

**NC STATE**

College of Education  
Belk Center for Community College  
Leadership and Research

**College Transfer 2.0:**  
The Case for Reengineering the  
Transfer Ecosystem to Restore  
Opportunity to America's Higher  
Education System

Sanford C. "Sandy" Shugart, Ph.D.  
President  
Valencia College

2019 Dallas Herring Lecture  
December 3, 2019

**2019  
DALLAS HERRING LECTURE**

Dear Colleagues,

We are pleased to share with you the full transcript of the 2019 Dallas Herring Lecture, delivered by Dr. Sanford C. "Sandy" Shugart, who has served as the fourth president of Valencia College in greater Orlando, Florida, since 2000. He delivered his lecture at NC State's Talley Student Union on Tuesday, December 3, 2019. The 2019 lecture also marked the opening of a new space for the NC State College of Education's Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research.

As you will see in his lecture, Dr. Shugart sparks a sense of urgency for college educators across community colleges and four-year institutions to place a greater emphasis on transfer success and calls for "dramatic improvements in the transfer ecosystem." Dr. Shugart described six steps for leaders across the transfer pipeline to drive reform:

1. Develop an end to end design from community colleges to universities
2. Change the value proposition to the student
3. Examine retention and application of credit
4. Value the associate's degree
5. Identify and address financial barriers to transfer success
6. Understand transfer as a career pathway

In the coming years, through the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research, we will address critical issues of transfer. The center's research team, graduate faculty, and doctoral students will jointly explore and propose solutions to problems of practice relating to transfer pathways. This research will inform North Carolina community college leaders' taking up Dr. Shugart's call to prioritize transfer success.

Our work in this area exemplifies the NC State College of Education's mission to solve pressing educational problems and improve the educational outcomes of all learners. With over two-thirds of faculty engaged in sponsored research endeavors, we are leveraging over \$91 million in grants to transform the practice of teaching, learning, and leading across North Carolina, the nation, and the world. The Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research will expand the NC State College of Education's reach through enhancing our preparation of outstanding community college leaders and strengthening our support of community colleges.

Cordially,



Mary Ann Danowitz, D.Ed.  
Dean  
NC State College of Education



Audrey Jaeger, Ph.D.  
Alumni Distinguished Graduate Professor  
Executive Director, Belk Center



## About Sandy Shugart



Sanford C. "Sandy" Shugart, Ph.D., has served since 2000 as the fourth president of Valencia College in greater Orlando, Florida. As the winner of the first Aspen Prize for Excellence, Valencia College is one of the most celebrated community colleges in the United States. Serving nearly 70,000 students per year, the college is known for high rates of graduation as well as transfer and job placement; and has become something of a national laboratory for best practices in learning-centered education.

Prior to Valencia College, Shugart served as president of North Harris College. He began his career in community colleges in North Carolina as a vice president in the Department of Community Colleges from 1983 to 1990 when he was mentored and counseled by many of the early founders of the North Carolina Community College System. Among them was the famed Dr. Dallas Herring, the chair of the State Board of Education when the system was created and a chief spokesperson for the mission and vision of community colleges in their early years.

"Little did I ever suspect that I would have the honor of speaking in Dr. Herring's name to the mission of colleges he helped create more than 50 years ago," Dr. Shugart said as he opened his 2019 Dallas Herring Lecture. "I chose the topic of 'redesigning the transfer ecosystem' because I knew that this is exactly where Dr. Herring's attention would be if he were alive today. No one was more passionate about making real the promise of opportunity for all through further education.

"Today, this promise is hanging by a thread and the most promising way to strengthen it is through effective transfer. It is a matter of economic importance, as we seek to grow talent. Even more, it is a matter of justice, as we seek to include those who have been sidelined by the evolution of selective higher education. Dallas Herring would be the first to speak into this challenge."

## **The 2019 Dallas Herring Lecture: College Transfer 2.0: The Case for Reengineering the Transfer Ecosystem to Restore Opportunity to America's Higher Education System**

Transfer of academic credit from community colleges to universities has been a part of the American higher education system since the founding of the first junior colleges in the early 20th century. Originally conceived as a mechanism for expanding access to students of academic promise to elite institutions such as the University of Chicago, the model was a central design principle of two-year colleges during the great building boom of these open-door institutions throughout the post-war years and their massive expansion during the 1960s and 1970s. The development of the Associate of Arts degree, articulation of programs across institutions, statewide common course numbering systems, and other mechanisms of “portability of credit” have been a uniquely American contribution to the evolution of higher education. So why is this system in need of redesign?

### **Scale**

As the needs of society have changed and program mixes across higher education systems evolved to meet these changing demands, transfer as a feature of the systems and of American college students' experience has grown remarkably in scale and importance, as have community colleges generally in the higher education ecosystem.

The place of the college transfer program within the community college varies somewhat from state to state, largely an artifact of the early history of each state's two-year college system. In some states, such as California and Texas, the development of the junior college was primarily a way of massifying participation in traditional college learning experiences where resources and geography mitigated against the addition of scores of new public four-year colleges and universities. In other states, the predominant focus in the creation of these systems was workforce development. Systems in North and South Carolina, for example, evolved from efforts in the mid-twentieth century to create skilled workforces to support economic strategies aimed at growing the industrial economies, both by recruitment of manufacturers and suppliers from other states and countries and expanding existing industries in the state. The credentials they offered—Associate of Applied Arts, vocational diplomas, and certificates—reflected these applied programming priorities. But over the years, these systems have evolved in ways that converge on the comprehensive missions we see today.

Both workforce and academic programming play a major role in virtually every system, though the mix varies from college to college. With the near disappearance of private junior colleges, there are virtually no two-year colleges left that don't offer a substantial mix of occupational and applied credentials. Similarly, there are virtually no “industrial education centers” or pure “technical institutes” (at least public ones) left, and those that

remain or community colleges that arose from such origins, all offer one or more avenues for transfer of credit to institutions offering the bachelor's degree. The "college transfer curriculum" and "articulation" are primary features of nearly every one of the 1,100 community colleges in the U.S. Community colleges now enroll some 41% of American undergraduates.

Most significantly, 45% of all bachelor's degrees are awarded to students who transferred credits from community colleges, up from just 16% in 1994 (NSCRC, 2012; Phillips, 2000). College transfer has grown into the dominant mode of access to higher education, not just an alternate mode, with more students beginning their education in community colleges than in independent colleges, public universities, or proprietary schools. Clearly, college transfer is an enormous and important feature of undergraduate education in America.

## Challenges in Higher Education

Now, the effectiveness and impact of college transfer programs is more important than ever. The reasons for this are several. As is widely reported and discussed, the cost of higher education, especially the cost of a traditional bachelor's degree, has become a serious source of criticism of the industry and a serious barrier, both real and perceived, for potential students. The issue needn't be revisited in detail here, but it is sufficient to say that any mechanism that can promise to reduce the cost of earning a degree is worth close attention.

Similarly, the extraordinary run-up in student debt that coincided with annual price increases that doubled the rate of inflation annually for nearly 30 years has placed a premium on ways to mitigate the cost to families of earning marketable credentials, and most especially for the middle and lower quintiles in income. The debt issue is a problem for those graduating with degrees who may be unlikely to lead to timely repayment. It is even more of an issue for the many that fail to complete a degree and are still carrying significant repayment obligations on student loans, defaulting on which may make



“As the needs of society have changed and program mixes across higher education systems evolved to meet these changing demands, transfer as a feature of the systems and of American college students’ experience has grown remarkably in scale and importance.”



“The effectiveness and impact of college transfer programs is more important than ever.”

any further education impossible. There are many thousands of these “refugees” from higher education left with no hope of achieving their dreams.

These challenges have emerged at precisely the time our systems are being called on to provide a new stream of talent to rapidly changing economies and jobs in the face of generational shortages, and with skills that are higher and have a shorter half-life than ever before. The technologists and professionals required by a thriving society will have to come from a more effective and productive higher education system, preparing a population heavily based on “first generation” students to meet these needs with many more of them earning credentials of market value, including certifications, applied associate’s degrees, and bachelor’s degrees.

It is important not to underestimate the continuing value of the bachelor’s degree, especially as durable occupations upskill. In a recent report, researchers noted, “As the workforce has upskilled, the likelihood of having a good job has favored workers with a bachelor’s degree or higher. Among whites, blacks, and Latinos, workers with more education fared better than those with less education. At the same time, the gaps in good jobs by race and ethnicity have generally persisted at every level of education” (Carnevale, et al, 2019). For emphasis, they go on to state, “The history of racial injustice in the United States has combined with structural economic change favoring highly educated workers to amplify the advantages held by white workers over black and Latino workers.”

This is a strong charge, and not to be ignored, especially in light of the growing economic divide in our society, generally, and the recognition that college admissions may not be nearly the level playing field it once claimed to be.

Put simply, the higher education system and the economy with which it is intertwined has failed to deliver the kind of social and economic opportunity and mobility it has long promised, especially to the bottom quintiles of earners and to people of color who are overrepresented in these strata (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013). Delivering real opportunity and rebuilding the middle class may be the most important challenges facing higher education, and, as I will argue, dramatic improvements in the transfer ecosystem will be required, indeed may be the only way, to meet these challenges.

This view is based on the remarkable diversity—economic, ethnic, racial, linguistic, social—represented in the community college student population. Not only do community

colleges enroll 41% of all undergraduates, they enroll 56% of Native Americans, 57% of Hispanics, and 52% of African Americans pursuing undergraduate studies (AACC, 2014). This pattern is growing. Since 1995, more than 80% of new white undergraduate enrollments have gone to the 468 most selective colleges, while community colleges have enrolled 72% of new Hispanic students and 68% of new African American students (Carnevale and Strohl, 2013).

And what of low-income students? Very recent analysis from an issue brief released by the American Council on Education paints a dramatic picture (ACE, 2019). Between the years 2000 and 2015, the share of undergraduates from low-income families (those earning less than 150% of the poverty threshold) grew from 26.7% to 43.1%. These numbers increase markedly among underrepresented students, with nearly 60% of black students being low-income compared to 33% of white students. As described earlier, the ethnic and racial distribution is much more minority focused in community colleges. Low-income students are also much more heavily served in these inexpensive and open-access institutions.

## Underperforming System

Surely a model that greatly reduces cost and debt, and that can bring remarkable diversity into higher education, and the opportunity for economic and social mobility it should be able to promise, should be an important part of the solution to the challenges higher education is facing. And the good news is that the students agree. Among this amazingly diverse class of new students at community colleges, more than 80% say they desire to transfer and earn a bachelor's degree. Unfortunately, only 15% will do so within six years.

“Delivering real opportunity and rebuilding the middle class may be the most important challenges facing higher education...”

The question of graduation rates through transfer compared to native students is complex and many studies have documented rather different rates. Compared to native students, studies have found no disparity (Rouse, 1995), a 21.6% disparity (Reynolds & Desjardins, 2009), or a 30% disparity (Alfonso, 2006). Monaghan and Attewell (2014) found that 25% of community college entrants had earned a bachelor's degree within six years, compared to some 46% of four-year college entrants. This does not mean that all students should begin in a four-year college, however, as models such as propensity score matching suggest that these same students might not have performed much better had they done so. These are not the same students.

In this same study, perhaps the most comprehensive approach to these questions, Monaghan and Attewell found that when propensity score matched, the community college entrants in comparison to four-year college entrants were no different in final



“Surely a model that greatly reduces cost and debt... should be an important part of the solution to the challenges higher education is facing.”

cumulative GPA, and were 5.5 percentage points more likely to enroll in remedial language courses, 19.2 percentage points more likely to enroll in remedial mathematics, 10.47 percentage points more likely to stop out within six years, 9 percentage points more likely to drop out by spring of year three, and much more likely to be working and to work longer hours. They found that only 42% of BA seeking students actually transfer within six years (while 13% of non-BA seeking students have transferred). Most strikingly, only 60% of the community college students who earned 60 credits at a community college have transferred within six years, leading them to comment, “Evidently, many relatively academically successful community college students fail to transfer to a four-year college.”

## The Need to Redesign

Here is the reason to redesign the transfer ecosystem:

Within the existing model are the students who have chosen a more affordable pathway, one that reduces the need for debt, and one that can provide the education and credential they require for economic and social mobility, but relatively few will achieve this goal in the system as designed.

If the oft quoted principle, “Every system is perfectly designed to achieve the results it routinely gets” is true, then we have a system redesign issue. In fact, competing theories don’t hold up to this conclusion. The most traditional formulation is that these students “aren’t college material.” But clearly, many are succeeding in college, but failing to successfully transfer and graduate. A second argument is that the problem lies with poor quality in the community colleges. How is it then that 45% of all bachelor’s degrees come from students who began at a community college? And propensity score matching suggests that the transfer students succeed at rates very similar to students like them who began at four-year colleges. No, the most promising course of action is to review a system that has changed only marginally in 50 years, a system that is in some ways held hostage to the self-interests and biases of siloed institutions, and a system that, if tuned properly, could yield hundreds of thousands of degree earners without major new infrastructure investments.

## Design Principles

Both recent research and examples of evidence-informed practice suggest a number of powerful design principles to be incorporated in the redesign of transfer ecosystems that could yield dramatic improvements in the outcomes of vertical transfer for students,



“Only 60%  
of the community college  
students who earned 60 credits  
at a community college have  
transferred within six years...”

institutions, the economy, and society. While some of these might suggest policy changes at the state and local levels, most will be best applied to the natural ecosystems at the regional level, involving partnering institutions.

### **1. End to End Design.**

At most institutions, both sending and receiving, transfer is generally treated as a transaction, beginning with an application for transfer and ending with the successful registration of the transfer student. Simply redesigning the transaction won't address the problem. Transfer begins with the discernment and declaration of a transfer goal early in the student's experience with the community college and culminates only in the successful graduation from the receiving university. The entire pathway must be considered in design. Alignment of curriculum pathways, frequent audit of the student's progress with interventions for any “off-plan diversions,” co-curricular preparation for the transition, thoughtful induction of the transfer student into the life of the receiving institution, attention to the transfer shock phenomenon, and regular measurement of the effectiveness of the system are all required.

This kind of attention to transfer as an end to end process will, in turn, require a different organizational structure and focus. Busy enrollment management staff are unlikely to be able to give this kind of attention to transfer. In most cases, the vast majority of transfers matriculate to a relatively small number of very local universities. Creating a “super-structured organization” from the staffs of the participating institutions—a consortium with real staff and tools, a clear agenda, goals, and accountability to the highest levels of academic administration—is warranted. This is the kind of organizational attention contemplated in the recently published “Transfer Playbook: Essential Practices for Two- and Four-Year Colleges,” published by the Aspen Institute (Wyner, et al, 2019). When transfer success finds its way into the strategic goals and organizational structure of the partnering institutions, real progress can be made.

### **2. Change the Value Proposition to the Student.**

In most cases, the value proposition, the promise, to the student goes something like this: “If you can't attend the university for some reason, try the community college. If you are successful, much of the credit may transfer somewhere and you

may someday earn a bachelor's degree somewhere." While accurate, this promise is no value proposition at all. Students are investing their most valuable asset—their time—in an education, and they need a promise that works for them. The key words are, "for them." In some states, the promise is that they may transfer their credits to at least one of the universities in the system—not much value to a place-bound, working, parenting community college student. Again, the local ecosystem is in a position to fashion a meaningful promise to local students, but they must do it together.

In central Florida, this promise is called "Direct Connect to UCF." It offers a guarantee of admission to any AA graduate of the local, participating colleges. There are no further conditions. Since implementation in 2005, more than 50,000 transfers to the University of Central Florida from local colleges have earned bachelor's degrees. The partnership involves many other elements, but without the guarantee, the value proposition, all the other efforts would yield, at best, only incremental improvements in outcomes.

### **3. Retention and Application of Credit.**

Evidence suggests the single most powerful inhibitor to transfer student success is loss of credit. This can be the complete failure to apply credit to a degree or application of credits where they do not move the student closer to a credential (elective credit or excess credit). Monaghan and Attewell (2014) found that students who have most or all of their credits applied to a degree pathway have more than two-and-a-half times greater likelihood of graduation than those who have less than half their credits effectively transferred. Further, students who have between half and 89% of their credits transferred have nearly 75% higher odds of graduating. However, their study found that only 58% of students were able to apply 90% or more of their credit after transferring and 14% of transfers had fewer than 10% of their credits accepted, essentially beginning their program from scratch.

In a similar study, Doyle (2006) found that transfer of credit powerfully affected graduation rates. Some 82% of students able to transfer all of their credits graduated within six years compared to only 42% who were unable to use all credits.



“This kind of attention to transfer as an end to end process will, in turn, require a different organizational structure and focus.”

Loss of credit has many causes, ranging from late changes of major to “curriculum creep” to outright bias. The solution is to be found best by close design of curriculum pathways for transferring students, assertive advising with tools to keep students on track, effective measurement of credit loss and excess credits with their effects on time to graduation, and centralization of resolution of credit transfer issues.

There may be a role for policy making at the state level here. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board created “field of study” advising tools to guide students through a 42-credit hour core by major that must be accepted as a block by public universities, but they still report that only 41% of their transfers complete the core prior to transferring. More recently, the Texas legislature passed legislation (Senate Bill 25) requiring universities to develop recommended pathways for transfers to all their majors and requiring the universities to report any non-transferable credits to both the legislature and the Coordinating Board by March 1 of each year.

Perhaps a better approach would be for states that have performance funding models for their universities and community colleges to, first, assure that their formulas don’t impede access through transfer (measuring time to graduation in ways that ignore the necessity of part-time enrollment for many transfers, for example); and, second, to develop thoughtful incentives for institutions to collaborate on improving transfer access and success. It is important to focus on both—access and success—to avoid perverse incentives to exclude transfer students to improve outcomes. Systems with strong state governance routinely regulate enrollment planning at constituent institutions; why not set goals for enrollment of transfers and their success for each institution in the system? This could even be a collaboration between the state board overseeing universities and the state board overseeing community colleges—a specific, shared, measurable strategic goal to increase economic opportunity by making transfer more effective.

“Students are investing their most valuable asset—their time—in an education, and they need a promise that works for them.”

#### 4. Valuing the Associate’s Degree.

Study after study has found that the completion of an Associate of Arts degree prior to transfer is strongly associated with transfer success and completion of the bachelor’s degree. A study in the SUNY system found that students who earned an associate’s degree prior to transfer had a 20 percentage point higher probability of earning the bachelor’s degree within three years (Ehrenberg & Smith, 2004). Crosta and Kopko (2014) found the same 20 percentage point improvement for associate’s

degree holders over transfers with 60 credit hours, but no degree. Nationally, only 64% of transfers have earned the associate's degree prior to transfer, but in some states, this is a single digit figure (Shapiro, et al, 2013). This same study found that, after propensity score matching, associate's degree earners were 92% more likely to earn the bachelor's degree within four years than non-degree transfers with 50 to 90 credit hours who transfer.




“Some 82% of students able to transfer all of their credits graduated within six years compared to only 42% who were unable to use all credits.”

Clearly, the associate's degree matters for transfer student success; yet few universities require it as a prerequisite to transfer. Again, in the Direct Connect to UCF program mentioned above, the guarantee of admission was contingent upon completion of the associate's degree prior to transfer. This was based on local evidence that degreed transfers would perform on par with native students, obviating the need for any other criteria. Within three years of the issuing of this guarantee, the number of Associate of Arts degrees awarded annually by their largest partner (Valencia College) had increased by 97%, giving value to the degree from the student's perspective and increasing their chances of earning a timely bachelor's degree.

Regional transfer ecosystems should develop models that place heavy value from the student's perspective on earning the associate's degree prior to transfer.

## **5. Identify and Address Financial Barriers to Transfer Success.**

The majority of discretionary financial aid resources (what is outside of Title IV and certain state programs) are oriented almost exclusively to enrollment management models, which is to say, to native freshmen at universities. Programs aimed at assisting transfer students are rare, and even more general programs that are available to transfer students often require full-time enrollment, eliminating many from participating. Yet, the economic diversity of transfer students suggests a heightened need for financial assistance. Further, even within programs such as the Pell Grant, policies often have unintended consequences. For example, academic progress measures sometimes make it impossible for students who may begin with a remedial course or two to complete the full bachelor's degree with financial aid support. STEM pathway students at community colleges often complete the Associate of Arts degree without meeting their lower division prerequisite courses. Since remaining at the less expensive community college to complete these is impossible for those needing a Pell Grant to attend, they are forced to transfer with more than two years of coursework to complete at the university, lengthening their time to degree and reducing their likelihood of graduating.



“Clearly, the associate’s degree matters for transfer student success; yet few universities require it as a prerequisite to transfer.”

Regional consortia seeking to improve transfer access and completion will want to review the student experience from a financial perspective in detail and craft programs that work for them. Actions such as waiving the application fee for transfers or arranging for them to be admitted to the university while pursuing lower division prerequisites as a “transient student” at the community college can substantially reduce barriers. Local or philanthropically-funded, needs-based transfer scholarships can contribute significantly to transfer and to the ultimate diversity of the graduating class.

#### **6. Understand Transfer as a Career Pathway.**

In many cases, where the core mission of the community college is rooted in a career or technical mission, attention to transfer can be viewed as “off-mission.” This view fails to understand that more than two-thirds of transfer students are pursuing a career-oriented bachelor’s degree. In many cases, one of the business pathways is by far the most popular major, followed by nursing and allied health, education, and other majors that are natural extensions of the career mission of the college. When one adds to this the changing nature of work, the elevation of credentials for entry into practice in many fields beyond the associate’s degree, and the general need for baccalaureate prepared technologists, it seems clear that developing transfer pathways that connect to careers beyond the bachelor’s degree should be considered a core mission of a 21st century community college in partnership with local universities. Boards, senior leaders, and policy makers should support this view and reward colleges for contributing to the worthy goal of diversifying the professions.

## **Conclusion**

These recommendations are meant to lead to more than “tinkering” with the existing transfer systems. The underlying argument is one of social justice, opportunity, economic mobility, diversity and equity. Community colleges are not only the largest sector of undergraduate education, they are by far the largest sector serving the underrepresented, lower economic strata, people of color, first-generation Americans, and many other groups whose inclusion in the American Dream of opportunity is essential to the flourishing of our society.

Almost 60 years ago, early scholarship on community colleges described their social role as maintaining the status quo, undermining mobility and opportunity by “chilling out” the aspirations of the underclasses (Clark, 1960). It would be a devastating thing to discover that this claim was supportable now. Fortunately, the evidence is otherwise, with some scholars now describing the role as “heating up” students’ aspirations (Alexander, Bozwick, & Entwisle, 2008). The potential and the strategic importance of transfer has never been greater for achieving multiple shared goals. This potential will never be realized unless higher education leaders make deep redesign of the system of vertical college transfer a priority.



“The potential and the strategic importance of transfer has never been greater for achieving multiple shared goals.”

## References

- Alfonso, M. (2006). "The impact of community college attendance on baccalaureate attainment." *Research in Higher Education*, 47(8), 873-903. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9019-2>
- American Association of Community College (2014). Fast Facts. Washington, D.C.: AACC. <https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/fast-facts/>
- Carnevale, A., & Strohl, J. (2013). "Separate and Unequal: How higher education reinforces the intergenerational reproduction of white racial privilege." Georgetown University Public Policy Institute. <https://cew.georgetown.edu/cew-reports/separate-unequal/>
- Carnevale, A., Strohl, J., Gulish, A., Van Der Werf, M., and Peltier-Campbell, K. (2019) "The Unequal Race for Good Jobs: How Whites Made Outsized Gains in Education and Good Jobs Compared to Blacks and Latinos." Georgetown University, Center for Education and the Workforce. <https://cew.georgetown.edu/cew-reports/raceandgoodjobs/>
- Clark, B.A. (1960) "The 'cooling out' function in higher education." *American Journal of Sociology*. 65, 569-576. [https://www.jstor.org/stable/2773649?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2773649?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Crosta, P.M., & Kopko, E.M. (2014). "Should community college students earn an associate's degree before transferring to a four-year institution?" CCRC Working Paper No. 70, Teachers College. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/associate-degree-before-transfer.html>
- Doyle, W.R. (2006). "Community college transfers and college graduation." *Change*, 38(3), 56-58. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3200/CHNG.38.3.56-58>
- Ehrenberg, R.G., & Smith, C.L. (2004). "Analyzing the success of student transitions from 2- to 4-year institutions within a state." *Economics of Education Review*, (23)1, 11-28. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272775703000785>
- Monaghan, D.B., & Attewell, P. (2014). "The community college route to the bachelor's degree." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1-22. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0162373714521865>
- National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (2012) *A Snapshot Report on Student Attainment*. <https://nscresearchcenter.org/category/snapshot-report/>
- Phillips, Kurt A. (2000) *National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends and Statistics, 3rd Edition*, American Association of Community Colleges.
- Reynolds, C.L., & Desjardins, S.L. (2009). "The use of matching methods in higher education research: Answering whether attendance at a 2-year institution results in differences in educational attainment." In J.C. Smith (Ed.) *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 24, pp. 47-97). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9628-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9628-0_2)
- Rouse, C.E. (1995). "Democratization or diversion? The effect of community colleges on educational attainment." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 13(2), 217-224. [https://www.jstor.org/stable/1392376?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1392376?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)
- Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Ziskin, M., Chiang, Y.-C., Chen, J., Harrell, A., & Torres, Y. (2013). "Baccalaureate attainment: A national view of post-secondary outcomes of students who transfer from two-year to four-year institutions." (Signature Report No. 5) National Student Clearinghouse Center. <https://nscresearchcenter.org/signaturereport5/>
- Wyner, J., Deane, K.C., Jenkins, D., and Fink, J. (2019). "The Transfer Playbook: Essential Practices For Two- and Four-Year Colleges." The Aspen Institute. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/transfer-playbook-essential-practices.html>



## About the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research

With a \$10.86 million grant from the John M. Belk Endowment, the NC State College of Education established the Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research to enhance and strengthen its support of community colleges in North Carolina in three ways:

- Further the preparation of future community college presidents
- Provide ongoing leadership development to community college executives and trustees
- Build capacity for evidence-based decision-making and applied research

In its first year of operation, in 2019, the Belk Center was actively involved in numerous research projects and initiatives regarding key issues and policies that affect community colleges across North Carolina.



**686**

Hours of Data Analysis,  
Consultation, and Facilitation  
Belk Center Staff Provided to  
Community College Leaders



**58 of 58**

N.C. Community Colleges  
Received Support  
from the Belk Center



**285**

Total Times the  
Belk Center Engaged  
with Community  
Colleges in N.C.

Other Belk Center highlights from 2019 include the following:

- Hosting the first ever **Presidents' Academy Statewide Leadership Conference**, where presidents and trustees discussed the role of community colleges in improving North Carolina's economic competitiveness, creating economic mobility and meeting workforce demands. The event saw the highest level of representation of community colleges at a statewide event since records have been kept.
- Holding the **Presidents' Academy Symposia** across four days in Pinehurst and Charlotte where community college presidents had the opportunity to dive into regional and college-specific data and discuss increasing credential attainment and labor market outcomes.



**43**

Community College Presidents  
Attended Presidents' Academy  
Statewide Leadership Conference



## Belk Center Leadership Team

- **Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.**, Executive Director and Alumni Distinguished Graduate Professor
- **James Bartlett, Ph.D.**, Director of Academic Programs and Associate Professor
- **Robert Templin, Ed.D.**, Professor of the Practice and Senior Fellow with The Aspen Institute
- **Mary Rittling, Ed.D.**, Professor of the Practice and Senior Fellow with The Aspen Institute
- **Ken Ender, Ph.D.**, Professor of the Practice
- **Andrea DeSantis, M.A.**, Assistant Director of Research
- **Jemilia S. Davis, Ph.D.**, Director of Strategic Initiatives and External Relations
- **Kim Sepich, Ed.D.**, Director of Executive Leadership Programs

## About the Belk Center National Advisory Board

The Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research National Advisory Board consists of current and former community college presidents, leaders from organizations whose work supports community colleges, and community college system leaders. The expertise of the National Advisory Board is helping to direct the Belk Center in preparing the next generation of community college leaders and addressing the most pressing issues facing North Carolina community colleges. The National Advisory Board also monitors the Belk Center's progress.

The 2019-2020 National Advisory Board members:

- **David Armstrong**, President Emeritus, Broward College
- **Dr. Thomas Brock**, Director, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University
- **Dr. Lisa Chapman**, President, Central Carolina Community College
- **Dr. Jeff Cox**, President, Wilkes Community College
- **Dr. Rufus Glasper**, President, League for Innovation in the Community College
- **Dr. David Gomez**, President, Hostos Community College
- **Dr. Gary Green**, President Emeritus, Forsyth Technical Community College
- **Peter Hans**, President, N.C. Community College System
- **Jennifer Haygood**, Chief of Staff/Executive Vice President, N.C. Community College System
- **Dr. Garrett Hinshaw**, President, Catawba Valley Community College
- **Dr. William Ingram**, President, Durham Technical Community College
- **Dr. David Johnson**, President, Johnston Community College
- **Dr. Randy Parker**, President Emerita, Guilford Technical Community College
- **Dr. Barbara Parker**, President Emeritus, Haywood Community College
- **Dr. Dan Phelan**, President, Jackson College
- **MC Belk Pilon**, Chair, John M. Belk Endowment
- **Dr. Scott Ralls**, President, Wake Technical Community College
- **Dr. Lawrence Rouse**, President, Pitt Community College
- **Dr. Stephen Scott**, President Emeritus, Wake Technical Community College
- **Dr. Pamela Senegal**, President, Piedmont Community College
- **Dr. Karen Stout**, President and CEO, Achieving the Dream
- **Dr. Milicent Valek**, President, Brazoport College
- **Dr. Thomas Walker**, President, Wayne Community College
- **Dr. Greg Williams**, President, Odessa College
- **Julie Woodson**, President, N.C. Association of Community College Trustees
- **Josh Wyner**, Founder, Executive Director and Vice President, The College Excellence Program at The Aspen Institute

## About Dr. Dallas Herring and the Power of Education

Dr. W. Dallas Herring made it his life's work to build a system that would serve all of North Carolina's residents by preparing them for productive work and active citizenship. As a teenager, he established a 75-book community library in the local general store of Rose Hill, his home town. He later developed a statewide system of technical education institutes that eventually became the North Carolina Community College System. He also served for 20 years as chair of the North Carolina State Board of Education. Throughout his career, he was always guided by his vision of educational "opportunity for all the people." Please consider powering education with a gift to honor Herring or to support the NC State College of Education's Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research.



### Gifts can be made in the following ways:

All gifts accepted by the NC State College of Education are managed by the NC State University Foundation, Inc.

**By Check:** Please make checks payable to the "NC State Foundation" and in the memo line, please write: "Belk Center Fund"

**Mail to:**

Gifts and Records Management  
NC State University  
Campus Box 7474  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7474

### OR

**Online:** To make an online gift by credit card to the Belk Center Fund, please visit the Belk Center website at [belk-center.ced.ncsu.edu](http://belk-center.ced.ncsu.edu)

- Click on "Support the Center" in the upper right corner
- Enter the amount and follow the instructions to complete the transaction.

**If you need assistance making your gift, please call our Gift Processing Office at 919-515-7827.**

**NC STATE**

College of Education



## **As a research powerhouse**

grounded in its land-grant mission, the NC State College of Education leads the way in solving pressing educational problems.



**Top 6%**

in Active Research  
Grants Among All  
Colleges of Education  
in U.S.



**Top 12%**

in Research and  
Scholarly Activities  
Among All Colleges of  
Education in U.S.



**#84**

in Times Higher  
Education's World  
University Rankings

**NC STATE**  
College of Education  
Belk Center for Community College  
Leadership and Research

[belk-center.ced.ncsu.edu](http://belk-center.ced.ncsu.edu)