student population served.
- Changes in how students are served (e.g., programs, supportive services, instruction).
- Changes in organization and governance.
- Shifts in financial support.
- Changes in community relations.
Nearly 100 community and junior colleges were randomly sampled, and 30 of those were visited by team members. Gleazer related that he spent several days in each of 25 institutions in 20 states, interviewing legislators, state officials, faculty members, students, administrators, board members, and citizens. In addition, each institution completed a self-study.

A report was submitted to AACC in 1971, and the findings were published in book form as *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges* (Gleazer, 1973). The book adds a significant dimension to the study’s raw data by extrapolating bits and pieces of dialogue from respondents, students, administrators, and legislators to show where the colleges were in 1970 and where they might need to go. Gleazer let achievements speak for themselves and applauded institutions that were poised on the brink of change for the ability to be self-critical.

Student diversity and, eventually, faculty, staff, and administrative diversity were the most compelling issues explored in Project Focus. Student populations in the 1960s reflected a dichotomy between the community college students who couldn’t go elsewhere and the “cream of the crop” that chose community colleges because they offered smaller class sizes and more personal treatment at a lower cost than did most universities. The phenomenon of “reverse transfer” brought North Carolina a 15% rate of in-state transfer from 4-year to 2-year colleges in 1970; in Washington state, the rate was 23%.

This diversity of academic preparation among students was compounded by increases in adult students resuming their education at community colleges. Such diversity led to conflicting expectations among college faculty and staff and highlighted the disparity in academic preparation in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools. Perceptions of minority and other disadvantaged students as “uneducable” was believed to have caused the defeat of a tax rate increase in one large midwestern city during this time.

How could such diversity be served? The answer seemed to lie in focusing more on community than on institutions. As the 1960s drew to a close, college structures, both physical and philosophical, reflected an increasing need for flexibility. The earlier focus on prebaccalaureate programs resulted in institutions that were seen as too beholden to universities and too bound by regulation to be responsive to the changing needs of their students. A community focus, the thinking went, would counterbalance the reliance on these closed systems—higher education, state regulation, leadership that perpetuated the status quo—and bring faculty, staff, and students into dialogue about how to improve the services provided by the institution.

The increasing diversity among student populations highlighted the need for diversity among faculty, staff, and administrators. The outcomes of Project
Focus revealed that, in 1970, only 5% of faculty were people of color (Gleazer, 1973) and that they were largely middle class. Colleges were not doing enough to support representative members of minority cultures.

### 2-2 **Nine Questions Gleazer Posed About the Direction AACC Should Take in the 1970s**

1. What should be the association’s relationship be to state offices of community college education, state and regional associations of junior colleges, and universities involved in personnel development and junior college research?

2. To what degree should the association serve the interests of various constituency groups in member institutions, such as business management, the faculty, community services areas, development and public relations officers, and governing boards?

3. What, if any, should be the role of the association in recruitment and placement of college personnel?

4. By what means can the association best serve members with different needs—those of public colleges, private institutions, institutions with terminal programs, and perhaps, in the future, proprietary colleges?

5. We have more or less successfully projected the image of the community college as that of an institution that means many things to many people. Currently, many national experts refer to these colleges as being the best avenues for serving minorities and other disadvantaged groups. Are these images that we really want to perpetuate?

6. The association is currently a highly centralized organization in terms of staffing. Should we continue to maintain that kind of situation? Or should we be looking ahead in terms of field offices and special centers for various activities?

7. Our board of directors has traditionally been made up of college presidents. Should it be expanded to include others in the junior college and, beyond that, citizens not directly tied to the institutions?

8. What purposes do our annual conventions serve? Are they worth the time, money, and energy spent? Are there other, more effective ways of serving the purposes that these annual meetings are presumed to serve?

9. What are the implications of decisions in these and other areas for the structure of AACC, even its name, its financing, and its administration?
OPENING THE ASSOCIATION TO GREATER DIVERSITY

The end of the 1960s was indeed a time of profound change for American culture. The 1968 Democratic convention had brought social unrest to the eyes of the nation and capitalized on the extreme reactions to young peoples’ demands. Civil rights, the Vietnam War, the Stonewall riots, and the women’s movement were the threads of a new American identity. When AACC held its 1969 convention in Atlanta, Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes and Ralph Nader were speakers, and then-Senator Walter F. Mondale spoke at a federal affairs luncheon, calling the higher education community “the most powerful institution for social reform—untapped—in the nation” (cited in American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969). According to Gleazer, the 1969 convention program was centered on the real and inescapable issues in higher education and society: student protest, faculty concern for greater involvement in college affairs, needs of disadvantaged minority groups, and the general unrest that pervaded many college campuses. In one forum, Norvel Smith, president of Merritt Community College, asked whether the community college could change to meet the changes in society. When an all-White choir sang “Dixie” at the opening session, Charles G. Hurst, president of Malcolm X College, walked out (Gleazer, 2005). (See also Smith, 1969, and Stokes, 1969, for transcripts of convention addresses.)

Typically, prior to AACC’s annual meeting, a nominating committee was convened by the board chair to supply one nominee for each vacancy; the vote was taken by show of hands. This procedure changed at AACC’s 50th anniversary meeting in Honolulu in 1970. Gleazer (2005) recalled during the annual business meeting, when the nominating committee had placed before the members the name of Joe B. Rushing as its nominee for Southern region director, the chair recognized Charles G. Hurst. Hurst read a prepared statement that addressed the need for AACC to become relevant and responsive to the needs of all members of its constituency, without regard for race, creed, or color. The statement encouraged AACC to enlarge the board of directors by three members to permit selection of minority personnel.

What followed was a tit-for-tat announcement of slated nominees followed by minority nominations from the floor. Hurst nominated Lonnie Horton, president of Kittrell College in North Carolina, to oppose Rushing. A paper ballot was distributed, and Rushing was elected. The committee nominated William Steward for Northwestern region director; the floor nominated William Moore, president of Seattle Community College. Voting by ballot elected Steward. For the position of representative-at-large, the committee
nominated Wesley Westerberg, president of Kendall College. On behalf of the minority caucus, Abel Sykes nominated Hurst. Once again, ballots were cast, but this time the minority caucus had its first victory. Hurst, perhaps the most radical of the nominees put forth, became the first person elected to the board from the floor as well as the first Black person to serve. Hurst was an early and vociferous advocate of diversity and a supporter of the idea that more women should advance in administration (Gleazer, 2005).

The change in procedure and board composition was profound, and it began to address the struggle for diversity that had been at the core of AACC’s work, even as its policies and procedures kept the board something of an “in-group.” The directors proposed changes to AACC’s constitution, which were adopted at the 1972 business meeting, that increased the board from 12 to 15 members. Minority caucuses began to work in earnest for greater representation not only on the board but also in the business of AACC at large. Writing in the *Junior College Journal*, William G. Shannon, former executive director of the National School Boards Association, made the following observation:

> Even a casual observer at the 1971 convention could sense the insistence of a growing number of groups for a more important involvement in [AACC] . . . representatives of minority groups with large populations such as Black, Chicano, and Native American, to mention a few self-identifying groups, proposed that provisions be made for their fuller participation in the governance and affairs of the Association. (Shannon, 1971, p. 5)

This struggle for diversity was aligned with Gleazer’s work on Project Focus. Gleazer’s reports on Project Focus indicated that events on the floor of the conventions in Hawaii (1970) and Washington (1971) supported the belief of many association members that the board of directors should be responsive to more than just the institutional members; a substantial number of respondents were critical of the board for its apparent insularity. The result was expansion of the board to 30 members in addition to the president and the moderator of the assembly *ex officio*. After 2 years of floor nominations pitting minority representatives against the committee’s nominees, voting was changed to mailed ballots to achieve a process that would be less influenced by the activities of interest groups and ensure greater involvement by the total membership. Member participation subsequently more than doubled. (The most comprehensive source for Project Focus is Gleazer, 1973; see also Gleazer, 1971a and 1971b for interim reports.)
Chapter 2: Laying the Foundation, Articulating the Vision

### Promoting Lifelong Learning as Process and Product

According to Gleazer, between 1973 and 1976, lifelong learning became the focal point of community colleges as full-time enrollments dropped, the number of part-time students increased, and an environment of “fiscal austerity” became the norm. Anti-inflation and tax initiatives, such as California's Proposition 13, tightened the belt for community colleges, for which income was principally based on property taxes. All the entities that survived on property tax–based funding experienced severe restrictions. According to Gleazer, “Everyone wanted to drink from the same state tax waterhole.”

As community colleges went to their legislatures seeking billions of dollars in funding, many funding sources began to question the role of the colleges. More and more, the need that the colleges could best meet seemed to be job and career training. Unfortunately, essential stakeholders were slow to embrace this reality. AACC’s assembly did not understand the need to shift focus, and the supporting government and financial structures did not facilitate the evolution of community colleges to address those changes.

What Gleazer saw was an apparent misunderstanding of the community college mission. If the colleges’ audiences had changed, then it was necessary for the mission to keep pace. Even though Gleazer was considering retiring, he felt that the community college mission needed attention. The Kellogg Foundation agreed, and it provided funding for Gleazer to spend 3 years conducting interviews with community college leaders in five states, including administrators, faculty, and board members (see Box 2-3). The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>Gleazer on the Need for Community Colleges to Embrace Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“As educators we have given our attention to patching the roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of our structures, to more efficient heating and cooling, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improving the communication system, while developments outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>our walls are washing away at the footings. The basic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexorable, unmistakable fact and force to deal with is that of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change … Any time we can describe the community college in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitive, specific terms, we will destroy it. It has to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change. It has to be different in different areas. You need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep moving as a community college norm. We need to look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people but we tend to look at the institution. We should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>try to push the river in a different direction.” (Gleazer, 1980, pp. 2, 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resulting data affirmed his belief that the issues confronting the community college sector included the community college mission, the extent of community college influence on lifelong learning and community development, and the future direction of the association.

The foundation was interested and supported efforts to identify the existing problems as well as to develop policies that seemed to contribute to lifelong learning. These problems included the misperception that community colleges were primarily remedial institutions, the belief that they were to provide only undergraduate programs and not occupational programs, and the perception that community colleges were simply an extension of high school and were less academic than their 4-year equivalents. Gleazer’s book, *The Community College: Values, Vision, and Vitality* (1980), was a product of that project.

The data Gleazer gathered in his interviews revealed issues related to purpose, leadership, and administration that pointed to the next wave of community college development. Community was still an underdeveloped element in the sector’s maturity. Gleazer suggested that if the term community college were to continue to be appropriate, then the program emphasis had to be on “community” rather than “college.”

Especially in a time of stringent economics, Gleazer’s data suggested that community colleges must be more flexible, to both adjust to and shape the needs of the community. The term community was, for Gleazer, the “nexus” of the college’s role “through its vertical connections in the educational hierarchy and its horizontal relationships with other community agencies” (Gleazer, 1980, p. 11). He cited one example in 1980 that has continued pertinence today: the decline in achievement levels of secondary students, a problem that could be addressed through collaborative efforts before such students enter college needing remediation.

**Leading Change**

What makes *Values, Vision, and Vitality* so remarkable in a contemporary reading is its relentless focus on change and change management. Gleazer recognized that if community colleges were going to thrive in an ever-changing world that had swung from the early glory days of high enrollments through shifts in demographics, then they would have to embrace change. That observation remains true today.

Gleazer questioned whether the community college model had changed enough in the preceding 30 years to continue to serve as the nexus for lifelong learning...
learning through community as process and product. In other words, was the community actively and perpetually involved in the educational opportunities provided by the community college and the community itself? And, as products of the community, had community members become professionals in occupational areas, graduated, or gone on to further education? Had literacy increased? Had poverty decreased? Were life spans equitable among America’s diverse populations? Did communities thrive with education for all, regardless of abilities and goals? Gleazer believed the answers to these and countless other questions about pressing issues required leaders who were capable of rethinking the community college model. Quoting author Myron Marty, Gleazer suggested that the approach to addressing those issues lay in rethinking the role of community colleges in community education and in the community itself:

Think of the salutary effects . . . if faculty members were encouraged to do what their work compels them to do: to write, to paint, to act, to play. . . . Periodically, administrators can provide teachers with opportunities for . . . “creative disengagements” from part of their college assignments . . . to devote time and energy to such things as local historical societies, museums, or community artists’ and writers’ groups. . . . Who is better poised to work with community groups—from the curious to the incarcerated to the aged—than faculty members in community colleges? . . . surely a desirable alternative to the cynical detachment that eventually leads faculty members to become realtors, antique dealers, or fast-food franchisers in their moonlight hours.” (cited in Gleazer, 1980, pp. 170–171)

Such a community is the responsibility of all members of the college leadership, including faculty, staff, presidents, and trustees. Leadership is the process of taking ownership. Faculty and staff must take ownership of their institutions by assuming leadership roles within the institution as well as in the community at large. They must continue to assess the communities their colleges serve. New paradigms of planning must be paired with new paradigms of incentive and reward. If a college links its success—enrollments, service, fiscal responsibility, stewardship—to rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic, then communities will be better served. Such assessment and planning must involve the entire institutional organism and organization; otherwise, members will be disenfranchised and distanced from the decisions that determine their destinies.
Community college presidents must ensure this level of commitment or suffer the consequences. The president who micromanages, whether from a distrust of staff members or an inability to develop them, is unable to “creatively disengage” from routine and to meet change head-on by seeking it out in the community among constituents. If Byron McClenney, project director at the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas–Austin, is correct that there is no such thing as status quo in colleges—that is, they are either developing or deteriorating—then presidents are charged with facilitating that continual development. Trustees also “could benefit from similar provisions: a committee on change to provide a context and occasion to review college policies and programs in light of developments in the community and beyond . . . to ward off the enervating tendencies toward routine and detail” (Gleazer, 1980, p. 174). The board of trustees that understands its charge as anticipating how the college can better serve the community would surely improve relationships and guarantee better service for all.

Gleazer called for the kind of new thinking that shaped late 20th-century organizational leadership theory and practice. He understood that community colleges evolved out of a system of higher education that had divergent goals: university-level education for the elite and vocational training for the masses. Community colleges with a core curriculum of great ideas and specialized courses could prepare students for either work or upper-level university study. Those goals came from a changing culture affected by global events such as world war, social strife, and revolution.

Gleazer suggested that change is dependent on leadership that integrates all sectors of the college community and that leaders must shape community colleges into more responsive organizations. Elements of systems thinking and change theory are valuable in contextualizing Gleazer’s work on values in the 21st century. New thinking about change and about organizations as systems sheds light on the apparent disconnect between what Gleazer learned during his college interviews and the community college sector’s rate of adaptation to both external and internal forces.

The community college’s role has been constrained by preconceived notions about who can learn and what they should learn; the role of remediation; the debate about teaching versus learning; the university model, with its relentless focus on postsecondary students; and policies that failed to keep up with or anticipate changes in culture and demographics. Gleazer’s research indicated a need to move away from university-based structures such as institutional campuses, academic transfer programs, 16-week semesters, credit hours, and designations such as full-time and part-time. The realities of
the sector and its organizational structures, policies, and legislatures resulted in recognition and reward for the same structures that limit the ability of community colleges to nimbly anticipate and address the needs of their constituents.

CONCLUSION

Gleazer’s leadership of AACC is one marked by significant growth of community colleges; the strengthening of the association and of community college leadership assisted in great part by the financial support provided by W.K. Kellogg Foundation; response to the societal pressures of the civil rights, anti-war, and women’s movements; and an increasing interest of leaders in other countries in America’s community colleges. His insights helped to define the colleges as important community centers, and his leadership abilities held the association together during turbulent times until it emerged as a significant force that helped to shape American higher education.

After retirement, Gleazer continued to contribute as an adjunct professor in the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas at Austin. Gleazer pursued an interest in adult and global education through work with the International Council for Adult Education and the Coalition of Adult Education Organizations. As a board member of the council, he participated in activities in India, France, Finland, Sweden, Iraq, Trinidad, Costa Rica, Brazil, Argentina, Zimbabwe, Thailand, Canada, Russia, and Egypt. He also served on President Carter’s Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies and on the board of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. In 1992, AACC recognized Gleazer with its Leadership Award.