ABSTRACT

HAWKINS, STEPHEN NEAL. Board Development and Its Impact on the Effectiveness of North Carolina Community College Boards of Trustees. (Under the direction of Dr. George Vaughan.)

The first part of the study examined North Carolina community college trustee demographic characteristics such as race, gender, age, and occupation. Trustees were randomly selected by appointing agency: the governor’s office, the local board of education, or the local board of county commissioners. The study found that trustees were predominantly White, male, college educated, over the age of 50, and were currently or formerly involved in some aspect of business or education.

The next part of the study focused on trusteeship by examining the difference in responses between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer. With almost no significant differences found between the two groups, trustees indicated that they overwhelmingly looked to the community college president for guidance, and over half of the respondents indicated that their boards as a whole evaluated their performance once every year or once every two years. Most trustees perceived that members of their governing boards worked well together all or most of the time. In addition, most governing boards provided funding for board development, and most trustees had experienced at least two or more board development opportunities.

The final part of the study focused on the impact board development had on board effectiveness. A six-dimensional framework for board effectiveness, developed by Chait and associates, was used in the study, and the Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire (BSAQ), designed and revised by Holland and Blackmon, was implemented as the
instrument of evaluation. Consistent with scores of various other organizations, the overall score for the education dimension was relatively low. In addition, correlation alpha, and regression analyses found that the six-dimensional model was significant yet contained weak predictor variables of effectiveness. Additional research is needed in the area of board effectiveness using the Chait model; however, this study provided baseline BSAQ sub scores for those who wish to continue a follow-up study in North Carolina or for those who want to compare the results with other community college systems.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In recent years, governing boards of colleges and universities in the United States have been closely examined, even scrutinized, by government officials, state legislatures, and the public to determine whether these boards are performing their duties and responsibilities effectively. Governing boards, or boards of trustees, are the highest policy-making bodies within institutions of higher education. Boards of trustees shape the direction of institutions, provide for the well-being of all constituencies, and are held responsible for the overall performance of the institutions they govern (Herron, 1969). In 1998, The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) reported, “Sound, responsive, and efficient governance is an essential link between society and higher education. In its absence, we risk jeopardizing academic quality, public confidence, and America’s competitive advantage in the world” (p. 1). Moreover, Herron (1969) stated, “A well-trained, carefully selected, continuously oriented, and involved board will make the critical decisions necessary for excellence in its institution” (p. 26). A well-functioning governing board can attract and retain capable presidential and administrative leadership. However, if board governance fails, it can possibly mean missed opportunities for strong leadership for an institution and the loss of public confidence in trustees (AGB, 1998). An effective governing board concentrates on understanding how or whether its institution is fulfilling its mission and how the mission
contributes to the broader public agenda for higher education and the public interest (AGB, 1998). Currently, there are institutions of higher education that have governing boards that are very innovative and effective; however, there are those governing boards that are inadequate, completely incompetent, and unsuccessful. Nevertheless, the majority of governing boards currently find themselves somewhere in the middle, all capable of improvement (Kerr & Gade, 1989; Nason, 1982).

The very existence of lay, or nonacademic, trusteeship distinguishes American higher education from the rest of the world where institutions of higher education are primarily dependent on the state for governance. In the United States, public and private institutions are dependent on the government in varying degrees; however, all institutions of higher education have been given the autonomy to carry out their educational functions through the medium of governing boards of trustees (AGB, 1998, November 8; Duryea, 2000; Kerr & Gade, 1989). A board of trustees, which can be a statewide governing board, a board controlling a multi-campus system, or a board of a single institution such as a community college, is either endowed by a state constitution, by a statute, or by a publicly issued charter with the authority to make or approve all decisions involved in the governance of the institution for which it is responsible (Corson, 1975). College and university board membership is one of the most significant and noteworthy exercises of voluntary leadership in American society. Fundamentally, all boards of trustees are responsible for creating institutional policy, setting long-range goals for the institution, and continuously planning for the future (Herron, 1969). A governing board must be solely committed to the institution in order to be effective. However, serving on a board requires a commitment to the institution as a whole rather than to any of its parts.
The effectiveness of a governing board is “more than the sum of the contributions of its individual members” (Nason, 1982, p. 53). Initiating a collective enthusiasm and sense of important responsibility can help transform an ineffective, indifferent board into one that aspires to new levels of performance and responsibilities (Nason, 1982).

Kerr and Gade (1989) found that board authority and effectiveness have been subjected to erosion over time. In fact, Callan and Honetschlager (1991) found in their research that the overall effectiveness of public higher education governing boards had been in a state of decline for the past 20 years. An AGB (1998) study found that the very institution and tradition of lay trusteeship in public higher education was not functioning as well as it should. The AGB (1998) 18-month study, which included interviews and discussions with over 250 state officials and educational leaders, set out to discover how they measured the performance of lay governing boards and how to assess the overall condition of academic governance. The participants in the AGB (1998) study overwhelmingly supported the concept that lay boards are the most appropriate type of system to oversee and govern colleges and universities. The participants in the study also linked lay governance to democratic ideals, and lay governance was considered superior to other governance alternatives used in many countries such as direct state or direct faculty control. However, the report basically concluded that governing boards and trustees are not performing as well as they should (AGB, 1998). The following findings overshadowed all other results of the study:

- The vast majority of state political leaders desire strong and effective governing boards and want them to succeed,
• Most boards and board members take their responsibilities seriously and are genuinely committed to doing the best jobs they can,

• Overwhelming support exists for the institution of college and university trusteeship conducted by lay citizens, but many stakeholders, including a number of trustees themselves, are concerned about the performance of boards and individual trustees. (AGB, 1998, pp. 8-9)

There are several reasons why trustees may not feel qualified for the position. They may feel that the opposition from other groups, such as faculty and students, is too overwhelming, or trustees may be unaware of problems at the institution because the administration has avoided telling them (Schaefer, 2002). Schaefer (2002) wrote that trustee apathy has been making trustees increasingly irrelevant to college governance. In addition, the public has recently been demanding greater accountability, particularly regarding student learning outcomes, and, as stated previously, elected officials have intensified their scrutiny of higher education institutions such as community colleges (AGB, 1998).

Community colleges, which are committed to open access and equity in admissions, are the only chance for many students to obtain a higher education. Across the United States, there have been more than five million students who have enrolled in credit courses at community colleges in a given academic year (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Community colleges currently offer courses and programs in occupational and technical education, college transfer education, and developmental education. They also offer a variety of community services such as providing continuing education courses as well as serving as the cultural, social, and recreational centers for the community (Deegan &
Gollattscheck, 1985; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). In addition, community colleges are
the center of change that will reshape their communities during the 21st century (Alfred,
Hudgins, & McClenneney, 1999).

Throughout the 1990s and into the new millennium, the role of board governance
within community colleges has dramatically changed. The dramatic change has been the
result of state legislation mandating changes in governance structures or shifting certain
responsibilities that previously were under the control of the community college board to
the state (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). In the early 1960s and 1970s, when local monies
were supporting a greater percentage of community colleges, state legislatures really
chose to have no voice in institutional decisions. However, now with growing negative
opinions and intense governmental constraints, legislators are being held accountable by
the public, and in turn these same legislators want accountability from community
college boards of trustees (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Building Communities: A Vision
for a New Century, a 1988 report of the Commission of the Future of Community
Colleges, promoted accountability and effectiveness at the highest level:

We recommend that the role of the community college trustees be strengthened.
Specifically the governing board should focus on selecting an effective leader and
defining institutional goals. The board also should receive, periodically, sufficient
information to know that the college’s goals are being met. Trustees should not try
to manage the institution. The education of community college trustees should be
expanded. We strongly urge that new trustees participate in an orientation program
as a condition of assuming office. We also recommend that they participate in
continuing trustee education at local, regional, and national meetings. (Martin, 1997, p. 62)

As concern, controversy, and indifference about boards of trustees escalated over the past several years, state governments have begun to require public institutions, such as community colleges, to meet certain detailed measures to ensure that students are receiving the education they need since tax revenues support public institutions. A detrimental perception that boards of trustees have become ineffective has led to even more erosion of trustee governance by the implementation of governmental regulatory initiatives such as setting performance measures for entire systems of higher education (Davis, 2000; Doser, 1976). These rather negative views regarding boards of trustees, in particular community college boards of trustees, have made the governor’s office, the budget director, and state legislators an even greater danger to local community college board governance (Davis, 2000).

Community college trustees are faced with confusion and uncertainty today, but trustees need to begin creating solutions to the problems brought on by a changing society. Over the past several years, higher education observers have noted how the changing environment of higher education, specifically the community college, has had an effect on the trustee’s role. Community college trustees often have to struggle with multiple and conflicting purposes of the institution, and they now have to meet the needs of both employers and students (Zwemer, 1985). For example, community college trustees are currently confronted with complex issues, such as retaining an open-door admissions policy, developing a comprehensive mission statement, offering developmental courses for all students, and, in some states, setting tuition charges
In addition, the authority of trustees has been challenged because governing boards of public institutions have been regarded as unrepresentative and incompetent to govern. Boards of trustees are often seen as socially and demographically homogeneous to govern diverse institutions, such as community colleges, and not knowledgeable enough with academic matters to use their judgment in the place of faculty and administrators at the institution (Callan & Honetschlager, 1991). A weak or divided board is ill suited to confront the many serious questions the public is raising about increased costs, program cutbacks, and educational accountability. When resources were plentiful and public support was strong, governing board leadership seemed adequate, or at least less consequential. But to position itself successfully for the 21st century, public higher education trusteeship has had to attract citizens of “great commitment and quality, working with structures devoid of partisan politics, and with clear expectations of high levels of performance and accountability” (AGB, 1998, p. 1).

There are several reasons why community college boards of trustees need to become aware of their own effectiveness. Several transformational forces, such as newer, easily accessible educational alternatives, advancements in technology, and the drive for better performance and accountability are all impacting community colleges in numerous directions. Students, as well as employers, are becoming more critical of the quality of services they are receiving today. Students today want quality, convenience, responsiveness, and flexibility. If students do not get these amenities at one institution, they will then go somewhere else (Alfred et al., 1999). For several years, the chief competition for one community college was usually another nearby community college. However, with new Internet competitors, such as the University of Phoenix’s on-line
programs, community colleges now find an environment that is unpredictable and constantly changing. Alfred et al. (1999) assert that success now comes to educational organizations that distinguish themselves from their competitors. Corporate universities, cable companies, virtual universities, and electronic campuses that have no geographical boundaries have created systems that develop quickly to deliver new programs to clients. Corporations, such as Motorola and General Electric, have also developed customized training programs that give workers skills that can be transferred to many different arenas (Alfred et al., 1999). In addition, policymakers are viewing the traditional campus-based, credit-for-contact educational models as too expensive to meet the rising demand for educational services. The new facets of technology are now profoundly affecting every aspect of education: what students learn, how they learn, and where they learn. Alfred et al. (1999) stressed that the passage of legislation supporting students’ right to know in the Higher Education Act and the recent formation of a congressional panel on college costs are two instances that policymakers and the public are no longer giving higher education carte blanche with public funds. Community colleges are going to be expected to perform, to document their performance, and to be accountable for producing return on taxpayer and student investment (Alfred et al., 1999). Therefore, governing boards need to perform at their highest potential to accept these new challenges.

The Selection Process

Two areas that have had a significant impact on governing board effectiveness is the selection process of trustees and board development. The selection process, whether trustee appointment or general election, has been criticized for years as being unfavorable, biased, and unrealistic. Most elections and appointments are completed
without a screening or nominating process for candidates. Many trustees are selected without any regard to their preparation or readiness for the position. Many trustees are appointed for political reasons and not necessarily for their personal interest or desire to serve. Once in the position, trustees often become disinterested and completely apathetic about their responsibilities to the institution. Without improvement in their effectiveness, many public institutions, such as community colleges, will find it extremely difficult to attract strong presidential leadership, to respond to increasing and conflicting societal demands, and to improve the institution’s quality and academic opportunities in times of severe financial constraints (Haro, 1995; Ingram & Weary, 2000; Kerr & Gade, 1989).

Callan and Honetschlager (1991) stated, “States cannot afford to permit their institutions of higher education to decline in quality, become unresponsive to demands for high-quality instruction and research, or fall into the mediocrity characteristic of highly centralized organizations dominated by multiple layers of internal or external bureaucracy” (p. 13).

One of the greatest detriments to board effectiveness is placing incompetent individuals in trusteeships. The current two selection processes for trustees, public elections and board appointments, have been criticized for their failure to provide competent and resourceful candidates. Most newly appointed candidates are not prepared for their responsibilities, are not familiar with the dynamics of an institution of higher education, and are not committed to educating themselves for a successful trusteeship (AGB, 1996; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Haro, 1995; Ingram & Weary, 2000; Kerr & Gade, 1989). In addition, the two processes have often failed at tapping into the diverse pools of talent found in communities, producing a homogenous board that lacks the insight and
ability to respond to increasingly diverse educational needs of the community. In general, most candidates who have been elected or appointed have been White, middle-aged, wealthy professional males (Callan & Honetschlager, 1991; Cohen & Brawer, 1996, Lovell & Trouth, 2002; Nason, 1982). A few recent studies have indicated that governing boards have begun to reflect more demographically the populations they serve; however, the transformation has been slow and does not reflect the nation as a whole (Madsen, 1998; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Madsen (1998) noted in his research that there was a gradual improvement in the representation of trustees across demographic lines: more women and minorities are currently serving as trustees than they were 20 years ago.

One of the primary reasons that governing boards have such a homogeneous composition is that, in many cases, voters rarely know who the candidates are for election, especially candidates vying for a community college trusteeship. Also, most candidates are known only by a small segment of the population, and once elected to office, oftentimes by special interest groups, trustees are expected to carry out the wishes of those who put them in office (AGB, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Haro, 1995). One study indicated that over 25% of trustees were elected to their positions (Madsen, 1998). At least 20 states use popular election to place individuals in community college trusteeships (Lovell & Trouth, 2002).

Appointment by governors or local boards, such as county commissioners or city council members, is another alternative to selecting individuals for trusteeships. Almost half of all trustees are appointed to their positions (Madsen, 1998). Unfortunately, many observers feel gubernatorial appointments or other types of appointments are no better
than electing trustees. Appointing authorities and the appointment processes fail to select the most qualified and committed citizens to serve on boards of public institutions such as community colleges. Many gubernatorial appointments across the nation have been viewed as political acts favoring individuals who donated money and time to the governor’s political career. In most states there are no requirements, qualifications, or explicit criteria for individuals to serve on a community college board. Also, most states have no systematic process for recruiting and screening potential candidates for governing board appointments (Callan & Honetschlager, 1991). Observers in higher education believe that a nominating process that includes a formal committee that screens candidates would be ideal for both processes, especially the appointment process (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Nason, 1982). Callan and Honetschlager (1991) reported that 34 states use some type of screening process to nominate candidates for the judiciary; however, relatively few of them--currently only three--actually use a screening process for trustees.

For example, in North Carolina, each community college governing board consists of a minimum of 12 voting members and one ex officio, non-voting student government representative. The governor selects four members, the local board of education selects four members, and the local board of county commissioners selects four members. A special provision is provided for additional members if the community college serves more than one county. However, none of the appointing agencies are required by statute to employ the use of a screening process to select candidates (Dowdy, 1996).
Board Development

Whether elected or appointed, many individuals are seen as ill prepared for their roles as trustees. Therefore, board development is essential for trustees to learn their responsibilities, become better acquainted with the purposes of higher education, and become familiar with the expectations that various constituencies have of them (AGB, 1998; Herron, 1969; Kerr & Gade, 1989, Nason, 1982). Governing boards that participate and endorse board development activities are much more effective than those boards that are not involved (Chait, Holland, & Taylor, 1993). Unfortunately, many trustees are learning their roles on the job without any systematic educational program (Haro, 1995). Research has shown that board development across higher education lacks effective orientation programs and adequate trustee education (AGB, 1996; AGB, 1998; Chait, et. al, 1993; Haro, 1995; Herron, 1969; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Nason, 1982; Taylor, 1993). Many institutions provide very little, if any, preparation for trustee education and board development (Gleazer, 1985; Haro, 1995). For this study, board development was divided into three categories: orientation; trustee education in the form of workshops, retreats and conferences; and board assessment. The North Carolina legislature found board development so important that it passed a law giving community college governing boards the right to remove trustees who do not attend orientation or educational sessions provided by the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees (NCACCT) within the first six months of assuming the trustee position (Shults, 2001). North Carolina General Statute 115-D reads as follows:

A board of trustees may declare vacant the office of a member who does not attend three consecutive, scheduled meetings without justifiable excuse. A board of
trustees may also declare vacant the office of a member who, without justifiable excuse, does not participate within six months of appointment in a trustee orientation and education session sponsored by the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees. (Section19b)

However, General Statute 115D, Section 19b, makes removal optional to governing boards when a trustee does not attend an orientation or educational session within six months of appointment. Depending upon the expectations of the individual governing board, trustees are not necessarily held accountable for participating in board development opportunities.

Many of the complaints concerning board development have focused on the lack of orientation programs for trustees (Davis, 2000; Herron, 1969; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Nason, 1982). Most reports have indicated that only about one-third of the institutions across the nation provide orientation sessions for their trustees (Nason, 1982). Slightly over 10% of the community colleges across the country currently mandate that their trustees attend an orientation session (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Other states, similar to North Carolina, give the governing board collectively the ability to determine whether an individual trustee should be removed for not attending board development activities such as orientations. Orientation programs provide an opportunity for new trustees to learn more about the institution’s purpose and mission, the institution’s history and culture, trustee duties and responsibilities, other board members, the president, and the college’s chief administrators.

After the initial trustee orientation session, the institution should provide enrichment opportunities or learning experiences for trustees throughout their tenure on
the board, for new members and experienced members alike (Kerr & Gade, 1989; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Opportunities, such as workshops, retreats and statewide or national conventions, provide enrichment for boards collectively as a group and trustees individually to reflect about prior board experiences and to learn how to improve their current status for the future (Boggs & Smith, 1997; Kerr & Gade, 1989). Many observers of higher education believe that trustees should be mandated to attend trustee educational opportunities. Granted, workshops and conventions cannot remedy the problems of a divisive board or one beleaguered with undue influence from special interests; however, trustee educational opportunities can help to build a more cohesive group that can plan better for the future (Boggs & Smith, 1997). In addition, boards that have no major problems and are perceived to perform effectively benefit from trustee educational opportunities as well. These opportunities remind trustees of their responsibilities and refresh their understanding of trusteeship and the purpose of serving (Boggs & Smith, 1997).

Regularly assessing board performance is an indication that trustees of an institution are committed to providing the campus with an effective board (Michael & Schwartz, 1999; Schwartz, 1998; Taylor, 1993; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Regardless of whether the governing board implements a formal assessment procedure with an outside consultant or uses an informal instrument to indicate a generalized level of performance, boards positively benefit from the assessment process (Schwartz, 1998; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). During an assessment process, board members review their responsibilities as a corporate entity or governing board, examine their goals and expectations of the board collectively, study the relationships among board members, and
determine ways they can become a more effective board (Ingram & Weary, 2000). In one study of community colleges, almost half of the community college board chairs stated that their boards did not assess board performance (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). In another study of both two-year and four-year public boards, again only one-third of public boards had conducted assessments of their performance within the last five years (Madsen, 1998). These results demonstrated that assessment is dramatically needed in order to keep governing boards, especially in community colleges, performing as effectively as they possible can.

**Board Responsibilities**

In the past, the effectiveness of a governing board meant how successful boards followed prescribed responsibilities. Governing boards have several tasks assigned to them that they must fulfill in order to maintain a proficient institution. The prescribed tasks or responsibilities include the following:

- Selecting, evaluating, and dismissing the president; ensuring professional management of the institution; purchasing, constructing, and maintaining facilities;
- defining the role and mission(s) of the college; determining staff and faculty salaries; contracting services for the institution; overseeing the educational program; ensuring financial solvency, preserving institutional autonomy; enhancing the institution’s public image; serving as a court of appeals; and assessing their own performance. (Cohen, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Nason, 1982; Rauh, 1969)

Richard Ingram, a president of the AGB and an advocate for effective governing boards, included other aspects of board governance that would help create a more effective board of trustees such as:
• Making decisions after being assured that affected groups have been consulted,
• Being advocates for institutional needs and interpreting what serves the larger public good,
• Accepting their accountability to elected leaders while guarding against inappropriate intrusion,
• Having members who help to build consensus,
• Thinking and acting strategically,
• Knowing when to lead and when to follow,
• Being loving critics of their academic leaders. (p. 102)

In addition, Kerr and Gade (1989) included prescribed measures in their definition of an effective board, yet expanded their understanding by providing the purposes of an effective governing board, which include the following:

• Providing a forum for discussion where respected and experienced citizens may share their knowledge, skills, and sensitivities to reach conclusions;
• Making possible thoughtful consideration of the performance of the total institution, as well as of its constituent parts, and of the requirements of the past, present, and future;
• Providing a mechanism to protect the autonomy of the institution and the freedom of expression of its members, while ensuring that the college or university serves the public welfare;
• Providing a check and balance internally against the overly powerful administration and/or the too dominant faculty and externally against overly intrusive political authorities and line-item bureaucrats;

• Serving to draw together the disparate parts of the institution so that the whole can be more than the sum of the parts;

• Serving as a jury at the ongoing trial of each institution of higher education as to whether its benefits exceed its costs. (p. 137)

**Conceptual Framework**

Chait, Holland, and Taylor (1993) conducted research that defined similar characteristics of effective governing boards that observers of higher education, such as Nason (1982), Ingram (1997), Cohen (1998) and Kerr and Gade (1989), used as well. Chait et al.’s (1993) research targeted specific behaviors that effective boards elicited to make them successful and different from those boards that were marginal or completely ineffective. In their study, Chait et al. (1993) did find that there were characteristics and behaviors that differentiated stronger, more effective boards from weaker boards. Chait et al. (1993) classified these differences into six distinct dimensions of effective trusteeship that enabled boards as a group to perform effectively. Their research did substantiate many of the studies other observers had completed in public higher education. However, Chait et al.’s (1993) research put the characteristics and behaviors into a manageable organized conceptual framework that could be used to examine board effectiveness. The following table gives the six-dimensional framework Chait et al. (1993) deemed as necessary elements of an effective board:
The elements incorporated into the conceptual profile include behavioral characteristics such as how boards adapt to the academic environment of the institution, how boards provide learning opportunities for themselves, and how boards draw upon multiple perspectives to reach appropriate responses to issues.

Although Chait et al.’s (1993) research centered on independent boards for the most part, most, if not all, of the profile criteria can apply to evaluating governing board effectiveness in the public sector. For example, Ingram (1997) and Ingram and Weary (2000) stated that the six competencies that Chait et al. (1993) generated in their research are appropriate to apply to public-sector boards. Interestingly, Kerr and Gade (1989) even categorized most community colleges east of the Mississippi River as collegial because the institutions were modeled on private colleges and had appointed boards.
Having community colleges in North Carolina modeled on the private sector provides more credibility when applying the conceptual framework developed by Chait et al. (1993) and incorporating a related self-assessment instrument that measures each dimension accordingly.

Chait et al. (1996) observed, “Most trustees are bright and earnest individuals, but most trustees whom we encountered were quick to acknowledge dissatisfaction and disillusionment with their board’s performance” (p. 55). The observation continues, “Despite the powerful connection between knowledge or expertise and effectiveness, remarkably few boards make a concerted effort to acquire the scope of knowledge essential to govern intelligently” (p. 84). On average, Chait et al. (1993) reported that over 150 boards scored lowest on the educational dimension of trusteeship, as measured by self-assessment surveys of board competence. The educational dimension focused on whether “the board takes the necessary steps to ensure that trustees are knowledgeable about the institution, the profession, and the board’s roles, responsibilities, and performance” (Chait et al., 1996, p. 84).

In addition, Holland and Blackmon (1994), using the conceptual profile created by Chait et al. (1993), developed a related self-assessment instrument entitled the Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire (BSAQ), which is currently used for measuring board effectiveness and has been implemented systematically and empirically tested to determine if there is a significant relationship between board actions and their level of effectiveness. The BSAQ offers the advantage of the conceptual profile’s behavioral focus. The BSAQ, which consists of 65 statements that trustees rate, measures the board’s performance on specific behaviors associated with effective trusteeship, identifies
areas that a board needs to strengthen, and offers various suggestions to improve areas of comparative weaknesses. The self-assessment questionnaire does provide more guidance for the board that wishes to move from a self-evaluation mode to one of self-improvement (Holland & Jackson, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

The current literature regarding community college governing boards suggests that both selection processes, public elections and board appointments, promote homogeneity among governing boards and are completely inadequate in providing institutions of higher education with trustees capable of the tasks required to fulfill their duties (AGB, 1996; AGB, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Haro, 1995; Lovell & Trouth, 2002). According to Statute 115D-Chapter 12, the State of North Carolina utilizes three appointing agencies in the selection of community college trustees: the governor’s office, local board(s) of education, and local board(s) of county commissioners. Consistent with other processes across the nation, the statute does not mandate the use of a selection or nominating committee beforehand to provide the best candidates from which an appointing agency can select. Also, there is no provision that will help provide a more representative board reflecting community, regional, and state demographics. Most studies show that trustees serving on public governing boards are White, professional upper middle-class males, who have either been elected by a small group of individuals with special interests or have been appointed by governmental agencies who use trusteeships as a method of political payback (Callan & Honetschlager, 1991; Cohen & Brawer, 1996, Lovell & Trouth, 2002; Nason, 1982). However, only a few studies, such
as Maden’s (1998), have indicated that there might possibly be a move away from the homogeneity of governing boards toward more diverse representation.

In addition, prior studies have indicated that the selection process of trustees in higher education has not been currently providing the best individuals to serve as trustees. Without a screening or nominating system in place, trustees who are elected or appointed have consistently not been prepared to assume their role as a trustee, therefore making board development almost essential if boards are to be effective (AGB, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Haro, 1995; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Nason, 1982). Another problem the study targeted included board development issues. Chait et al. (1993) stated that there was an abundance of literature on trusteeship, such as books, articles, and pamphlets on governance and board development; however, most of the works were “armchair studies or prescriptive exhortations by seasoned practitioners such as Houle, Nason, O’Connell, or Zwingle” (p. 3). In their research, Chait et al. (1993) develop a six-dimensional profile of board effectiveness; however, there have been few, if any, studies published using Chait et al.’s (1993) model to determine whether board development actually improved the effectiveness of a community college governing board. This study used results from Holland and Blackmon’s (1994) Board Self Assessment Questionnaire (BSAQ), based on Chait et al.’s (1993) study, to determine if North Carolina community college governing boards supported board development, and, in turn, how board development affected other areas of effectiveness.

Another problem addressed in the study was whether community colleges were implementing board development and if board development had a positive impact on other areas of community college governing board effectiveness using Chait et al.’s
conceptual model of board effectiveness measured by Holland and Blackmon’s (1994) $BSAQ$. Finally, the study analyzed overall effectiveness ratings among community college governing boards in North Carolina using results from the $BSAQ$.

**Purpose**

One purpose of this study was to determine whether North Carolina community college governing boards reflected the normal homogeneity of higher education boards or whether there was a significant difference in the composition of boards related to such variables as race or ethnicity. This study investigated the selection of North Carolina community college trustees by three different appointing agencies: the governor’s office, the local board(s) of education, and the local board(s) of county commissioners. The study examined whether community college trustee appointments reflected the homogeneity found in previous studies or if the composition of community colleges governing boards in North Carolina were more heterogeneous. Another purpose of the study was to analyze responses from less experienced, first-term community college trustees and those trustees who had served two terms or longer regarding board development. Finally, the last purpose of the study was to correlate $BSAQ$ scores with overall scores that provided how trustees perceived the effectiveness of their governing board.

**Research Questions**

A broader research question for this study focused on the relationship between the three North Carolina community college trustee appointing agencies, the governor’s office, the local board of county commissioners and the local board of education, and their appointments to community college trusteeships. Afterwards, a more specific
examination focused specifically on board development as related to Chait et al.’s (1993) dimensional profile, and finally board development and its impact on board effectiveness. The following research questions guided this study:

- Research Question 1: Using a random sample of North Carolina community college trustees, is there a significant relationship between appointing agencies and demographic data?
- Research Question 2: Does the respondent data set reflect similar demographic characteristics of the sample data set?
- Research Question 3: Using the respondent data set, is there a significant relationship between trustee service (first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer) and variables such as age, highest level of education, participation in board development activities, board dynamics, preparation for board matters, primary sources of information, and frequency of board evaluations?
- Research Question 4: Do first-term trustees have the same perception of board effectiveness as trustees serving two terms or longer?
- Research Question 5: Using responses from the education or builds learning dimension (BL2 through BL51) on the BS4Q, are there significant differences between the means of first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer?
- Research Question 6: Do institutional BS4Q sub scores reflect overall trustee perceptions of effectiveness?

The study will also include the following four open-ended questions:

- In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?
• What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?
• What topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would you like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee?
• What concerns do you believe will be important to your board five years from now?

Importance of the Study

This study has implications in three important areas. First, this study added to the body of literature related to the selection process of community college trustees. This study has provided a demographic profile of individuals appointing agencies in North Carolina have selected to serve as community college trustees. This study has also added to the literature concerning governing board effectiveness. Using community college governing boards, this study implemented Chait et al.’s (1993) conceptual model of board effectiveness and Holland and Blackmon’s (1994) BSAQ to determine the level of board development and its impact on other areas of effectiveness. Finally, the study related sub scores on the BSAQ to overall board effectiveness scores generated by North Carolina community college trustees.

Limitations of the Study

Though the limitations of this research study are numerous, some of the more significant limitations include the following:

1. The scope of the study was limited to North Carolina only.
2. Community college trustees in North Carolina are selected by three different appointing agencies: the governor’s office, the local board(s) of county commissioners, and the local board(s) of education. Other states have different
methods for selection such as popular elections for community college trustees. The results of this study may not be reflective of individuals who have been elected to the position of community college trustee.

3. The lack of comparative data was considered a limitation in itself. There have been few, if any, published reports of community college governing boards assessing their effectiveness using the BSAQ.

4. The term “effectiveness” may be defined differently among the various types of governing boards.

5. Self-assessments are not always consistent with assessments by observers or with other indicators of organizational performance.

The various questions that may naturally arise from these limitations should yield significant opportunities for replication of this study in different states and different institutions of higher education throughout the United States.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Trusteeship

Since the establishment of colleges and universities, trustees individually and trustees collectively as governing boards have been both revered and vilified. The following comments from a variety of sources represent some of the less than flattering opinions formed over time about governing boards and the trustees who comprise these boards:

- “Effective governance by a board of trustees is a relatively rare and unnatural act” (Chait et al., 1996, p. 1);
- “Current community college governance suffers from poor design and poor execution” (Davis, 2000, p. 2);
- “Boards of trustees seem either not to know what’s going on or not to care” (Abbott, 1970, p. 531);
- “Trustees are out to lunch” (Schaefer, 2002, p. 32); and

In addition, Chait et al. (1996) provided commentary that viewed trustees as “often little more than high-powered, well-intentioned people engaged in low-level activities” (p. 1). When trustees unite to work together as a board, Chait et al. (1996) offered that the board “typically performs below capacity and, from an institutional perspective, a potentially valuable asset goes underutilized” (p. 2). Schaefer (2002) stated, “The board of trustees is asleep at the switch” (p. 34). Moore (1973) added, “The board of trustees is, perhaps, the most uninformed and incompetent component in a community college structure” (p. 173). A community college president in Winner’s (1986) study of
governing boards in North Carolina added that “trustees possess a vast reservoir of influence and power, but are loosely connected within institutions in ordinary times, are called upon chiefly in the stress of selecting a new president, but otherwise in a perfunctory way, approve annually or semi-annually the doings of the continuing administration” (p. 5).

Students, faculty, and administrators have expressed their frustration regarding trustees as well. Many students have expressed the perception that trustees were outsiders to their own institution and only came to campus for special occasions (Doser, 1976). Doser (1976) provided the following commentary regarding student perspectives related to college trustees: “Trustees are dictatorial, narrow-minded, establishment old bags who couldn’t possibly understand or sympathize with the problems students face” (p. 12). Administrators have viewed trustees as major personnel problems requiring delicate handling (Doser, 1976). Finally, faculty members have perceived trustees as “those people who meet only a few hours a month yet make all the educational decisions for the institution” (Doser, 1976, p. 10).

James Fisher, president emeritus of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and a consultant for boards gone awry, stated that community college trustees represent one of the most serious problems in contemporary higher education (Wright, 1998). Fisher stressed that trustees are often misled and ill advised in the decisions they make for an institution. He also believed that community college trustees have a tendency to micromanage institutions, meaning community college trustees are more susceptible to become too involved in administrative matters simply because they live in the actual service area of the institution. Currently, many community college
presidents have decided to resign before their contracts were over simply because
governing boards have meddled in institutional affairs. Also, presidents have to deal with
infighting within boards, primarily political power struggles within the group (Wright,
1998).

Others observers of higher education have actually viewed governing boards in a
much more positive light. Herron (1969) stated, “The board of trustees is the single most
important agency of an institution” (p. ix). Duryea (2000), who has traced the
importance of governing boards over the past several hundred years, stated that
“governing boards have contributed in a fundamental manner to the transition from a few
small colleges in a rural, colonial society to the complex system of colleges and
universities we know today” (p. xiv). Ingram (1980) stated, “The lay governing board
remains higher education’s best hope for coping successfully with the challenges that lie
ahead for our colleges and universities” (p. 1). Lee (1997) believes that trustees are
responsible for directing institutions of higher education into the future. Lee (1997)
stated, “Trustees are at the forefront of higher education efforts to fulfill an increasingly
broad and complex mission. They face unparalleled challenges as leaders of
‘democracy’s colleges’” (p. 87).

In their publication Community College Trustees: Leading on Behalf of Their
Communities, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stressed, “Service on a college or university
board of trustees is an important statement on American democracy; these lay boards
make it possible for our institutions of higher education to function effectively in a
society committed to democratic ideals” (p. 6). In addition, Kerr and Gade (1989) stated
that they do not support the “critical views and gross caricatures” (p. 28) regarding
trustees in higher education. In fact, Kerr and Gade (1989) wrote that boards are actually getting better in many areas such as their relationships with faculty, their representation of the population as a whole, and their decreased involvement with special interests.

Many observers of higher education view boards of trustees as organizations that actually protect intellectual freedom and serve to make institutions relevant to the general society today (Nason, 1982). Kerr and Gade (1989) also believed that boards are less likely to interfere with academic freedom and “have access to more experienced potential board members” (p. 28) now than ever before. Kerr and Gade (1989) explained that any negative criticism placed on trustees in higher education has been due to the governing board’s increased responsibilities of managing the tremendous and often unrealistic oversight of systems with several campuses or even multiple institutions.

Kerr and Gade (1989) depicted boards of trustees as guardians that manage the welfare of the institution, protect academic freedom, and protect the public welfare in conducting institutional affairs. Other observers in the field of higher education believe that boards of trustees have prescribed roles and responsibilities that they are supposed to fulfill, such as appointing the president of the institution, approving the budget and long range plans, appointing and dismissing personnel, conferring degrees, setting fees and tuitions, and overseeing educational programs (Cohen, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Deegan & Gollattscheck, 1985; Dowdy, 1996; Ingram, 1997; Moore, 1973; Nason, 1980; Nason, 1982).

Since the colonial period, American higher education has used elected or appointed boards to reflect the collective will and wisdom of the people in the United States. At the grass roots level, the local community college board has always been
viewed as a link between the college and community (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The community college governing board’s primary role has been to translate community needs into policies to ensure a quality education and to protect the institution from external forces that could cause harm. Cohen and Brawer (1996), in *The American Community College*, stressed that trustees must be vigilant to protect the institutions from special interests, both internally and externally.

As noted earlier, Nason (1982) stated that not everyone has viewed the past role of boards of trustees with approval or confidence. In various situations it has been customary to denigrate trustees as either “absentee landlords” or “unintelligent busybodies” (Nason, 1982, p. 14). Nason (1982), in *The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards*, pointed out that too few boards have taken seriously the task of organizing their own business and clarifying their own role and responsibilities. Corson (1975) stated that trustees have spent entirely too little time with the governance of institutions and that few trustees have had any familiarity with the problems of higher education or the processes of colleges and universities. Moore (1973) believed that many trustees on boards were not professional educators and had no unity of purpose, while Wood (1985) believed that boards were seen as too socially and demographically homogeneous to govern diverse institutions. Moore (1973) wrote that most governing boards were considered nothing more than rubber stamps of the college administration. Citing another extreme, Davis (2000) wrote that many governing boards have refused to draw a distinct line between their responsibilities and the responsibilities of their presidents, thus micromanaging all aspects of the institution. Currently, as in the past, criticism of boards of trustees has ranged from alleged wasteful
spending to poor institutional responsiveness to the needs of the public (Michael & Schwartz, 1999). Kerr and Gade (1989) believed that “the governance of individual institutions of higher education needs more constant and explicit attention than it now receives by boards of trustees” (p. 14). Kerr and Gade (1989) stated that their greatest concern, especially in the public sector, was that trustees were participating more out of self-interest or were representing an internal or external constituency. During their research, Kerr and Gade (1989) found that some boards had lost so much of their influence that “they were becoming ineffective internally and increasingly in danger of losing the confidence of elected officials and the public in their ability to govern” (p. 136).

**Historical Perspective**

Boards of trustees, regents, or visitors, by whatever name they are called, are lay citizens responsible for a sizable portion of the governance of American colleges and universities (Zoglin, 1976). Like several American traditions, the concept of higher education governance by lay people came from Europe. The very prototype of today’s American boards of trustees appeared during the Italian Renaissance when municipalities took over management of some universities and selected four or more citizens to oversee the conduct of the institutions (Heilbron, 1973). Over the past several centuries, governance of higher education institutions has experienced many intriguing developments that have eventually impacted the overall governing structure of lay trusteeship in the United States. From faculty-governed institutions in France to student-governed institutions in Italy and Germany to contemporary Calvinistic ideals of governance that began at universities in Leyden and Edinburgh, tracing the evolution or
the transformation of governance in higher education demonstrates mankind’s attempt at perfecting the very best and least intrusive leadership for its institutions of higher education. Whether the groups of individuals are called boards of regents, boards of visitors, or boards of trustees, lay citizens are primarily responsible for helping to govern American colleges and universities (Kerr & Gade, 1989; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Zwingle (1980) stressed that “failure to understand the evolution of a system such as trusteeship can lead to false expectations about it or to misconceptions of alternatives to it” (p. 15).

One of the most distinctive characteristics of college and university trusteeship in the United States is that trustee control is vested in individuals who are not professional educators at an institution but rather nonacademic professionals in areas such as the clergy, banking, business, law, and medicine, a phenomenon usually described as lay control (Rauh, 1969). Trustees for many of the first institutions of higher education in colonial America and after independence from Great Britain were primarily clergy and lay church leaders. Each institution had students and faculty representing a major religion or possibly multiple sects, a legislature that provided institutional control through appointing trustees, and funding from a variety of sources such as donations, legislative appropriations, and student tuition (Cohen, 1998). Zwingle (1980) believed that there were two primary underlying principles for using lay boards when colonists founded institutions of higher education in colonial America. First, having a lay board prevented the threat of undue control that could exist if educational professionals, church officials, institutional administrators, or even students had complete opportunity to govern. Also, many founders felt that faculty interest was always present in a college or university, so
having faculty on the board would only create some type of unchecked monopoly that would present a threat to any public self-interests (Zwingle, 1980). In his book entitled *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities*, Rauh (1969) stated that lay control also presented governing boards of American institutions of higher education with dual authority, which gave the board complete authority to manage the institution as well as to control institutional finances. More importantly, Schuster and Miller (1989), in their work *Governing Tomorrow’s Campus: Perspectives and Agendas*, wrote that from all the characteristics of governance in American higher education that lay control would withstand the test of time and continue to provide an essential service to all institutions. Moreover, Kerr and Gade (1989), in *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities*, stated that lay trustees are “a gift of history” (p. 17).

Like many of our other traditions in higher education, the idea of governance by lay boards came from Europe. In Europe the universities had evolved from self-governing groups of instructors and students or from within a court or church hierarchy itself. The French institutions of higher education struggled for control with the French monarchy and then with the Catholic Church, with control finally resting with the faculty. For example, at one time, students at the University of Paris were taught church doctrine and principles of theology along with their main course of study. However, once faculty wrestled control from the other constituencies, the professors designed the courses of study; neither the church nor the government had as much impact. Prototypes of lay or external trusteeship of higher education developed in Italy as early as the 12th century when the Italian city-states appointed boards of citizens as liaisons between university students and their instructors. Interestingly, the Italian students had created trade guilds
during the time so they could hire instructors and then decide various arrangements for instruction, facilities, and an administrative body. Students actually controlled the Italian institutions of higher education by filling administrative positions and making all governance decisions. For example, the Italian students held instructors accountable for poor preparation, tardiness, absenteeism, and other academic failings (Cohen, 1998; Ingram, 1993; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Zwingle, 1980). In addition, when describing student governance of Bologna University in Germany, Kerr and Gade (1989) stated the following:

Faculty members had no vote in matters, they had to swear an oath of allegiance to their student rulers, and they were subject to expulsion by students. They could not leave campus without permission. Professors with poor lectures were fined. (p. 11)

With student-driven governance at institutions, such as those in Italy and then later in Germany, students controlled faculties much more strictly than faculties control students presently (Cohen, 1998). Kerr and Gade (1989) even noted how students themselves behaved as the parent, or in loco parentis to faculty, a complete reversal from their contemporary counterparts. Once students created their own special university through multiple guilds or organizations, they would hire faculty and also set rules governing the courses of study, examinations, and the awarding of degrees. Many of the Italian student universities were placed under public control after student governance became beleaguered with claims of unfairness against the professoriate and even the local townspeople (Kerr & Gade, 1989). The evolution from student control to lay control occurred when professors and city officials joined forces to break the powerful student guilds that had combined to form learning institutions. As a result, an appointed board of
curators, or trustees, began administering the government grants, supervising the professoriate, and controlling the students (Kerr & Gade, 1989).

The responsibility for the community as a whole is to educate its citizens through the churches and state, a product of the Protestant Reformation (Kerr & Gade, 1989). Kerr and Gade (1989) stated, “The public interest should be in the hands of the public through citizen involvement” (p. 18). During the Protestant Reformation, John Calvin believed that it was “safer and more bearable for a number to exercise government, so that they may help one another and teach and admonish one another, and if one asserts himself unfairly, there may be a number of censors and masters to restrain his willfulness” (Kerr & Gade, 1989, pp. 17-18). Ingram (1993) wrote that the origins of lay boards in the United States are by-products of the Protestant Reformation, especially in what were considered Calvinistic institutions of higher education. Zwingle (1980) explained in an article entitled “Evolution of Lay Governing Boards” that Calvin’s theories regarding moderation and social control initiated a more dramatic participation of lay boards in governing social institutions, such as in churches and institutions of higher education. Founders of institutions of higher education used Calvin’s fear of a tyrannical leader or the anarchy of a mob as a guide for developing the lay board concept (Kerr & Gade, 1989). John Calvin founded The Academy, which was the first of the “Reformation colleges that embodied this theory of lay control” (Kerr & Gade, 1989, p. 18). Other institutions that incorporated Calvin’s theory of lay, or nonacademic, control included the University of Leyden, which used a board of curators who were selected by a body of noblemen and by the provincial legislature, and the University of Edinburgh, which was controlled directly by the town’s council (Kerr & Gade, 1989). Having the
ownership and control of the colleges centered outside the institutions themselves was quite different than the earlier student-controlled institutions in Italy and Germany or the faculty-controlled institutions of France, thus presenting an ever-evolving concept of institutional governance (Zwingle, 1980). Another form of lay control in higher education developed at Trinity College, in Ireland, when it adopted a bicameral form of lay governance. Trinity College had an internal board of fellows, who owned and operated the institution. In addition, another board, called the board of visitors, made up of seven laymen, was appointed to serve as outside supervisors (Zwingle, 1980).

As stated previously, the influence of the Protestant Reformation forced the colonists at the time to create a form of institutional governance based upon two principles that have affected higher education governance since the beginning of the nation. According to Zwingle (1980), the first principle stated that “the unchecked monopoly was a threat to the public good” (p. 15), and the second principle stated that “education is too important to the public interests to rely totally for its governance on the faculty whose self interests, as with any professional group, is ever present” (Zwingle, 1980, pp. 15-16).

Harvard, the first college in America, established the first board of trustees in this country in 1636, and the role of the lay trustees in governance of higher education has evolved ever since. With as many as 35 graduates coming from the institution, the Puritans, who settled the Massachusetts Bay Company, modeled Harvard after Emmanuel College, Cambridge University (Ingram, 1993; Schuster & Miller, 1989; Zwingle, 1980) and used Emmanuel’s patterns of lay trusteeship for Harvard as well (Cohen, 1998; Houle, 1989; Zwingle, 1980). Within the confines of British law, a college was created
by a legislative enactment naming an external group of magistrates or ministers as the
governing board (Schuster & Miller, 1989). The General Court, or the legislature of the
Massachusetts Bay Colony, agreed to establish Harvard College and later arranged a
board of overseers, comprised of leading men throughout the colony, to be the initial
governing body (Cohen, 1998). What was so unusual was this form of governance was
in direct contrast with many of the colleges within Oxford and Cambridge themselves,
where senior faculty members comprised their governing bodies, the board of governors,
and “who in turn relied on a single visitor from outside the college to adjudicate
irreconcilable disputes” (Zwingle, 1980, p. 16). Because Harvard’s board of overseers
had infrequent meetings due to problems of traveling in the 17th century, then Harvard
President Dunster, using Trinity College in Ireland as a model, had the board of overseers
amend the college’s charter to include both external and internal boards (Ingram, 1993;
Kerr & Gade, 1989). The internal board included the president and tutors, or faculty, and
the board of overseers was considered the external board with lay members. Eventually,
the internal board became rather ineffective because of high instructor turnover rate and
the eventual firing of the president (Houle, 1989). Although Harvard had two governing
boards, one lay and the other comprising the college’s administration and faculty, the lay
board, or board of overseers, was clearly the controlling group (Cohen, 1998). Later,
American colleges and universities continued to incorporate this tradition of lay
leadership.

The College of William and Mary, the second colonial college founded in 1693,
had dual boards as well. The purpose of William and Mary was to prepare clergymen for
service in the Anglican Church, civilize the Indians, and prepare civil servants (Cohen,
The charter of the College of William and Mary, written in 1693 and similar to others, spelled out the concept of trusteeship as the form of governance of the institution (Williams, 1980). The charter called for two boards: an internal board of governors, which included the president and faculty, and an external board of visitors, which consisted of laymen and clergymen from all areas of Virginia who created statutes for the college and had ultimate authority with the board of governors subordinate to them (Cohen, 1998; Ingram, 1993; Rudolph, 1990). Again, similar to Harvard, the dual roles of the two boards at William and Mary did not work because of role conflicts (Ingram, 1993). Later, Virginia Governor Thomas Jefferson, who strongly believed in lay control over faculty control, solidified the authority of the Board of Visitors through legislative measures (Kerr & Gade, 1989).

The College of Rhode Island, or Brown University, was the third and last colonial college to adopt dual boards (Kerr & Gade, 1989). Like Harvard and the College of William and Mary, the internal board of administrators and faculty at Brown lost its power to the lay board. In each case, the dual board model failed because of conflicting roles between the two boards, with the more powerful external board with lay members created for ultimate authority finally governing the institutions (Cohen, 1998).

The first American model for college governance with a single board first emerged at Yale University. A group of external ministers were empowered to serve as trustees for purposes of founding a collegiate school. The Collegiate School of Connecticut, founded in 1701, now known as Yale University, served as the governance model for most colleges that followed by establishing a self-perpetuating single board of lay people, or in Yale’s case, clergy. The Connecticut General Court appointed 10
clergymen as trustees to organize the institution (Cohen, 1998; Ingram, 1993). With Yale as a model, an external board of trustees became a key feature of American higher education. The clergy exercised internal control as well as external control by serving as presidents and governing board trustees. However, as time passed, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stated, “Clergy lost their positions as college presidents to secular leaders in most institutions and became less important as members of governing boards, especially in non-denominational and public institutions” (p. 4).

Before the American Revolution, faculty and boards often fought for control of the colonial colleges. More importantly, after the fight for independence, external or lay board control would prevail over any other individual or group (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Rudolph (1990), as well, asserted that by the mid 18th century, although not completely unique, a basic pattern of governance, control of the institution residing in a board of non-resident, non-academic trustees, emerged as the primary characteristic of American colleges. After the Revolutionary War, boards of trustees gradually transferred the responsibility of management of the institution to the president. Rudolph (1990) explained in *The American College and University* that in the early American colleges only the president could go before the governing board as a man of learning or as a representative of the faculty. As time passed, the president was in a position to become a faculty representative to the board or even share governance with the faculty to some measure; however, the president increasingly became the representative of an absentee board of trustees and less the leader of the college faculty (Rudolph, 1990). In addition to lay governance, the actual position of president would separate the American institutions of higher education even more so from the governance structure of many European
institutions. Duplicating the same governance pattern as private institutions, state
colleges and universities as well used lay boards of trustees who also became responsible
for making policy and overseeing fiscal matters but also for appointing a president who
would manage the daily affairs of the institution and who was answerable only to the
board (Cohen, 1998).

An important court case, The Dartmouth College case in 1819, created the distinction
between private and public institutions. Vaughan and Weisman (1997) explained the
background for the Dartmouth College case with the following:

The early colleges and their lay governing boards had to decide how to
incorporate their institutions under public statutes while preserving academic
freedom of faculty, serving the public good, and rejecting undue influence from
special interest groups, including politicians and business leaders. (p. 4)

The primary question centered on whether these early colonial institutions were
under the authority of the state legislatures or were the governing boards the ultimate
authority over the institution. In other words, the basic legal question at hand, according
to Kerr and Gade (1989), was the following: “Were the colleges civil bodies, under the
jurisdiction of and subject to change by the legislature, or were they charitable trusts,
responsible only to their founders and subsequent designees” (p. 22)? According to the
Supreme Court, Dartmouth College was a private institution accountable to its founders
because its charter designated it as a charitable institution (Kerr & Gade, 1989).
Institutions that had separate charters independent from the state legislature were
considered private. Moreover, lay trustees of public institutions with state charters, such
as the University of Georgia, the University of North Carolina, and the University of
Virginia, were, according to state authority, responsible for these institutions and were “therefore responsible to the public for their own actions and the actions of their institutions” (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997, p. 5). As a result, according to Cohen (1998), public institutions had the state constitution or state statutes that described their governance structure, while in the case of private institutions the articles of incorporation and the state license covered their authority structure.

During the 19th century, a division of responsibilities became evident among trustees, the college president, and the faculty. Many more boards began to delegate academic decisions to the administration and faculty (Duryea, 2000). Trustees soon began to focus primarily on overseeing the business aspect of the institution and letting the president and his administration handle the daily affairs. After the Civil War, many colleges faced dwindling financial resources, so they approached the state legislatures for funding. These financial pressures to survive during the latter part of the 19th century led to gradual changes in the composition of boards of trustees. Duryea (2000), in The Academic Corporation: A History of College and University Governing Boards, stated that the most predominant change was how alumni of the institution, especially those who represented business and law, replaced the clergy that had been so dominant at the turn of the 19th century. Trustees had normally dominated matters of policy, instruction, discipline, and facility construction and use. However, in the latter part of the 19th century, as stated previously, the president had taken over as executive in charge. Governing boards then had to deal with campuses that were much more complex, with a greater selection of programs of study leading to a greater number of faculty and students. Trustees for those first institutions of higher education were mainly clergymen.
and lay church leaders since many early colleges and universities were closely related to
the church. However, by the late 19th century, business and professional men took over
as trustees as the public system of higher education expanded (Heilbron, 1973).

By the 20th century, trustees had to deal with the complexities of a significantly
larger institution, complicated financial situations, and overwhelming organizational
responsibilities (Duryea, 2000). With the complexity of universities, trustees and
presidents started to rely more heavily on faculty for their expertise on academic affairs.
President Eliot of Harvard stated, “The governing bodies of American universities being
generally composed of men not themselves experts in any of the university’s activities,
the real direction of those activities devolves on the professors and other teachers; and
there is no avoiding this delegation of power” (Duryea, 2000, p. 185). Moreover, this
reliance on faculty eventually prompted the founding of the American Association of
University Professors (AAUP) in 1915. Kerr and Gade (1989) believed that the very
specialization of research institutions automatically provided faculty a voice in the
governance of the institution. Later in the 20th century, students were another group that
wanted a voice in governance, along with trustees and faculty. As stated previously,
students in Europe dominated faculty at one time. As governance evolved, faculty
dominated students 400 years later in the American institutions before the Civil War. At
the beginning of the 20th century, students were beginning to be treated more like adults.
Eventually, by the 1960s, student trustees emerged to fulfill roles on boards, usually as
non-voting members (Duryea, 2000; Kerr & Gade, 1989). As institutions became more
research-based, their boards of trustees were becoming much more flexible in their
viewpoints regarding academics. However, governance was an entirely different issue
especially for public institutions because sunshine laws, which are open meeting laws that require boards to meet publicly and to make minutes available to the press and the public, could actually “inhibit open discussion of alternative courses of action and force the board to rely more heavily on administrative recommendations” (Kerr & Gade, 1989, p. 25).

Community Colleges

In addition to growth of public and private colleges and universities, the 20th century had another institutional form emerge in higher education called the community college. Community colleges were created as open-door higher education institutions that belonged to their local service area. The community college was established to be responsive and accessible to a variety of individuals such as vocational students, remedial students, college transfer students, and several other types of students (Martin, 1997). Many community college boards of trustees were modeled similarly to private university boards; however, community college boards have usually consisted of individuals only in the immediate service area of the college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Kerr & Gade, 1989).

In the article “Opportunities and Challenges for Boards in Times of Change,” Martin (1997) stressed that community college trustees must become familiar with the community college concept, the institution for which they serve, and the importance of the institution’s initial trustee orientation. Martin (1997) stated, “It is essential that trustees study and understand the history and role of the community college. The initial orientation of the board members should include significant information on the history and role of the community college” (p. 58). The local board of a community college often serves as a connection between the college itself and the community. Community
college boards of trustees “translate community needs for education into college policies and protect the college from external demands” (Cohen & Brawer, 1996, p. 120).

Although community colleges are fairly new institutions on the higher education scene, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stated that the roots of community college governance can be traced back to colonial America:

> It is the milieu of lay control, public ownership, public trust, and public service that community college trustees perform their duties. Building upon proud traditions extending back to colonial times, today’s community college trustees, through their daily activities and devotion, fulfill their commitment to the community college mission. (p. 12)

Furthermore, Helen B. Dowdy, a former executive director of the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees (NCACCT), stated, “A community college trustee is a member of a board empowered to a body corporate to hold in trust the real and personal assets of the community college for the benefit of the students and other citizens of the state” (p. 4). Dowdy (1996) also expressed, “The effectiveness of the institution is grounded in the effectiveness of individual members acting as a corporate body in official board sessions” (p. 5). Because community college boards are considered public corporations, they are legally responsible for all college affairs, such as the hiring and firing of personnel and the bidding and purchasing of materials for the college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Trustees are representatives of the entire service area of the community college. Although a community college governing board is made up of individuals, the governing board, acting as a whole, represents the legal authority of the institution. In North Carolina, for example, the governing board of each individual
community college must work effectively not only within itself but also with other
groups such as lawmakers, policymakers, administrators, faculty, and students (Dowdy, 1996).

**North Carolina Community College System**

North Carolina has been one of the states at the forefront promoting community
colleges for several decades. The North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS)
is the primary agency for the delivery of job training, literacy, and adult education across
North Carolina (Simmons, 2003, June 2). During the 2000-2001 academic year, an
unduplicated headcount shows that the NCCCS served 776,000 people (NCCCS, 2002).
Community colleges in North Carolina conferred one out of every five, or 19,022, of the
state’s high school diplomas, and employers across North Carolina have formed
partnerships with community colleges to provide basic skills instruction at the worksite
for almost 13,000 employees (NCCCS, 2002). English as a second language (ESL)
classes served 41,426 students, and almost 53,000 students were enrolled in some form of
distance learning (NCCCS, 2002). More than two-thirds of the students who attend
community colleges in North Carolina work either part-time or full-time jobs. Many of
the students who attend community colleges in North Carolina are older adults. The
average community college student in North Carolina enrolled in a curriculum program is
30 years old, and those who are in continuing education are an average of 36 years old
(NCCCS, 2002).

The NCCCS has developed quite rapidly over the past 50 years. After World War
II, as North Carolina’s economic base changed significantly over time, from a
predominantly agricultural economy to one more industrial, state leaders recognized that
a different kind of education was needed, especially for those people who wanted a high school education but not necessarily a four-year baccalaureate education (Dowdy, 1996; NCCCS, 2003). In 1952, North Carolina’s State Superintendent of Public Instruction authorized a study for the need of a system of tax-supported community colleges (Dowdy, 1996; NCCCS, 2003). In 1952, Dr. Allan S. Hurlburt published a report that proposed a plan for the development of state-supported community colleges in North Carolina. Using information gleaned from the Hurlburt Report, the General Assembly of North Carolina in 1957 passed the first Community College Act, which provided funding for community colleges that would emphasize the arts and sciences, and then later that year the General Assembly provided funding for a statewide system of industrial education centers, which focused on technical and vocational education (Dowdy, 1996; NCCCS, 2003). Finally, a community college system was established by the General Assembly in 1963 (Simmons, 2003).

Community college governance represented a unique situation in education, according to Richardson et al. (1972) in *Governance for the Two-Year College*, because the system was developed with similar elements of secondary schools and the university structure combined. The community college system in North Carolina tried to incorporate elements from both systems into its governance structure. For example, the community college inherited its focus on the teaching-learning process from secondary schools and an organizational structure from traditional higher education governance that viewed the community college president similarly to a university president or chancellor as being the top official in charge of the institution (Richardson et al., 1972). In addition, the two-year community college modeled its curriculum specialization and faculty
ranking on the university system. Community college governance is very similar to the university system in that both systems currently receive funding from the state, both have very similar institutional hierarchal structures, and each institution in both systems has a board of trustees. However, much of the local control of the community colleges lies in the hands of the local boards of trustees that serve each institution rather than a central state board (Richardson et al., 1972).

By 1961, there were five public junior colleges and seven industrial education centers in North Carolina. In 1962, Governor Terry Sanford appointed the Governor’s Commission on Education Beyond the High School, a commission that examined how to coordinate the two post-high school educational systems at that time, community colleges and industrial education centers, found throughout the state. The commission, chaired by Irving Carlyle, recommended that the two types of institutions be combined into one administrative organization under the State Board of Education and provide local boards of trustees for each institution (Dowdy, 1996; Senger, 1966). The Carlyle report became the foundation for the current community college governance system in North Carolina. The Carlyle report established two levels of governance for the proposed system. The community colleges were first to be placed under one existing statewide agency, the State Board of Education. Although it was recommended that community colleges be supervised on the state level by one agency, the commission also recommended, as stated previously, that a board of local trustees govern each institution. The local trustees were to have responsibility for the following: “initiative in the selection of community college personnel; in the establishment of college policies, procedures, and curriculum; and in the location, design and construction of college physical facilities subject to the rules and
regulations of the State Board” (Segner, 1966, p. 125.) The report stated that the final product should be a unified community college system that would provide comprehensive post-high school education. The Carlyle report also recommended the method of local board membership. The 12 voting members of each local board were to be appointed by the governor, the local board of county commissioners, and the local board of education--with each agency appointing four members (Segner, 1966). The Carlyle report passed almost entirely intact and later became the basis for General Statute (GS) 115A, the original law outlining community colleges and technical institutes in North Carolina (Segner, 1966).

At the recommendation of the Carlyle Commission, the General Assembly enacted GS 115A, later changed to its current title GS 115D, which provided for the establishment of a Department of Community Colleges under the State Board of Education. However, in 1979, the General Assembly changed the state control of the system by making a provision for a separate State Board of Community Colleges. The State Board of Community Colleges was appointed and organized in 1980, and at its inception met conjointly with the State Board of Education several times before assuming sole responsibility for community colleges across the state. The new state board assumed full responsibilities for the community college system on January 1, 1981 (Dowdy, 1996; NCCCS, 2003).

The North Carolina General Assembly has currently assigned the State Board of Community Colleges to oversee 58 public community colleges and the North Carolina Center for Applied Textile Technology. The General Assembly has given the State Board full authority to adopt all policies, regulations, and standards it may deem
necessary for the operation of the community college system. Eventually, the General Assembly officially changed the community college system office name from the Department of Community Colleges to the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) Office (Dowdy, 1996).

The 21 members of the State Board are selected by the governor and the General Assembly. The lieutenant governor and the state treasurer are ex officio members of the State Board. The governor appoints ten members, four from the state at large and one from each of the six trustee regions across the state. Four are elected by the State Senate and four more by the State House. The president or vice president of the North Carolina Comprehensive Community College Student Government Association (NCCCCSGA) serves as an ex officio member. The terms are staggered and expire every odd-numbered year. No person may be appointed or elected to more than two consecutive terms of six years. The State Board meets at least ten times per year to evaluate the recommendations of the NCCCS Office, to set policy for the community college system, and to oversee its operations. Members elect a board chair to serve as the Board’s leader, spokesperson, and presiding officer. The State Board has three major functions: distributing funds equitably and maintaining fiscal accountability; establishing and maintaining state priorities, and providing educational program approval and accountability (Dowdy, 1996; NCCCS, 2003).

At the local level, each of the colleges currently operates under a board of trustees. Each board is composed of a minimum of 12 citizens from the college’s service area who are appointed for staggered four-year terms. The president of the student body serves as an ex officio, non-voting member, creating a minimum total of 13. The local
board of education and the local board of county commissioners select four trustees each, and the governor appoints four members as well. However, depending upon the college’s service area, there may be more than 12 trustees on a governing board. Community colleges that serve more than one county may include trustees selected by the board of county commissioners and boards of education from other counties. Each board of trustees sets local policy. By state statute, local community college board governance structure has considerable authority, including employing the president and approving all budgets and curriculum matters subject to final approval by the State Board of Community Colleges (NCCCS, 2003).

**Community College Trustees**

Gleazer (1985), in the article “Governance and the Shifting Role of the Board of Trustees,” stated that during the early days of community colleges in the nation board members knew very little about the nature of the community college, its mission or its philosophy, so trustees would search for presidents who had some expertise in higher education, and, in turn, trustees would rely heavily upon the president for guidance. Community college trustees in North Carolina, as well as others across the United States, should understand the overall mission and operation of their institution, the criteria required for awarding certificates, diplomas and degrees, and the problems and concerns of the disadvantaged and physically challenged students. Furthermore, trustees should be committed to providing quality programs for the citizens of their service areas (Gleazer, 1985).

Since community colleges enroll students from various backgrounds, these institutions are frequently the only opportunity many Americans have of obtaining a
higher education. For example, almost 50% of all first-time college students in the nation enroll in community colleges, and more than 45% of minority students enrolled in higher education in the United States attend a community college (Cohen, 1998; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Ever since Harvard was established, an individual serving on a college or university board of trustees is seen as a significant position in American society and as an important avenue for fulfilling one’s civic responsibilities (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Vaughan and Weisman (1997) provided principles they believe have shaped the mission of most community colleges across the nation and that every community college trustee should understand. Every community college should operate upon these principles:

- A commitment to serving all segments of society through an open-door access admissions policy;
- A commitment to a comprehensive educational program that offers programs and courses leading to employment or transfer to a four-year institution;
- A commitment, as a community-based institution, to serving the community through the concern for its health and welfare;
- A commitment to teaching rather than to research; and
- A commitment to lifelong learning for all who can profit from such learning.

(Vaughan & Weisman, 1997, pp. 9-10)

Serving as a community college trustee is an extremely important responsibility in higher education. Trustee responsibilities include overseeing all academic programs, approving faculty appointments, and shaping long-range plans, mission statements, and college policies (Cohen, 1998; Nason, 1980; Nason, 1982; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997).
In addition, trustees spend billions of dollars of public money in any given fiscal year and also select community college presidents who serve at the pleasure of the board (Nason, 1982; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Community college trustees also are responsible for the educational experiences of more than five million students who enroll in community college courses each year. Community college trustees invest their time, energy, knowledge, experience, and talents in improving their community colleges, thereby improving the quality of life for millions of individuals. Most community college trustees consider the community college a special institution and consider serving on its board a special privilege (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997).

According to the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), community college trustees generally live in the communities in which they govern and are professionals, business owners, and/or managers. Moreover, they act as community leaders in their roles as trustees. Board members are responsible for ensuring that their college is serving the needs of the community and for adopting, following, and enforcing standards of conduct that respect the public trust (Shults, 2001). The board of trustees is the legal entity that is responsible for maintaining statues, entering into legal contracts, appointing and dismissing personnel, promoting and ranking staff, setting fees and tuition, conferring degrees, and authorizing expenditures. Finally, the community college board of trustees is also the intermediary between the various constituencies of the college and the liaison between the state and the college as well as the local community (Moore, 1973).

Blackmon (1970) stated that community college trustees are servants not only of their communities but of the state as well. Being a member of a system of statewide
institutions across North Carolina, community college trustees cannot neglect their responsibility to push education forward on a unified statewide basis. Trustees should strive to improve that which already exists and to create new educational opportunities to meet the needs of an ever-changing society (Blackmon, 1970). In responding to the question why would one want to serve as a community college trustee, knowing the frustration and aggravations that may come with the position, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) cite several responses made by trustees in their study such as the following: “I love my country, my state, my community, and it is my responsibility to make life as good as possible for all members of society, and I can do this by helping my community college.” (p. 10). In some cases, trustees believe they need the exposure that trusteeships may offer such as the following: “I need the prestige, or contacts, or public recognition that come with service on the community college’s governing board” (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997, p. 11).

Today, however, according to Taylor (1988), the legitimacy of trustees has been challenged on the grounds that boards are unrepresentative and incompetent to govern. Taylor (1988) stated that boards of trustees are currently not familiar enough with academic matters to presume to substitute their judgment for that of academic experts within the institution. Kerr and Gade (1989) reported that the governance of individual institutions of higher education needed more constant and explicit attention than it now receives by boards of trustees and that a “slow erosion is taking place in the position of boards of trustees and this erosion is now reaching a point of concern in some institutions --and even a point of no return in a few” (p.105). Cohen (1998) stated that trustees have
used their positions as a stepping-stone to further attain higher public office and have also influenced boards to negotiate business contracts with their friends.

The revelations made by Cohen (1998), Kerr and Gade (1989), and Taylor (1988) are not necessarily that unique. Going back almost thirty years, Moore (1973) stated that the “board of trustees was perhaps the most uninformed and incompetent component in a community college structure” (p. 173). Trustees were people who were knowledgeable about their own businesses and vocations but ignorant of the educational enterprise about which they were expected to make decisions. Too often boards accepted their role as the president’s official rubber stamp because they were uninformed and had to depend upon the college’s administration for their data. They were not professional educators, and they did not always have unity of purpose (Moore, 1973). Moore (1973) also stressed that there was no way to guarantee quality on a board. He continued by stating that a board of trustees was a political entity. Moore (1973) did not support the notion that a board of trustees was a body of “public-spirited, selfless, objective, understanding, well-informed, apolitical citizens” (p. 175). Moore (1973) believed that trustees were political fodder whose sole purpose was to carry out the wishes of whoever appointed them. In addition, in the early days of community colleges, Gleazer (1985) stated that board members knew very little about the nature of the community colleges, their mission, or their philosophy; therefore, trustees searched for experienced presidents so trustees could heavily rely upon them for guidance. However, currently trustees are facing more responsibilities and are confronting more complex problems than those addressed in the establishment of the early growth of community colleges.
Potter (1976) stated that the following are the primary responsibilities of a board of trustees:

Selecting, evaluating, and terminating the president; ensuring professional management of the institution; purchasing, constructing, and maintaining facilities; defining the role and mission of the college; engaging in public relations; preserving institutional independence; evaluating institutional performance; creating a climate for change; insisting on being informed; engaging in planning for the institution; and assessing board performance. (pp. 10-16)

Nason (1982) stated that the effectiveness of a board of trustees is more than the sum of the contributions of its individual members. Nason (1982) wrote that the board is an organism and the quality of its performance depends on a variety of organizational factors quite distinct from the individual abilities of the members who compose it. Nason (1982) included other board tasks, such as supporting the president, serving as a court of appeals, overseeing educational programs, and interpreting the community college’s purpose to the community.

A recent AGB (1996) study revealed that there were “too many trustees who lacked a basic understanding of higher education or a significant commitment to it” (p. 11). *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times*, by the AGB’s (1996) Commission on the Academic Presidency, reported, “Many trustees understand neither the concept of service on a board as a public trust nor their responsibilities to the entire institution. In many cases, these problems arise because the state lacks clear criteria for board appointments, and the institutions provide little orientation or training for new board members” (p. 11).
The Selection Process

Kerr and Gade (1989) stated that the erosion of board effectiveness occurs with the selection of incompetent or uninterested individuals. Ingram and Weary (2000) noted that most newly appointed or elected board members “have very little understanding of their responsibilities, the extent of their commitment, or how to cope with ambiguities of trusteeship in responsible ways” (p. 44). Callan and Honetschlager (1991) stated that there are many effective boards and many highly committed and competent individuals who serve on them. However, Callan and Honetschlager (1991) also revealed that “there is a virtual consensus among those who have examined the issue since 1980 that the overall effectiveness of public education governing boards is declining” (p. 3). All analyses attribute the weakening of public governing boards to the quality of board appointments.

Appointing authorities and processes often fail to select the most qualified and committed citizens to serve on boards of public institutions (Callan & Honetschlager, 1991). Callan and Honetschlager (1991) expressed, “The process frequently fails to tap the many diverse pools of talent and commitment in the states, resulting in homogeneous boards that lack the insight and ability to respond to increasingly diverse educational needs (p. 4). Gleazer (1985) cited Griffiths, author of Excellence and the Open Door: An Essential Partnership: A Report of the Commission to Study the Mission, Financing, and Governance of County Colleges, State of New Jersey, who stated, “There has been an erosion in the quality of the members of the boards of trustees of this institution [county colleges] in recent years, and a concomitant increase in the number of members who have important political ties. The trustee board no longer acts as a barrier to the intrusion of
external political forces, but rather serves as a conduit for the exercise of such influence” p. 46). Haro (1995) stressed that “we need to find ways to insure the selection of trustees who offer more qualifications than wealth, who are willing to educate themselves for their responsibilities, and who care about issues beyond finances” (p. 15A). Haro’s (1995) study also indicated that politicians or campus administrators appeared able to manipulate trustees by limiting their exposure to important issues.

Numerous gubernatorial appointments have been based on political ties to the prospective trustees primarily on the amount of money the individual contributed to the governor’s campaign rather than on any demonstrated record of public service or interest in education (Haro, 1995). Cohen and Brawer (1996) also stated that the selection of a trustee might be viewed as a political act in which the appointing authority or voters weigh the costs and benefits of having a certain individual in the position. Moreover, Haro (1995) does not believe that electing trustees of public institutions guarantees any better results than the appointment process.

Interestingly, Haro (1995) stated that trustees in his research appeared preoccupied with issues related to money, institutional prestige, and presidential searches rather than issues involving academic quality or educational access. The participants in an AGB (1998) study stated that appointment is a better means than election for selecting effective and qualified board members. George Vaughan, editor of the Community College Review and a North Carolina State University higher education professor, favors appointed boards as well. However, Vaughan stressed that in the end “what’s most important is that the board speak with one voice. You can’t have a board that is splintered” (Weiger & Wright, 1998, p. 17).
Selection of appointees to trustee positions varies over states but can involve personal knowledge, informal recommendations from others, or even a formal nominating committee that forwards names to the appropriate appointing agencies (Kerr & Gade, 1989). For the election process, there are very few citizens who know the issues or the candidates, especially for community college vacancies, so a trustee can possibly be elected by a small number of people who have special interest in that trustee (AGB, 1998). For that primary reason, Nason (1982) believed that publicly electing a trustee is probably the least satisfactory way of selecting a trustee. Nason (1982) favored a gubernatorial appointment with legislative confirmation.

A more simplistic yet helpful process could incorporate a local screening or nominating committee composed of prominent local citizens that could be used to help improve the quality of gubernatorial appointments. Also, an endorsement of certain candidates from a screening committee could also influence the results of public election in a positive direction (Nason, 1982). Just recently, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Minnesota have implemented reforms in the trustee-selection process by providing a screening or review board used for evaluating candidates and making recommendations to the governor and/or legislature (AGB, 1996). Some experienced political leaders say that an advisory or nominating committee responsible for recruiting, screening, and recommending board candidates can help depoliticize the selection process. Kerr and Gade (1989) stated that appointing a trustee was probably better than electing a trustee. Individuals who would make excellent board members have no desire to go through the trials and tribulations of running in an election. Kerr and Gade (1989) believed that those individuals who entered in elections for trusteeships did so for political or special interest,
not for the overall welfare of the institution. These individuals are more likely to be committed to special interest groups that finance their campaigns. Moreover, elected trustees may possess greater political power than appointed trustees; however, elected trustees often feel as if they should speak for their own voting constituency. Kerr and Gade (1989) stated, “Trustees believe that an election gives them an independent position that allows them to behave as they wish. It is perceived that it is the electorate, not fellow board members, who ought to provide any necessary advice or carry out censure” (p. 42).

Kerr and Gade (1989) expressed that the appointment process can “take into account skills and sensitivities needed on a board in ways that elections cannot” (p. 41). In order to do so, the appointing process must include a nominating, screening, and confirming mechanism. Having several steps or components in place, especially the screening component, makes the appointing authority more responsible in selecting a trustee to serve on a high education governing board (Kerr & Gade, 1989). Kerr and Gade (1989) even went as far as stating that the institution’s board chair or president may be instrumental in selecting an individual who possesses special skills or specific knowledge that would strengthen the institution’s current governing board. In Kinkel’s (1998) study, the focus group, composed of trustees as well as individuals who help select trustees, agreed with the literature that a screening process should be used in the selection process. Unfortunately, qualified people are passed over or do not step forward to serve on governing boards, and many boards do not retain the qualified, high caliber trustees who may currently serve. In addition, open meeting laws, the amount of time and effort, excessive public disclosure requirements, and public displays of board dissention make public trusteeship an unattractive civic activity for many (AGB, 1998).
Interestingly, the politics of the selection process and requirements of the position may have played a role in providing weak trustees, yet some observers are now saying that a general decline in civic responsibility throughout the United States has also contributed to a shortage of high-caliber trustees. Business and community leaders, along with other prominent citizens, are simply turning away from serving on public higher education boards (AGB, 1998).

In 1996 and 1997, the AGB surveyed nearly 1,100 governing boards of both private and public colleges and universities to examine trends in their membership and certain board policies and practices. Nearly one-half, or 47%, of all public board members had been selected by gubernatorial appointment. Public election was the second most common selection method with 29% elected. Another 22% of public boards reported that their members were selected through other entities, such as local boards of education and/or local boards of city or county commissioners. Only 2% of the boards were appointed by a state legislature. Not surprisingly, the survey also revealed that a rather large 41% stated that political party affiliation is an important consideration in selecting board members (Madsen, 1998).

The Commission on the Academic Presidency, a group of individuals involved in an AGB (1996) study, found that “a board should encompass a mosaic of backgrounds, professions, and experience that will help the institution make decisions on the broad set of issues it faces” (p. 30). However, Cohen and Brawer (1996) stated that whether governing boards are elected or appointed that the board members are predominantly White, college educated, wealthy, middle-aged men with professional or managerial occupations. Moreover, most of the trustees currently selected come from affluent
sections of the community, creating a predominantly White board, oftentimes in an ethnically mixed environment (Haro, 1995). Research shows that trustees representing both private and public higher education institutions, including community colleges, are predominantly White, over the age 50, and male (Kerr & Gade, 1989; Lovell & Trouth, 2002; Moore, 1973; Shults, 2001, Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Thirty years ago, Moore (1973) stated, “Community college boards are, for the most part, fifty-year-old conservative WASP male managers who listen to the people speak in [their] golfing foursome at the local country club and over the tinkle of martini glasses at sophisticated cocktail parties” (p. 173). However, in recent years, women and minorities have been represented in slightly greater proportions than in the past. Regardless of the slight increase women and minorities have made, the ethnic and gender composition of boards often do not reflect the diverse constituencies they serve. The prevalent governing board composition could possibly affect policy decisions, student enrollment and taxpayer support, along with other factors as well (Lovell & Trouth, 2002).

Nason (1982) writes that a major criticism about governing boards is their “monolithic character” (p. 55). All recorded research studies report that governing boards in higher education consist of White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant males who are normally successful businessmen over 50 in age. A survey conducted by the AGB reported that 85% of trustees were male, 15% were female, 93% were White, 6% were Black, and 1% was other minorities. Sixty-six percent were over the age 50 and 15% were under the age of 40. Community colleges that were surveyed showed an identical split to national data with males representing 85% of the trustees and females representing 15% (Nason, 1982). Nason (1982) also reported that a 1976 census taken of
the overall trustee population indicated that governing boards were skewed in favor of
White, 50-year-old or older males. Kerr and Gade (1989) cited a 1985 AGB report that
found from 1,400 trustee respondents of a study that 90% were White, 6% were Black,
3% Other--Asian, Native American, and 1% Hispanic. In addition, 80% of the governing
boards were male and 20% were female (Kerr & Gade, 1989).

Focusing specifically on community colleges, Vaughan and Weisman (1997)
reported very similar results with their study of community college trustees across the
United States. Of the 618 respondents, 67% of the trustees were men and 33% were
women. The racial or ethnic composition was 86.6% Caucasian, 7.9% African
American, 2.3% Hispanic, 1.2% labeled themselves other, 1.2% Asian American, and
0.8% Native American (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). More specifically, Vaughan and
Weisman (1997) found that trustees on average were 57½ years old and that 52 years old
is the most common age of community college trustees.

Nason (1982) stressed, “a truly effective board is more likely to be composed of
individuals who bring diverse experiences, talents, and attitudes to the resolution of
institutional problems” (p. 57). Nason (1982) also believed that colleges and universities
need trustees with different experiences and backgrounds “to hammer out a sensible
meeting of the minds” (p. 57). Madsen’s (1998) recent study of 535 governing boards of
public institutions did show some slight improvement over the past 20 years in favor of
more representative boards. Madsen (1998) reported that 30% of all public trustees were
female and 70% were male. Almost 83% of all board members were White, 3.1%
Hispanic, and 2.6% reported as other minorities (Madsen, 1998). Many, or 62%, of all
public board members were between the ages of 40 and 59. There were 8% of the
trustees older than 70 and 8% of the trustees younger than 40 (Madsen, 1998). Madsen (1998) reported that 68% of board members were 50 years of age or older.

Madsen (1998) found that almost 37% of all public college and university board members were business executives, while 15% were retired, and 14% were educators or students (Madsen, 1998). Madsen (1998) also reported that 17.8% were professionals in different areas such as lawyers, physicians, accountants, and psychologists, and 14.9% were identified as retired. Over 47% of the trustees were selected by gubernatorial appointment and 29% were selected by popular election (Madsen, 1998).

With respect to their education level, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) found that 85% of the community college trustees they surveyed had received a bachelor’s degree or higher and that 51% of community college trustees had been awarded a graduate degree. Vaughan and Weisman (1997) also reported that 69% of community college trustees were employed either full-time or part-time and that over 28% of community college trustees were retired. Of the 406 community college trustees who stated that they were professionals, 37% indicated that they were involved in education, 12% were lawyers or judges, 11% were in the medical or healthcare field, and 10% were in banking or finance. In addition, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) reported that governors appointed over 35% of the respondents, district-wide elections were responsible for over 30% of the trustees, and slightly over 28% were appointed by locally elected officials.

**Board Development**

As criticism continues about selection processes and about incompetent and disinterested individuals serving on governing boards, board development for trustees is now more important than ever. Board development for this study has been divided into
three categories. Trustee orientation represents the first category; then trustee education in the form of professional development such as workshops, retreats, and conferences is the second category; and finally board assessment or self-study is the third category. Since research findings indicate that numerous trustees are not prepared for their roles, board development is more important than ever to prepare individuals for one of the most important positions in higher education. Once trustees are selected, whether through the appointment process or through general elections, many are simply not prepared for their position in a governing board of an institution of higher education. One area that is vital for the success of individual trustees and boards collectively is board development. In a report entitled *Bridging the Gap Between State Government and Public Higher Education*, the AGB (1998) cited in the summary that trustees and regents must become better informed about their institutions or systems, about their roles and responsibilities, and about higher education in general. Trustee orientation and education programs should be strengthened. Where such programs do not exist or are weak, trustees often lack cohesion, exhibit incivility, and are confused about their basic roles and responsibilities. (p. 14) Taylor (1993) stated that board development included specific activities, such as orientation programs, continuing education and board assessment, that purposely target board performance. Organizations, such as institutions of higher education, only excel when their board members are well trained and when their roles and responsibilities are clearly understood (Davis, 1997). Unfortunately, Haro (1995) believed that too often very little attention in the past had been paid to prepare new trustees for their role. Trustees need to be well informed to provide quality service to their institutions;
therefore, new trustees need instruction on the nature of trusteeship (Nason, 1982).

Gleazer (1985) stated that trustees are learning their jobs through trial and error because systematic and comprehensive orientation and training programs are missing. This particular lack of board development is prompting erosion in the quality of members of community college boards of trustees. In research conducted by Chait et al. (1996), most of the governing boards they examined were disillusioned by their lower than expected self-assessment scores on board development. Chait et al. (1996) found that across all boards used in their research trustee education was the area where scores were uniformly lowest. Herron (1969) stated, “One of the greatest weaknesses among college trustees is the lack of a systematic educational program to strengthen the understanding of their role and their responsibilities as stewards of an educational institution. The involvement in an in-service education program can give the board the basis of educational adeptness upon which to make decisions” (p. 148). Herron (1969) also stressed that the board chair and the president were “obligated to design, direct, and supervise a continuous self-improvement program” (p. 148).

Many of the studies conducted indicate that trustee orientation and educational programs need to be strengthened. Past studies have revealed that trustees in colleges and universities are simply not involved in enough board education and development (AGB, 1998). Even before appointed or elected, candidates for trusteeships should have a clear understanding of their responsibilities. Many first-time trustees who serve on a board do not know what trustees are supposed to do as the guardians of their institutions (Kerr & Gade, 1989). The deficiency leads to confusion over simple responsibilities. An AGB report (1998) stated, “Board appointees should have a clear understanding of the
dual responsibilities they must perform: the scope and nature of the institutions they will
serve, and the nature of the public trust they will hold” (p. 53). Prospective or actual
board appointees greatly benefit from a professionally planned and implemented
orientation and continuing education program. Many states are making progress in this
area by legislative action and executive orders to improve board education through
annual statewide conferences. For example, the State of North Carolina considered board
development so essential that in 1999 the state’s legislature passed a law stating that a
community college governing board could “declare vacant the office of a member who,
without justifiable excuse, does not participate within six months of appointment in a
trustee orientation and education session sponsored by the North Carolina Association of
Community College Trustees” (GS 115D-19, Section B).

Trustee Orientation

Kerr and Gade (1989) believed that regardless of whether a trustee is elected or
appointed, that “almost universally, once selected, new members are not given an
adequate orientation” (p. 47). Trustees who serve for the first time need an orientation on
the “history, organization, and peculiarities of the college or university” (Nason, 1982, p.
69). Almost 20 years ago, Nason (1982) reported that a national survey indicated that
only one-third of the trustee respondents stated that a systematic orientation for new
members was provided. Later, in their research, Kerr and Gade (1989) stated that they
had received rather strong complaints about the lack of effective orientations for new
members, very similar to complaints Rauh (1969) described a decade earlier. Trustee
orientation and development should be a high priority for presidents and trustees alike
(Davis, 1997). Boggs and Smith (1997) reported in their research that “orientation
sessions provided an opportunity for the president and college staff to inform the new trustees about the college, its mission, and its operations while providing an opportunity for the new trustees to learn more about their role in policy setting and monitoring” (p. 50). Rauh (1969) stated that there was little evidence of any attempt to prepare new trustees for their role. Rauh’s (1969) idea of orientation offered a fairly practical and prescribed session for new trustees that included a tour of the campus, a review of campus planning, a history of the institution, an educational plan of the college that included updated curricular developments, and a review of hard copies of the college catalog, the institution’s charter, previous board minutes, and financial reports.

Davis (1997) explained that boards themselves should be responsible for providing orientation and professional development for trustees. In fact, Iowa Western Community College adopted a formal policy that requires orientation and conferences for trustees. Boggs and Smith (1997) stated that it takes at least two years for a new trustee to be fully oriented to the position. In order to fulfill this task, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stressed that new trustees should be willing and responsible to learn about their new duties and responsibilities of being part of a governing board. Established trustees should make sure that new trustees have a formal orientation program after joining the board. In their research, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) revealed that only 14% of the boards they surveyed actually required new trustees to participate in any type of structured orientation to the board, and that a surprising 16% of community college governing boards had not even provided new trustees with a formal orientation. Moreover, 70% of the boards provided orientation sessions, yet trustee participation was voluntary (Davis, 1997; Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). Vaughan and Weisman’s (1997) research indicated that
orientation sessions provided an opportunity for new trustees to learn more about their role as the guardians of their institutions. Also, one-on-one meetings have enabled new trustees to ask questions that might be difficult to raise in a more formal setting. Boggs and Smith (1997) found in their research that presidents were the greatest contributor to any orientation session. An informal setting also allowed college presidents to explain important issues in greater detail and to introduce new board members to faculty and staff (Boggs & Smith, 1997). More importantly, trustees that came to the board with a special interest agenda began to change their perspectives as a result of well-organized formal and informal orientation sessions (Boggs & Smith, 1997). Also, the addition of new trustees can change the complexity of any board and can begin a new set of relationships among board members and between the board and the college president (Boggs & Smith, 1997).

**Trustee Education**

After an initial orientation session providing trustees with information about their role, they must continue with trustee educational opportunities that enrich their knowledge about trusteeship and encourage their learning more about various issues related to higher education. Ingram (1997) stated that trustees needed to be prepared for trends that currently affect higher education such as “shifting demographics, unforeseen changes brought about by information technology, and mounting pressure for more cost effectiveness, productivity, and quality” (p. 1). Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stated, “Boards should continue and intensify their educational development. For board development to be effective, it must be comprehensive and ongoing” (p. 180). Kerr and Gade (1989) stated, “New and experienced board members benefit from periodic
opportunities to step back and look at the role of the board, at the appropriate behavior for its members, and at their personal interaction. The opportunities may take the form of attendance of regional or national trustee meetings, board retreats, or a session with a knowledgeable outside consultant” (p. 47). Nason (1982) suggested that trustees should “explore and discuss the major problems and impending issues which are of current concern to higher education and which will affect the policies and operations of the college” (p. 66). Vaughan and Weisman’s (1997) study provided comments from trustees who supported the idea of continued trustee education. One trustee commented, “Board members need to be better educated on what their role and responsibilities are” (p. 180). Continuing the emphasis on trustee education, another trustee stated, “To improve board effectiveness, trustees have to be educated about their role” (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997, p. 180). Another trustee expressed, “Trustees have to attend meetings that are specifically designed to help trustees be more effective. Attending their state meetings; attending regional meetings; attending Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) meetings” (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997, p. 181). In states, such as North Carolina, that are using student performance measures to indicate institutional value (NCCCS, 2002), Davis (2000) asserted trustees should push to clarify the lines of accountability, take advantage of available training opportunities, and move governance closer to those who understand citizens’ needs.

Although Davis (1997) stressed that the community college president and the board chair had a responsibility to provide educational opportunities, he also expressed that “all trustees bear the responsibility for seeing that they continue to grow in their roles” (p. 24). Vaughan and Weisman found that 60% of chairs reported “their trustees regularly
study local issues as a part of a program for board development. Forty-three percent said their boards engage locally in the study of state issues, and 14% of chairs reported that their boards participate in regular discussions of national issues related to community college performance” (Davis, 1997, p. 21). Interestingly, Davis (1997) reported, “Nearly one of every four colleges does not provide any local professional development programs for trustees” (p. 21). Haro (1995) stated that new trustees should be required to participate in training programs offered by national organizations, such as the AGB, the American Council on Education (ACE), or ACCT.

In almost all research, the president was identified as the most important contributor to board development. Boggs and Smith (1997) stated that during their research it was the president’s primary responsibility to encourage board members to attend state and national trustee association meetings. If trustees cannot attend national meetings, presidents should encourage trustees to attend meetings sponsored by state trustee associations. Boggs and Smith (1997) also stated that trustees should be required to attend at least one national or regional seminar or conference each year where they can update their understanding of key higher education issues. Many of the state meetings include topics such as policy making, basic trustee responsibilities, legal requirements, and open meeting laws. In Boggs and Smith’s (1997) research, respondents considered board workshops extremely valuable. With such problems as split boards, overriding special interests, and/or renegade board members, sometimes a workshop, especially one with an outside facilitator, helps the board become a more cohesive team. Workshops cannot solve serious problems within a board; however, they can help plan for building a better board. “Even in cases where there are no serious problems on a governing board,
occasional workshops, study sessions, or retreats are valuable in maintaining a leadership team focused on the best interests of the college” (Boggs & Smith, 1997, p. 51).

A program of professional development is the only way trustees can assure their board’s accountability or effectiveness. Retreats offer trustees, especially new board members, an opportunity to get acquainted in a relaxed setting without any interruptions (Nielson & Newton, 1997). Fortunately, trustees who were elected with a special interest agenda sometimes change their perspectives as a result of well-organized formal and informal sessions (Boggs & Smith, 1997). Continuing professional development is even less frequent. Nearly 25% of the community colleges did not provide any local professional development programs for trustees (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). If professional development was offered, the most common topic for discussion was budget or financial management of the college. If individuals who played a significant role in the selection of the trustee signaled an interest in the new trustees’ growth and development, the trustee was normally inclined to participate in professional development activities. If appointing officials or voters saw no need or no interest, then board development did not take place (Davis, 1997).

**Board Assessment**

Since boards may not operate as effectively as they should, observers of higher education have cited regular assessment as an essential tool for improving board effectiveness (Michael & Schwartz, 1999). Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stated, “If boards are to improve their effectiveness they must engage in self-assessment, either formal or informal, and the research also confirms and illustrates the importance of educational programs in enhancing the governing board’s effectiveness” (p. 184). Taylor
(1993) reported that there have been studies conducted to show a connection between regular appraisal and improved performance in governing boards. Taylor (1993) stated, “Regular board assessment helps create a sense of collective responsibility and collective achievement and the candor that honest self-reflection entails can help bind members together in pursuit of common goals” (p. 363). In addition, an assessment plan helps to determine how well trustees understand and fulfill the expectations and goals of the board (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). In the past, governing boards have not typically placed any emphasis on evaluating themselves. Community college governing boards often find it difficult to assess their own effectiveness. Schwartz (1998) gave two reasons boards rarely evaluated themselves: trustees are volunteers and that no meaningful performance standards had been set. Over the years, the idea of board assessment has made numerous boards extremely uncomfortable. However, the goal of board assessment is improvement and not judgment (Schwartz, 1998). Self-assessment by boards should indicate the board’s commitment to improving its effectiveness (Taylor, 1993). Taylor (1993) stressed, “Skillful assessment produces systematic feedback on performance that boards otherwise would not receive” (p. 361). Ingram and Weary (2000) believe that periodic self-assessments provide governing boards with assurance that they are functioning effectively. Ingram and Weary (2000) also stated, “Periodic reviews help trustees grasp their responsibilities as corporate entities, reach consensus on and clarify their goals, find ways to strengthen their effectiveness, improve relationships among members, and clarify mutual expectations” (p. 22). Even an AGB study (1998) found that “from time to time, boards should examine their membership, structure, and performance. Boards and their individual members should engage in periodic evaluations of their effectiveness and
commitment to their institution” (p. 22). Another AGB study (1996) stated, “The best accountability mechanisms are designed around assessments of performance and quality rather than compliance with regulations, administrative procedures, and red tape” (p. 38).

Ingram and Weary (2000) found that most public-sector boards function with “vague, confusing, contradictory, or nonexistent job descriptions” (p. 22). In addition, boards have often found it difficult to know the distinction between institutional governance and management. A well-designed self-assessment program or self-study can help reduce the ambiguities found in academic trusteeship (Ingram & Weary, 2000). One way of assuring that trustees have a clear understanding of the board’s goals and expectations is through self-assessment.

Helen Dowdy, a former president of the NCACCT, stated that self-evaluation is valuable yet is often neglected by most college boards. Boards do not often realize the benefits that can come from self-assessment. Each governing board should examine its own performance by critically examining the decisions it has made and then measuring the effectiveness of those decisions (Dowdy, 1996). In order for governing boards to identify where they are performing well as a board and where they might improve, they must engage in a continuing process of self-assessment or evaluation of their performance (ACCT, 2002). The ACCT (2002) stressed that discussion generated about board roles and responsibilities can strengthen communication and understanding among board members. These discussions can lead to stronger more cohesive working groups. More importantly, the ACCT (2002) stressed that a board’s willingness to engage in self-assessment sets itself as a model for the rest of the institution and indicates that board members take their responsibilities very seriously. Currently, state governments do not
directly evaluate the effectiveness of governing boards, nor are boards evaluated by the administrators or faculty that they govern (Michael, Schwartz, & Cravcenco, 2000). Assessment can be the means for boards to enhance their own performance through reflection, a self-conscious step in the learning process, not an end in itself. It can also help good boards to become better boards (Schwartz, 1998). Effective boards and governance lead to effective presidencies, management, and leadership (Ingram & Weary, 2000).

Far too few governing boards have formal assessments of their performance. In their study of community college trustees, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) reported that 49% of the board chairs who participated in their research stated that they had no formal plan for assessing their board’s performance. In her study of two-year and four-year institutional boards, Madsen (1998) reported that only 34% of public boards had conducted a review of their own performance within the past five years. The Schwartz (1998) survey revealed that only 47% of board chairs reported that their boards had conducted a self-assessment with within the past five years. However, public-sector boards did so less frequently with only 42%. The results from these surveys demonstrate that “appropriate introspection by volunteer academic governing boards does not come very easily or willingly” (Ingram & Weary, 2000, p. 18). The Schwartz (1998) study, conducted in 1997 with 535 board chairs responding, revealed that most governing boards, over 57% of boards of public institutions, had no traditions, policies, or established schedules for self-assessment of any kind. Moreover, 55% reported that their governing board had not conducted a self-assessment within the past five years. According to board chairs who participated in the Schwartz (1998) study, the greatest
barriers to board assessment were the lack of clear benchmarks for good board performance, a lack of good models for an assessment process, and, unfortunately, a lack of interest among the majority of trustees (Schwartz, 1998). However, more importantly, self-assessment activities generally had a positive impact on governing boards, especially in regards to increasing trustee commitment and clarifying trustee responsibilities (Schwartz, 1998).

Ingram (1997) reported that research conducted through the AGB revealed that only 33% of all types of public boards of higher education conducted a self-study or assessment of their performance. Similar to Madsen (1998) and Schwartz (1998), Ingram (1997) reported that only one-third of public boards of trustees conducted a formal self-study or assessment program from 1986 to 1991, a five-year period. Ingram (1997) asserted that if boards of trustees accepted the responsibility of assessing the institution’s president, then they should be willing to accept the responsibility to assess their own performance. Michael and Schwartz (1999) noted that a key factor of successful boards is the presence of “an active mechanism for the board to review its own structure and performance” (p.166). Ingram (1993) believed that being able to self-critique is the surest impetus for improving the quality of the board and the work it does. Ingram and Weary (2000) asserted that periodic board self-assessment gives boards a measure of confidence that they are functioning effectively. In addition, Ingram and Weary (2000) stated, “Periodic reviews help boards grasp their responsibilities as corporate entities, reach consensus on and clarify their goals, find ways to strengthen their effectiveness, improve relationships among members, and clarify mutual expectations” (p. 22). Ingram
(1993) believed that governing boards should set an example and overcome any natural reluctance to subject themselves to scrutiny.

**Board Effectiveness**

Improving the overall effectiveness of colleges and universities is increasingly recognized as a major concern throughout the United States. Central to effectiveness is the role played by boards of trustees in exercising leadership and governance of public institutions (Kerr & Gade, 1989). Ingram and Weary (2000) provided a list of 13 governing board responsibilities that overlap many other lists that observers of higher education have given such as the following:

- Clarifying the mission; appointing, supporting, and assessing the chief executive’s performance; ensuring that high-quality planning and goal setting take place;
- Requiring the periodic assessment of institutional performance--especially through accreditations and other external reviews; approving new academic programs;
- Ensuring the well-being of faculty, students, and staff; providing adequate financial resources; insisting on effective financial management; ensuring adequate and safe physical facilities; arguing for the institution and its needs; speaking out for society’s needs; protecting the institution from inappropriate partisan politics and intrusions from special-interest groups that threaten the autonomy of the institution and board; and protecting academic freedom and meeting its broad responsibilities to the public trust. (p. 25)

Higher education has had available a number of lists containing prescribed characteristics of governing boards (Herron, 1969; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Moore, 1973; Nason, 1980; Nason, 1982); however, Chait et al. (1993), Michael and Schwartz (1999),
along with other observers of higher education, have stated that for several years there was a void in the literature of higher education concerning any comprehensive theory of board of trustee governance. Although several potential standards of effectiveness could have been inferred from the assorted literature, most of the available material prior to Chait et al.’s (1993) research was prescriptive rather than empirical, providing a very limited foundation on which to build knowledge about board governance and its influences on educational institutions. Moreover, Chait et al. (1993) discovered that their findings regarding independent or private boards could be just as applicable to public governing boards as well. For example, Chait et al. (1993) reported, “The vast majority of trustees are not systematically prepared for the role prior to their appointment to a governing board. Not many trustees have the benefit of a thorough orientation or ongoing board-development programs after joining a board. Many boards consist of a collection of successful individuals who do not perform well as a group. The parts sum to less than the whole” (p. 2).

Conceptual Framework

Chait et al. (1996) focused primarily on understanding and improving boards of trustees and thus defined effective boards of trustees as those whose “collective efforts, through smooth and suitable processes, take actions that advance a shared purpose consistent with the institution’s mission” (p. 1). In researching boards, Chait et al. (1993) characteristically found that ineffective boards generally refused to learn about their roles and that they normally rejected assessments of their own performance. Productive boards, on the other hand, always sought to discover how well they were performing through self-assessment, and when improvement was needed they instituted learning
opportunities for their members. Chait et al. (1993) also focused on the board as a group since boards are collective bodies acting as one. Most previous treatments of governing boards overlooked group dynamics and group processes. Earlier works about trusteeship focused much more on “structures, procedures, bylaws, and the terms and conditions of trustee appointments, such as length of service, attendance requirements, and committee assignments” (p. 4). In addition, earlier trustee literature centered on how the governance process was organized; yet Chait et al. (1993) concentrated on how the governance process was actually accomplished. In their research, Chait et al. (1993) did not see that structure revealed any systematic patterns of association between board effectiveness and factors such as the board’s size, the number and duration of board meetings, and whether there were limits on a trustee’s length of service. Through their research, Chait et al. (1993) were instrumental in creating a six-dimensional conceptual profile of effective boards. Rather than solely including prescriptive measures in their description of an effective board of trustees, Chait et al. (1996) designed a conceptual framework that incorporated both the cognitive and affective areas of trustee duties and responsibilities. Ingram and Weary (2000) found that the six dimensions or competencies outlined in Chait et al.’s (1993) research were appropriate for public board as well. The dimensions or competencies are the following:

**Contextual Dimension**

The contextual dimension concerns the governing board’s ability to understand and take into account the culture and norms of the organization it governs (Chait et al., 1993; Ingram & Weary, 2000). Chait et al. (1993) stated that effective boards “adapt to the distinctive characteristics of an academic environment; rely on the institution’s mission,
values, and traditions as a guide for decisions; and act so as to exemplify and reinforce the organization’s core values” (p. 9). Effective boards were able to understand and adapt to elements of the academic culture, such as shared governance and academic freedom, while less effective boards never acclimated to the culture at all. In fact, many of the ineffective governing boards never accepted the academic culture, often becoming frustrated dealing with the different constituencies at the institution and wanting to change the culture to one that they could understand.

Chait et al. (1993) also found that effective boards relied heavily on the institutional mission statement that should “provide guidance and direction to all members of the campus community, from students to trustees” (p. 13). More effective boards used the mission as a means of defining the purpose of the institution and as a blueprint for which the board could direct the institution. In their initial study, Chait et al. (1993) found that many trustees, at least one-third, were simply unable to articulate their college’s mission.

The contextual dimension also reflects the college’s values, belief, and philosophy. Trustees on effective boards cited such values as students becoming independent thinkers and self-directed learners, whereas trustees on ineffective boards could rarely provide any response to what their institutions represented.

Educational Dimension

Ingram and Weary (2000) stated that the educational dimension guarantees that “the board takes the necessary steps to ensure that trustees are well informed about the institution, the profession, and the board responsibilities and performance” (p. 25). Chait et al. (1993) included principles for effective boards that follow the necessary steps to ensure that trustees are well informed. Chait et al. (1993) stated, “Effective boards
consciously create opportunities for trustee education, regularly seek feedback on the board’s performance, and pause periodically for self-reflection, especially to examine the board’s mistakes” (p. 26). Interestingly, Chait et al. (1993) claimed that although colleges are in the business to educate colleges themselves have done very little to educate their own boards. Similar to Chait et al.’s (1993) study, Davis (1997) stressed that without an orientation, new trustees must learn the board’s style and habits only through meticulous personal observation that may take several months or years with minimal involvement. Having the president discuss the board’s traditions and culture during a new trustee’s orientation session can help the trustee understand and adapt to the board that she or he is joining. Chait et al. (1993), very similar to Kerr and Gade (1989) and Vaughan and Weisman (1997), argued that an orientation was essential to provide needed information to trustees. In their research, Chait et al. (1993) found that many of the weaker boards had trustees relying on their own experiences when they were in college or their experiences in the corporate world in order to cope with institutional problems. Also, the weaker boards relied heavily on on-the-job training. Trustees were expected to learn their roles as governance played itself out for the institution (Chait et al., 1993).

Chait et al. (1993) stressed that the president was essentially responsible for board development. Similarly, Vaughan and Weisman’s (1997) study stated that boards of trustees and presidents who worked together as a team enhanced the effectiveness of the institution in achieving the college’s mission and goals. Preparing for their role at the institutional level was beneficial; however, attending national conferences proved just as valuable. Boards also found learning about their own performance or the processes they
used to conduct business as a board beneficial. Retreats were one way boards could better examine themselves or self-reflect (Chait et al., 1993).

Weaker boards found self-assessment a waste of time and did not support such measures (Chait et al., 1993). Many of the trustees from weaker boards took negative criticism personally and allowed the comments to fester to the point that it hampered board performance. Weaker boards simply did not want feedback generated on their performance. Stronger, more effective boards actually wanted feedback because they used the feedback to improve their performance. Although boards have found that self-assessment is a method of motivating and enhancing performance, very few boards have any regular processes to gather and discuss performance feedback on the board as a whole or on individual trustees (Chait et al., 1993). Chait et al. (1993) found that most boards gave three arguments for not self-assessing their own performance: the lack of time, the lack of any compensation, and the lack of any substantial results. In their study, Chait et al. (1993) found that the least effective boards were never willing to acknowledge that they made any mistakes while the most effective were more than willing to give lengthy explanations about the mistakes they had made. Effective boards learned from reflecting on their mistakes. One board chair reflected, “Mistakes aren’t so bad, if you learn something from them” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 34). Chait et al. (1993) strongly supported board members attending national conferences, holding local trustee seminars, creating and attending discussion groups with trustees from other institutions, rotating committee assignments within the board, providing internal self-assessment, and also using external feedback from the president and other administrators, faculty, students, and alumni.
**Interpersonal Dimension**

The interpersonal dimension pertains to the board as a group (Ingram & Weary, 2000). Chait et al. (1993) stated, “In order to nurture the board’s collective welfare and to foster a sense of cohesiveness, effective boards should create a sense of inclusiveness among trustees, set goals for themselves, and groom members for leadership positions on the board” (p. 42). On the other hand, weaker, ineffective boards see themselves as individuals who only come together to make decisions. Considering the make-up of boards, most consist of community or business leaders who make ultimate decisions for themselves in their occupations. However, each member of a board carries the same weight, and individual trustees have no authority to act formally or independently on the board’s behalf. Trustees must decide as a group. Of course, complicating the matter has been that board members probably do not know each other very well and have no common professional interests.

Members of productive boards stated that an effective board was one in which the board focused on “smooth interpersonal relations” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 43). Similar to Chait et al.’s (1993) findings, Davis (1997) stated that effective boards realized that they need efficient and effective discussion before reaching a decision. Trustees need to know a working knowledge of parliamentary procedures, and good personal relationships among trustees can create a climate of healthy discussion. Successful group discussion and decision making requires that all group members should respect themselves and each other. Davis (1997) wrote that once trustees develop skills involved with effective group
processes they are more confident when voicing their own opinions and work to ensure that all voices on the board are heard.

The board fosters positive interpersonal relationships among board members by creating a sense of inclusiveness among trustees, setting goals for itself, and grooming members for leadership positions on the board (Chait et al., 1993). Usually, the board chair or the president of an effective board provided social occasions so trustees could get to know each other better. Chait et al. (1993) stressed that there has to be a social connection among board members so they can learn about each other’s background, personality, and individual perspectives. When trustees know each other more personally, each trustee can understand the position others may take in the boardroom. Many of the trustees from weaker boards expressed that they did not socialize with other members and that they rarely knew each other (Chait et al., 1993). Also, effective boards were more laterally oriented--or trustee to trustee--rather than a vertical format where trustees asked questions of the board chair, president, or administrative staff with little, if any, interaction among themselves.

Chait et al. (1993) believe that all successful teams are normally motivated by the pursuit of shared and realistic goals. Trustees on stronger boards created board goals and objectives much easier than trustees from weaker boards. The board’s goals should be “thoroughly discussed, clearly developed, and voluntarily embraced by the board and the president” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 56). Creating goals collectively helped with the actual actions that improved the board’s ability to function effectively internally among members or externally with various constituencies. Moreover, creating goals for the board also strengthens the board’s internal capacity to contribute constructively to the
attainment of the college’s overall aims and strategic priorities. In their study of effective boards, Chait et al. (1993) indicated that “the goals served as beacons that guided the direction of members’ efforts and mobilized collaboration among members” (p. 50).

Effective boards were much more thoughtful about assigning people to committees and more methodical about evaluating performance. In interviews with trustees from ineffective boards, trustees had no idea how the board fostered leadership. Apathy regarding cultivating leadership hampered efforts of the board. Boards without leadership within were exclusively dependent on the president. Board members were “uneasy, without self-confidence, and excessively reliant upon the president” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 52). Chait et al. (1993) stated that boards should create a sense of inclusiveness by enabling trustees to become better acquainted with one another and to help new trustees understand board or group dynamics. Setting group goals is also another challenge. Trustees should generate commitment to the board’s goals, which should always be realistic.

Analytical Dimension

Ingram and Weary (2000) described the analytical dimension as one in which “the board recognizes complexities and subtleties in the issues it faces and draws upon multiple perspectives to dissect complex problems and to synthesize appropriate responses” (p. 26). Effective boards were much more analytical than those that were less dynamic. Stronger boards exhibited interpersonal relationships, group dynamics, and patterns of thought that were much more complex and intricate than decisions offered by trustees of less effective boards. In their research concerning organizations, Bolman and Deal concluded that administrators should analyze important information through
different lenses or perspectives. Bolman and Deal developed frames through which individuals can analyze a problem from varying angles (Chait et al., 1993). Chait et al. (1993) developed their analytical dimension on the premise that boards must approach a problem from several different angles in order to get a proper perspective. Many policy questions are complicated, multi-sided issues that should be examined from several perspectives. Chait et al. (1993) incorporated into their research Bolman and Deal’s four frames or models through which executives, such as trustees, could use to examine various situations:

- The rational systems model assumes that an organization exists only to accomplish stated goals. In order to accomplish the stated goals, there must be clearly defined roles, a bureaucratic structure, rules and regulations, and a chain of command.

- The human resource model assumes that an institution exists to serve human needs. The organization relies less on supervision and control and more on creating an environment where people can realize their potential and capitalize on self-motivation.

- The political model views an institution as structured around the reality of scarce resources. Organizations are coalitions of interest groups that bargain to set goals and reach decisions. Power, conflict, and negotiation are central features of organizational life.

- The symbolic model emphasizes the importance of the interpretation people attach to events rather than decisions or actions themselves. Beliefs, culture,
rituals, ceremonies, myths, and metaphors provide meaning and make confusion comprehensible. (Chait et al., 1993, p. 60)

When trustees view an institution through only one lens or frame, trustees often see a problem-free campus. However, in reality, using a different lens or frame might present an entirely different picture. Effective boards see an institution as an intricate web of activity and situations and, therefore, look at situations from different perspectives. “Trustees are members of a group that adopts a broad institutional perspective and exercises limited authority, often influencing events indirectly” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 64).

In their study, Chait et al. (1993) noted that participants on effective boards could differentiate between their role at work and on the board. At work many of the individuals had to make decisions on their own, yet as members of a board they recognized the fact that the board should operate as a group; individuals should not make sole decisions that represented the board.

Ineffective trustees could not make the distinction between personal work and board work. Many of the ineffective boards had one or even a few individuals who spoke for the board as a whole and saw no conflict of interest. Effective boards understand and tolerate ambiguity, track needed information, and promote debate among various issues. More effective boards are much more able to deal with ambiguity and compromise than ineffective boards. In pursuing information, effective boards, with the president’s help, were much more able to conduct information sessions with students, faculty, staff, and alumni. Chait et al. (1993) stated, “Effective boards initiated these integrative conversations as a way to augment the intellectual horsepower of the discussion and to improve the quality of the ideas on the table” (p. 68). Effective boards wanted
information from different sources and to explore alternatives and to synthesize available options. With ineffective boards, additional information and/or various perspectives on an issue only created more confusion and difficulty (Chait et al., 1993). Effective boards were more amenable toward open exchange and lively debate. Also, effective boards were less likely to whisk through the board meeting agenda and more likely to take time with issues at hand. Many of the ineffective boards congratulated themselves for speedily covering all agenda items at the end of the meeting, yet most of the discussion was superfluous (Chait et al., 1993).

Political Dimension

Trustees of effective boards stated that the decision-making process at colleges and universities moved much more slowly and entailed more discussion with more people from more constituencies when compared with other types of organizations (Chait et al., 1993). Also, boards that were more politically sensitive believed in academic freedom and let the faculty deal with academic affairs and curriculum issues. In issues related to academics, the more effective boards “provided guidance through inquiries, discussions, requests for information, and attempts to reach reasonable compromise” (p. 79). In their research, Chait et al. (1993) stated that successful and effective boards promoted the shared governance concept, thus creating a more positive environment among various constituencies such as the faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Trustees on ineffective boards were not concerned about student issues, faculty concerns, or alumni reactions. Many ineffective boards passed most, if not all, problems to the president to handle. Trustees on effective boards tended to communicate and interact with constituencies on a regular basis. Trustees on successful boards wanted to consider
opinions and ideas from other constituencies or stakeholders as they made decisions as a board as a whole (Chait et al., 1993).

Ingram and Weary (2000) described the political dimension as one in which a governing board “accepts as one of its primary responsibilities the need to develop and maintain healthy relationships among key constituencies” (p. 26). Communicating with various stakeholders is beneficial because it can improve the quality of information and discussion and makes the political process go much more smoothly (Chait et al., 1993). Chait et al. (1993) recommended that boards should move slowly when making extremely important decisions so a consensus may form and avoid actions and decisions that threaten to divide the board or the campus into winners and losers. Chait et al. (1993) stated, “leaders should move deliberately, engage others, and allow a mutually acceptable plan to emerge” (p. 86). Ineffective boards, however, were not concerned about creating a consensus, working out a compromise, or averting a showdown with other constituencies. Most ineffective boards simply believed in calling for a vote and declaring a winner.

**Strategic Dimension**

Many of the ineffective boards in Chait et al.’s (1993) study did not plan for the future. Much of their work was routine and dealt primarily with renovations to buildings, approval of academic modifications, or other matters of the moment. Chait et al. (1993) believed that “effective trusteeship concerns the strategic dimension, or the board’s ability to envision and shape institutional direction” (p. 95). Keller stated in *Academic Strategy*, “Strategy means agreeing on some aims and having a plan to arrive at a destination through the effective use of resources. It is understanding what business you
are in, or want to be in, and deciding what is central for the health, growth, and quality of the organization” (Chait et al., 1993, p. 96). Chait et al (1993) stated, “Competent boards cultivate and concentrate on processes that sharpen institutional priorities and ensure a strategic approach to the organization’s future” (p. 95). Again, trustees belonging to effective boards used other stakeholders to help create strategy for the institution (Ingram & Weary, 2000).

Implementing the components of the six-dimensional profile developed by Chait et al. (1993), community college governing boards should better fulfill the expectations the state governments and public have imparted to them. Employing the contextual dimension should make boards more cognizant of their institution’s culture, values and mission, thus creating less friction between the board and various constituencies when problems arise. Incorporating board development, such as orientations, trustee educational opportunities in the form of workshops, retreats, and conferences, and board evaluation, into their normal activities should inform new trustees about their responsibilities related to trusteeship and also improve the knowledge of experienced trustees. Characteristics of the interpersonal dimension should help community college boards become better at being a board that fosters teamwork and cohesiveness. The analytical dimension will allow governing boards to look at problems and situations through different perspectives. In addition, the political dimension will provide positive two-way communication between the board and several constituencies associated with the community college such as, students, alumni, faculty, and the community. Finally, the strategic dimension will help the community college board plan for the future and find individuals who will share their vision of the institution.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Research Design

Prior to this study, NCACCT collected data to create a data set of the population of North Carolina community college trustees. The data set contained information such as each trustee’s first and last names, mailing address, telephone number, appointing agency, chair status, gender, and race. After randomly selecting trustees from the NCACCT data set, a sample data set was created for the study. The research design for this study was a correlational design that implemented cross-sectional survey methodology. The additional data used for this study was collected at one point in time using a self-administered survey instrument, or board questionnaire, with a self-assessment component. The purposes of the research design were to obtain additional demographic data regarding North Carolina community college trustees and to examine trustee perceptions of effectiveness as related to Chait et al.’s (1993) conceptual framework.

Population and Sample

The target population of the study included 734 (N=734) individuals who were appointed North Carolina community college trustees as listed in an NCACCT data set for the 2003-2004 academic year. In their initial study, Jackson and Holland (1998) had a sample of 34 sites and 1,036 trustees. In an attempt to replicate the high response rate of 30% to 100% from institutions Jackson and Holland (1998) reported in their initial study, a census of all 58 community colleges was implemented, and a randomly-selected
A subtotal of 10 trustees was selected from each institution for a grand total of 580 potential participants in the sample population.

**Sampling Process**

A random number generator was used to assign whole numbers from 1.00000 to 100.00000 to each of the available 734 community college trustees in the target population. Afterwards, trustees from each community college were grouped according to their respective appointing agency: the governor’s office, the local board of county commissioners, or the local board of education. The primary purpose for stratifying most of the sample by trustee appointment was to get the best representation of trustees possible for an examination between appointing agencies and demographic data. After trustees of each institution were arranged by appointing agency, trustees were then arranged numerically within their respective groups from highest to lowest, based on each trustee’s randomly assigned whole number. Once trustees were grouped and then ranked numerically from highest to lowest, the three trustees with the highest whole numbers were selected from each group. Therefore, as Table 3.1 illustrates, from each of the 58 community college boards of trustees, three trustees appointed by the governor were selected, three trustees appointed by the local board(s) of education were selected, and three trustees appointed by the local board(s) of county commissioners were selected for a subtotal of nine trustees per institution for a stratified random sample data set. In addition, the remaining trustee from each community college, who was assigned the highest whole number and regardless of appointing agency, was included in the sample data set for a total of 10 trustees per community college, and for a grand total of 580 (n=580) trustees selected for the study.
Once the 580 trustees were selected as potential participants, all information was input in an Excel worksheet, creating a sample data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointing Agency</th>
<th>Number Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board(s) of Co. Comm.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board(s) of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Trustee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a population of 750, with a confidence level of $p < 0.05$, would require a sample size of 254. With this study, selecting a large sample of 580 trustees had two primary advantages. A large sample in this study not only helped to prevent a Type II error, but it also provided for as many potential participants as possible to complete the board questionnaire, specifically Part B, the BSAQ. In addition, fewer trustees, in general, serve on community college boards than on most other governing boards of higher education. To reflect a similar response rate comparable to Jackson and Holland’s (1998) study using the BSAQ, the minimum response rate was set at three respondents and a maximum of 10 respondents per institution when scoring the self-assessment instrument. In addition, the confidence level for all statistical analyses was set at $p < 0.05$ to prevent Type I errors.

Using information provided by the NCACCT trustee data set, the sample data set contained certain demographic information that was labeled and then operationalized for statistical analyses in this study. Many of the variables provided in the Sample Data Set Code Sheet, or Appendix A, are considered confidential because they risk identifying
potential participants and respondents of the study. For example, variables such as FIRST, representing the trustee’s first name, LAST, indicating the trustee’s last name, and STREET1, indicating the participant’s primary street address, are listed yet the actual data are not provided in the study. In addition, Appendix A also provides an explanation of the variables in the data set and how the variables were operationalized for the study. For statistical analyses, all data sets for this study were first input in a Microsoft Excel worksheet, saved, and then later imported into the SAS System for Window (8.2) statistical software for data analysis.

Research Question 1

Using a random sample of North Carolina community college trustees, is there a significant relationship between appointing agencies and demographic data?

Using categorical variables such as APPOINT, RACE, GENDER, WORK, and OCCUPAT, chi-square tests of independence were used to detect any significant relationships between appointing agencies and demographics. Table 3.2 provides a list of analyses performed for Question 1--and later for Question 2. The null hypothesis for each analysis stated that there was no significant relationship between variables, and each analysis used a significance level of $p<0.05$. PROC FREQ, along with the tables and chisq cmh commands, was used in the analysis with the SAS software. See Appendix A for information about variables.
Demographics: Sample Data Set

The target population for the sample data set consisted of all North Carolina community college trustees identified from an NCACCT data set. From the target population of 734 trustees, 580 trustees, or potential participants, were randomly selected for the study. The Sample Data Set Code Sheet, or Appendix A, contains a list of variable names, their definitions, and how the variables were operationalized for analysis. The sample data set of 580 potential participants included 9%, or 50 trustees, who were chairpersons of their respective boards, and 91%, or 530 trustees, who were classified as trustees of the 58 institutions across the state.

Table 3.2 Sample Data Set: Chi-Square Analyses for Question 1

| 2x2   | GENDER*RACE   |
| 3x2   | APPOINT*GENDER|
| 3x2   | APPOINT*RACE  |
| 3x2   | APPOINT*WORK  |
| 3x10  | APPOINT*OCCUPAT |

Table 3.3 Sample Data Set: RACE by GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>29.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>60.34</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>70.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>75.56</td>
<td>82.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>72.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.6706</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>Table Probability (P)</td>
<td>5.570E-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sided Pr &lt;= P</td>
<td>0.0016*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05*
Table 3.3 shows that of the 562 potential participants who identified their race 27.58%, or 155 trustees, identified themselves as female, and 72.42%, or 407 trustees, identified themselves as male. Of the same 562 potential participants, 20.64%, or 116 trustees, identified themselves as a minority race or ethnicity (Black/African-American, Native American, or Hispanic) and 79.36%, or 446 trustees, identified themselves as White or Caucasian. A chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2(4, N = 562) = 1, p = 0.0016$, showed that there was a significant relationship between the variables GENDER and RACE. With a $p=0.0016$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables GENDER and RACE had no significant relationship, was rejected. Male trustees outnumbered female trustees by almost 50%. Moreover, White or Caucasian trustees outnumbered trustees of other races or ethnicities by over 50%.

Using the sample data set, several chi-square tests of independence were conducted to determine whether any significant relationship existed between the variable APPOINT and other demographic variables, such as RACE, GENDER, WORK, and OCCUPAT. Table 3.4 provides an overview of the results from the chi-square analyses conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4 Overall Chi-square Results for the Sample Data Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*RACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*OCCUPAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant $p<0.05^*$
Null Hypothesis Rejected with Caution$^+$

The first analysis examined the relationship between APPOINT and RACE. The results of this analysis gave a racial or ethnic composite of the sample data set and then
provided the actual numbers each appointing agency selected in the sample data set to serve as North Carolina community college trustees.

Table 3.5 shows that of the 562 potential participants who identified their race or ethnicity, the local boards of education appointed 33.10%, or 186 trustees; the local boards of county commissioners appointed 34.34%, or 193 trustees; and the governor’s office appointed 32.56%, or 183 trustees.

Of the 186 potential participants, the local boards of education appointed 27.42%, or 51 individuals, who identified themselves as minority and 72.58%, or 135 individuals, who identified themselves as White or Caucasian.

Of the 193 potential participants, the local boards of county commissioners appointed 18.65%, or 36 individuals, who identified themselves as Black or African-
American and 81.35%, or 157 individuals, who identified themselves as White or Caucasian.

Of the 183 potential participants, the governor’s office appointed 15.85%, or 29 individuals, who identified themselves as minority and 84.15%, or 154 individuals who identified themselves as White or Caucasian.

A chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 562) = 2, p = 0.0162$, showed that there was a significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and RACE. With a $p = 0.0162$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and RACE had no significant relationship, was rejected.

Table 3.5 shows that proportionally boards of education were over twice as likely to appoint a White or Caucasian than individuals from another race or ethnicity; the boards of county commissioners were almost four times as likely to appoint a White or Caucasian than individuals from another race or ethnicity; and the governor’s office was well over four times as likely to select a White or Caucasian than individuals from another race or ethnicity.

The 2000 census showed that North Carolina’s population was comprised of 72.1% Whites or Caucasians, 21.6% Black or African-American, 1.4% Asian, and 1.2% Native American--or 24.2% for minorities as a whole. Boards of education appeared to have appointments representative of the state population as a whole. However, the appointment patterns of boards of county commissioners and the governor’s office are representative of the state’s overall population. The boards of county commissioners appointed less than 19% minorities and the governor’s office with even fewer--less than 16% minority appointments.
The next chi-square analysis examined how many males and females were serving as North Carolina community college trustees by appointment from the three agencies. Table 3.6 shows that of the 194 potential participants appointed by the local boards of education, 27.32%, or 53 trustees, were females and 72.68%, or 141 trustees, were males. Of the 198 potential participants appointed by the local boards of county commissioners, 22.73%, or 45 trustees, were female and 26.38%, or 153 trustees, were male. Of the 188 potential participants appointed by the governor’s office, 32.98%, or 62 trustees were females and 67.02%, or 126 trustees, were males.

With a chi-square test of independence, \( \chi^2 (5, N = 580) = 2, p = 0.0787 \), Table 3.6 shows that there was a potentially significant relationship between the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPOINT</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.32%</td>
<td>72.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>77.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.98%</td>
<td>67.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0837</td>
<td>0.0787+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05
Null hypothesis rejected with caution+
APPOINT and RACE. With a p=0.0787, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and RACE had no significant relationship, was rejected with caution because the p-value was so close to 0.05.

Table 3.6 shows that proportionally the boards of education appointed almost three times as many men as women; the boards of county commissioners appointed over three times as many men as women; and the governor’s office appointed slightly more than twice the number of men as women.

The next set of analyses examined trustees and their professional occupations or work experiences. Appendix I provides the professional categories used in the study and the list of associated occupations for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.7 Sample Data Set: APPOINT by WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT(APPOINT) WORK(WORK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent, Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct, Employed, Retired, Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE, 116, 72, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.05, 13.07, 34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.70, 38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.04, 38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC, 119, 69, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.60, 12.52, 34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.30, 36.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.87, 36.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, 127, 48, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05, 8.71, 31.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.57, 27.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.08, 25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 362, 189, 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.70, 34.30, 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics for Table of APPOINT by WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic, Chi-square, DF, Value, Pro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05
Null hypothesis rejected with caution+
Table 3.7 shows that of the 551 potential participants who indicated their work status, 65.70%, or 362 trustees, were employed full-time or part-time and 34.30%, or 189 trustees, were retired.

Of the 188 potential participants appointed by the local boards of education, 61.70%, or 116 trustees, were employed; 38.30%, or 72 trustees, were retired.

Of the 188 potential participants appointed by the local boards of county commissioners, 63.30%, or 119 trustees, were employed and 36.30%, or 69 trustees, were retired.

Of the 175 potential participants appointed by the governor’s office, 72.57%, or 127 trustees, were employed and 27.43%, or 48 trustees, were retired.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 551) = 2$, $p = 0.0645$, table 3.6 shows that there could be a potentially significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and WORK. With a $p=0.0645$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and WORK had no significant relationship, was rejected with caution. Table 3.7 shows that there were almost twice as many trustees who were employed as those who were retired.
Table 3.8 shows the total number of individuals who were employed and those who were retired by their professional category. Over 35%, or 173 potential participants, were currently or had previously been associated with some type of business, and over 18%, or 90 potential participants, were currently or had previously been involved in some aspect of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>490</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Data = 90

Table 3.9 Sample Data Set: Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Employed Participant</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Retired Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Data = 90
In a more detailed analysis of those trustees who were employed or retired, Table 3.9 shows that 84%, or 146 trustees, who were involved in a business-related occupation were currently employed, while 78%, or 70 trustees, who were involved in education were retired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Fin. Services</th>
<th>Gov.</th>
<th>Indus.</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

$X^2 (13, N=490) = 18, p = 0.0676^+$

Significant $p < 0.05$
Null hypothesis rejected with caution$^+$

Table 3.10 shows that of the 490 potential participants who provided an occupation, 34.39%, or 173 trustees, were involved in some aspect of business; 17.89%, or 90 trustees, were involved in some aspect of education; 7.95%, or 40 trustees, were involved with some aspect of the legal profession; 7.55%, or 38 trustees, were involved with some aspect of financial services; 6.56%, or 33 trustees, were involved with some aspect of the medical profession; 6.16%, or 31 trustees, were associated with some aspect of industry; 5.77%, or 29 trustees, were involved in some aspect of federal, state, or local government; 5.00%, or 29 trustees, identified occupations that were not included in any of the related professional categories; 2.16%, or 16 trustees, were involved in the real estate business; and 1.91%, or 11 trustees, were involved with insurance.

Of the 173 potential participants appointed by the boards of education, the leading professionals included 29.48%, or 51 trustees, who were involved with some aspect of business, and 22.54%, or 39 trustees, who were involved with some aspect of education. The least chosen professionals were the 2.37%, or 4 trustees, who were involved in insurance, and 1.16%, or two trustees, who represented real estate.
Of the 168 potential participants appointed by the boards of county commissioners, the leading professionals include 35.12%, or 59 trustees, who were involved with some aspect of business, and 16.07%, or 27 trustees, were involved with some aspect of education. The least chosen professionals included 3.57%, or six trustees, who were involved in some aspect of the medical field, and 1.19%, or two trustees, who were involved in insurance.

Of the 162 potential participants appointed by the governor’s office, the leading professionals included 38.89%, or 63 trustees, who were involved in some aspect of business, and 14.81%, or 24 trustees, who were associated with some aspect of education. The least chosen professionals included 3.09%, or five trustees, who were involved in real estate, and 3.09%, or five trustees, who were involved in insurance.

With a chi-square test of independence, \( \chi^2 (13, N = 490) = 18, p = 0.0676 \), Table 3.9 showed that there was a potentially significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and OCCUPAT. With a \( p = 0.0676 \), the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and OCCUPAT had no significant relationship, was rejected with caution.

The analysis showed that the largest segment of individuals who were appointed as trustees were currently employed businessmen and businesswomen. The second largest segment of individuals appointed as trustees were those retired from some aspect of education.

Instrumentation

The board questionnaire, or the survey instrument used in the study, contained four sections as noted in Appendix B. The first section, or Part A, included items that
provided additional trustee background information. The second section, or Part B, contained an actual self-assessment, or the *BSAQ*, which provided separate sub scores on six variables related to board effectiveness defined by Chait et al. (1993). The third section, or Part C of the board questionnaire, gave respondents an opportunity to rate overall board effectiveness on a scale of 1 to 10. Finally, the fourth section, or Part D, provided open-ended questions related to trusteeship.

From responses generated from the board questionnaire, a respondent data set was created to include information from the sample data set as well as new data generated by the board questionnaire. A Respondent Data Set Code Sheet, or Appendix C, was designed for the respondent data set. The Respondent Data Set Code Sheet, or Appendix C, contains additional variables, a description of each additional variable, and how each variable was operationalized for the study.

The actual survey instrument, or board questionnaire, was divided into four separate sections:

**Section A: Individual Background Information:** The first section, or Part A of the board questionnaire, contained items related to specific trustee information, such as trustee age, educational level, trustee weekly preparation time, and trustee educational opportunities. Questions related to trustee perceptions about their own governing boards were also included in this section. Items included the frequency of board evaluations, a trustee’s perception of how well his or her board worked as a group, and the primary source trustee used for information about role and responsibilities. See Appendix B for a complete listing of questions.
Section B: **Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire (BSAQ)**. The second section, or Section B of the board questionnaire, included the *Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire (BSAQ)*, which was a 65-item self-assessment instrument designed to assess board performance or effectiveness in six areas that previous research has shown to characterize highly effective boards (Chait et al., 1993; Jackson & Holland, 1998). Permission to use the instrument, which can be found in Appendix D, was granted by Thomas Holland, Ph.D., an original developer of the *BSAQ*.

**BSAQ: Reliability and Validity**

The *BSAQ* underwent extensive analyses of reliability and validity (Jackson & Holland, 1998). Two different measurements of internal consistency for each dimensional scale indicated strong reliability. The overall Cronbach’s alpha for the *BSAQ* was 0.77, which was considered reasonably strong. In addition, factor analyses showed that each dimensional scale was composed of one dominant factor, with an overall theta of 0.76 (Holland & Jackson, 1998). Two different measurements of internal consistency for each dimensional scale indicated strong reliability. In addition, validity for the *BSAQ* was established using two external criteria: using knowledgeable raters’ independent rankings and the organizations’ financial performance. Holland and Jackson (1998) indicated that there was a strong consistency between scores produced by the *BSAQ* and average experts’ rankings. The *BSAQ* scores also showed moderately strong and statistically significant correlations with each organization’s financial reserves and with composite scores of overall financial health (Holland & Jackson, 1998). Jackson and Holland (1998) stated that the association between *BSAQ* scores and institutional indicators suggested that board performance and organizational performance were linked,
which is consistent with the assumption that the quality or effectiveness of board performance does make a difference in the organizations they govern. Moreover, Jackson and Holland (1998) stated that these correlations did not prove any type of causation, but gains in board effectiveness are related to organizational or institutional improvements.

Table 3.11 provides a specific number of statements per competency and a brief description of what that section of the questionnaire attempted to measure. The BSAQ Scoring Guide (Appendix E) provides each statement on the self-assessment, its appropriate dimension or competency, and the process by which items are scored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Statements</th>
<th>Measured Competency</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>Demonstrated how a board understood and took into account the culture, norm, and values of the organization it governed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Demonstrated how a governing board took the necessary steps to ensure that members were well informed about the organization and the professionals working there as well as the board’s own roles, responsibilities, and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Demonstrated how the governing board nurtured the development of its members as a group, attended to the board’s collective welfare, and fostered a sense of cohesiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Demonstrated that the board recognized the complexities and subtleties in the issues it faced and drew on multiple perspectives to dissect complex problems and to synthesize appropriate responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Demonstrated that the board accepted as one of its primary responsibilities the need to develop and maintain healthy relationships among all key constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Demonstrated that the board envisioned and shaped institutional direction and helped to ensure a strategic approach to the institution’s future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holland and Jackson (1998)

Section C: Overall Effectiveness Rating  In Part C, each respondent indicated, using a scale from 1 to 10, his or her perception of his or her board’s effectiveness or performance. A scale with three ranges was developed to interpret effectiveness scores:
very ineffective for responses 1 to 3; effective for responses 4 to 7; and very effective for responses from 8 to 10.

Section D: Your Comments. Section D of the board survey instrument provided four open-ended questions for trustee comments. These four questions were related to the BSAQ and to trusteeship in general. The responses were not used in the computation of statistical results; however, responses were used to provide additional explanation to the statistical information gleaned from the study. The four open-ended questions were the following:

- In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?
- What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?
- What topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would you like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee?
- What concerns do you believe will be important to your board five years from now?

Data Collection

After approval from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB), two organizations were contacted to make community college leaders aware of the study. First, NCACCT organizational directors were contacted to make them aware of the study. Second, the president of the North Carolina Association of Community College Presidents (NCACCP) was contacted to inform NCACCP members about the study. Afterwards, all community college presidents were contacted via email (Appendix F) to make them aware of the study. Soon, thereafter, all board chairs received notification (Appendix G) of the study via U.S. mail.
All 580 trustees listed in the sample data set were considered potential participants in the study. A cover letter explaining the purpose and description of the study, along with other pertinent information, was attached to the board questionnaire as shown in Appendix H. A label with each trustee’s identification code was attached to each board questionnaire as well. Attaching an identification code to each board questionnaire had a two-fold purpose: to track board questionnaires as they were received and then to group respondent board questionnaires by institution.

Afterwards, all packets containing a cover letter, the board questionnaire, a self-addressed stamped envelope and pencil, were mailed to potential participants. Trustees were given three weeks to complete and return the board questionnaire in a self-addressed stamped envelope provided in the initial packet. Two weeks after mailing the survey instrument, an email message was sent to potential participants reminding them to complete and return the board questionnaire.

All potential participants who returned usable surveys were then referred to as respondents. Once surveys were deemed usable, all information was input in an Excel worksheet, creating a respondent data set. Once the respondent data set was completed, the file was imported into the SAS Statistical Analysis Software (Version 8.2), which was used for all statistical analyses.
Analysis of Data

Research Question 2

Does the respondent data set reflect similar demographic characteristics of the sample data set?

Using categorical variables such as APPOINT, RACE, GENDER, WORK, and OCCUPAT, chi-square tests of independence were used to discover any significant relationships in the respondent data set between appointing agencies and demographic data. The null hypotheses stated that there were no significant relationships, and all analyses used a significance level of $p<0.05$. A comparison of related contingency tables and percentiles were used to make comparisons between the sample data set and the respondent data set. Any notable difference(s) between the two data sets would be noted in the results section, or Chapter 4, because the difference(s) could influence the outcome of any results. PROC FREQ, along with the tables and chisq measures commands, was used for the analysis with the SAS software.

Research Question 3

Using the respondent data set, is there a significant relationship between trustee service, and variables such as age (AGE), highest level of education (TRUST_ED), participation in board development activities (DEVELOP), board dynamics (WORKWELL), preparation for board matters (PREP_W), primary sources of information (SOURCE), and frequency of board evaluations (EVALUATE)?
Table 3.12 shows that several chi-square tests of independence were performed using categorical data collected from Part B of the board questionnaire. The purpose of these chi-square tests was to determine if there was a significant relationship between the SERVICE variable and other categorical data such as trustee education, board dynamics, and board preparation time. Appendix C provides all the variables, their descriptions, and associated values for analyses. For each analysis, the null hypothesis stated that there was no significant relationship between variables, and each analysis used a significance level of $p<0.05$. PROC FREQ, along with the table and chisq measures commands, was used for the analysis with the SAS software.

**Research Question 4**

Do first-term trustees have the same perception about board effectiveness as trustees serving two terms or longer?

Part C of the board questionnaire provided each respondent an opportunity to rate his or her board on its effectiveness. The scale ranged from 1 to 10, with 1 being the least effective and 10 being the most effective. In order to examine the mean score of each group, a t-test was used for the analysis. The null hypotheses stated that the means of the
two groups were equal, and the significance level was set at $p < 0.05$. In addition, Cohen’s D, or $d$, indicated the magnitude of the difference, and the Effect Size, indicated whether the magnitude was large (0.80 or above), medium (0.79-0.50) or small (0.49-0.20) (Cohen, 1988). PROC T-TEST was used in the analysis with the SAS software.

Research Question 5

Using responses from the education or builds learning dimension (BL2 through BL51) on the $BSAQ$, are there significant differences between the means of first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer?

For the analysis for each statement, a contingency table was created that combined the responses strongly agree with agree and strongly disagree with disagree. The purpose of the contingency table was to provide a chart to view responses per statement. A t-test was used for each analysis, and the null hypotheses for each analysis stated that the means of the two groups were equal for each statement. All analyses used a significance level of $p < 0.05$. In addition, Cohen’s D, or $d$, and the effect size, or $r$, were also included in the calculations of results as well. PROC FREQ, along with the tables command, and PROC T-TEST were used in the analyses with the SAS software.

Research Question 6

Do institutional $BSAQ$ sub scores reflect overall board perceptions of effectiveness?

With six independent variables, or the six dimensions of effectiveness as defined by Chait et al. (1993), such as BLT, or builds learning dimension total, the UCT, or understands context dimension total, NGT, or nurturing group dimension total, RCT, or recognizing complexity dimension total, RPT, respects process dimension total, and SDT,
shapes direction dimension total, and one dependent variable, EFFECT, or overall
effectiveness ratings, a test of multiple regression was used to determine whether there
was a significant relationship between the six independent variables to the one dependent
variable. Appendix K contains the data used in the analysis.

Two tests were conducted: a test of correlation and a test of multiple regression.
These two tests were used not only to determine the strength of the relationship between
the six independent variables and the one dependent variable but also to determine how
well the independent variables modeled the one dependent variable.

The first part of the research consisted in calculating the correlation coefficients in
order to determine whether each of the six independent variables correlated with the one
independent variable: overall effectiveness rating. In order to calculate a correlation
coefficient for this model, univariate data was gathered on all the variables and analyzed.
A spearman’s correlation coefficient was used to compute the correlations or simple
bivariate relationships between variables. PROC CORR ALPHA SPEARMAN was used
in the analysis with the SAS software.

The research question also consisted of a multiple regression analysis on the
model. The multiple regression analysis determined which of the independent variables
were important predictors of the dependent variable and which variables were
unimportant. The first purpose of the test of multiple regression was to find $R^2$, which
indicated the percent of variance in the criterion variable that is accounted for by the
linear combination of predictor (independent) variables. The second purpose of the
multiple regression was to find the regression coefficients--or more specifically the
standardized coefficients--represented by each predictor or independent variable. These
standardized coefficients are readjusted coefficients that indicate the amount of weight that is given to a predictor or independent variable in predicting the dependent variable. If a predictor variable is assigned a standardized coefficient with a significant amount of weight, then it must be an important predictor. The standardized coefficient could be considered important only when the p-value showed that the standardized coefficient was significantly different from zero. Once it was determined whether a standardized regression coefficient for the various predictor variables were significantly different from zero, they were seen as evidence that the corresponding predictor variable was a relatively important predictor of the dependent variable in that model. In addition, the variance inflation indicators (VIF) were included to determine how interrelated variables may have been with each other. PROC REG, along with the commands model, stb, vif, and selection=rsquare commands, was used in the analysis with the SAS software.

In addition to the statistical analyses, this study also examined the responses to four open-ended questions. The responses were not used in any of the statistical analyses but rather the responses were included in the study to provide additional commentary on the statistical results as well as catalysts to investigate related areas of trusteeship. The open-ended questions asked trustees what areas they perceived their boards to be most effective, how their boards could become more effective, what topics they themselves wanted to investigate to become a better trustee, and what topics their boards would have to handle five years from now. The study included the following four open-ended questions:

- In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?
- What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?
• What topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would you like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee?

• What concerns do you believe will be important to your board five years from now?
Chapter Four

Results

Response Rate

Table 4.1: Overall Board Questionnaire Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Status</th>
<th>Number Mailed</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Mailed</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Questionnaires</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Questionnaires</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusable Questionnaires</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this study, 580 board questionnaire packets were mailed, and 280 questionnaires were returned. Table 4.1 shows that of the 280 questionnaires returned, there were 12 questionnaires that were unusable, for a total of 268 usable questionnaires. Of the 268 usable questionnaires, 265 questionnaires retained the identification label attached at the initial mailing. However, of the 268 usable questionnaires, three were returned without Part A completed. Also, due to missing data on some questionnaires, the total number listed in each analysis might slightly vary from the actual number of overall respondents, thus creating missing data values. Table 4.10 shows the institutional response rate, which ranged from no responses from two institutions to 10 responses from one institution.

During the analysis of the data of responses, it was discovered that not all of the respondents were currently serving community college trustees. There were seven trustees listed in the NCACCT data set who were not reappointed or who had just recently resigned; however, no official replacements had been appointed to fill the vacancies at the beginning of this study. Therefore, since no more than six months had elapsed between the ending of their trustee service and the beginning of this study, these
individuals were still considered part of the study, and all had served at least two terms as community college trustees in North Carolina. Also, of the 265 respondents, there were 26 community college board chairs and 239 known trustees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: College Response Rate for Usable Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Rate %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Data Set

The first set of analyses was conducted to determine if the demographics of the respondent data set were similar to the demographics of the sample data set. Multiple chi-square tests of independence were conducted with the respondent data set.

Table 4.3 shows that of the 258 respondents who identified their race or ethnicity, 27.52%, or 71 respondents, identified themselves as female, and 72.48%, or 187 respondents, identified themselves as male. Of the 258 respondents, 17.04%, or 44 respondents, identified themselves as minority (Black/African American, Asian, Native American, or Hispanic); 82.95%, or 214 respondents, indicated they were White or Caucasian. Of the 44 respondents who identified themselves as minority, 52.27%, or 23 respondents, were female and 47.73%, or 21 respondents, were male. Of the 214 respondents who identified themselves as White or Caucasian, 22.43%, or 48 respondents, were female, and 77.57%, or 166 respondents, identified themselves as male.
With a chi-square test of independence, $x^2 (4, N = 258) = 1, p = 0.00001450$,

Table 4.3 showed that there was a significant relationship between the variables GENDER and RACE. With a \( p = 0.00001450 \), the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables GENDER and RACE had no significant relationship, was rejected.

When comparing both the sample data set and the respondent data set, the compositions of both data sets were very similar. There were 72.42% males in the sample data set and 72.48% males in the respondent data set. There 27.58% females in the sample data set and 27.52% females in the respondent data set. There were 20.64% minorities in the sample data set and 17.05% minorities in the respondent data set. There
were 79.36% Whites or Caucasians in the sample data set and 82.95% Whites or Caucasians in the respondent data set. Similar to the sample data set, the respondent data set consisted predominantly of white males.

Research Question Two

The purpose for the analyses in this section was to compare the results with those given earlier for the sample data set. The ideal for this study was to have a respondent data set composed as nearly identical to the sample data set as possible. Table 4.4 shows the overall results for the chi-square analyses used with the respondent data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*GENDER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8048</td>
<td>0.6687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*RACE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7250</td>
<td>0.1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*WORK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2949</td>
<td>0.1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT*OCCUPAT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.2564</td>
<td>0.5055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05

The first analysis examined the relationship between the APPOINT variable and the GENDER variable. Table 4.5 shows that of the 265 respondents, the local boards of education appointed 30.94%, or 82 respondents; the local boards of county commissioners appointed 35.47%, or 94 respondents; and the governor’s office appointed 33.58%, or 89 respondents. Of the 82 respondents appointed by the local boards of education, 30.49%, or 25 trustees, were female and 69.51%, or 57 trustees, were male. Of the 94 respondents who were appointed by the local boards of county commissioners, 24.47%, or 23 trustees, were female and 75.53%, or 71 trustees, were male. Of the 89 respondents who were appointed by the governor’s office, 26.97%, or 24 trustees, were female, and 73.03%, or 65 trustees, were male.
A chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (5, N = 265) = 2, p = 0.6687$, showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and GENDER.

With a $p=0.6687$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and GENDER had no significant relationship, was not rejected. When comparing the sample data set with the respondent data set, the local boards of education appointed 33.45% or 194 trustees, in the sample data and 30.94%, or 82 trustees, in the respondent data set. The local boards of county commissioners appointed 34.14%, or 198 trustees, in the sample data set and 35.47%, or 94 trustees, in the respondent set. The governor’s office appointed 32.41%, or 188 trustees, in the sample data set and 33.58%, or 89 trustees, in the respondent data set. The sample data set contained 27.59% trustees who were female.
and 72.41% trustees who were male and the respondent data set consisted of 27.17% trustees who were female and 72.83% who were male.

Table 4.6 shows that of the 258 respondents, 17.05%, or 44 trustees, indicated they were minority, and 82.95%, or 214 trustees, identified themselves as White or Caucasian. Of the 80 respondents appointed by the local boards of education, 22.50%, or 18 trustees, identified themselves as minority, and 77.50%, or 62 trustees, identified themselves as White or Caucasian. Of the 94 respondents appointed by the local boards of county commissioners, 17.78%, or 16 trustees, identified themselves as minority, and 82.22%, or 74 trustees, identified themselves as White or Caucasian. Of the 88 respondents appointed by the governor’s office, 11.36%, or 10 trustees, identified
themselves as minority, and 88.64%, or 78 trustees, identified themselves as White or Caucasian.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 258) = 2$, $p = 0.1553$, Table 4.6 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and RACE. With a $p=0.1553$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and RACE had no significant relationship, was not rejected. The respondent data set and the sample data set were almost identical along racial lines. The sample data consisted of 20.64% minorities and 79.36% Caucasians or Whites, and the respondent data set consisted of 17.05% minorities and 82.95% Caucasians or Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7 Respondent Data Set: APPOINT by WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPOINT(APPOINT)     WORK(WORK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics for Table of APPOINT by WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2969</td>
<td>0.1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next analysis examined the relationship between the variables APPOINT and WORK, or trustee employment status. Table 4.7 shows that of 250 respondents, 59.20%,
or 148 trustees, were employed and 40.80%, or 102 trustees were retired. Of the 80 respondents appointed by the local boards of education, 53.75%, or 43 trustees, were employed, and 46.25%, or 37 trustees, were retired. Of the 88 respondents appointed by the local boards of county commissioners, 56.82%, or 50 trustees, were employed, 43.18%, or 38 trustees, were retired. Of the 82 respondents appointed by the governor’s office, 67.07%, or 55 trustees, were employed, and 32.93%, or 27 trustees, were retired.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 250) = 2$, $p = 0.1925$, Table 4.7 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and WORK. With a $p=0.1925$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and WORK had no significant relationship, was not rejected. The sample data set had 65.70% employed trustees and 34.30% trustees who had retired from work while the respondent data set had 59.20% employed trustees and 40.80% trustees who had retired from work. The sample data set had p-value of 0.0645, with null hypothesis being rejected with caution. The respondent data set had a much smaller difference between those trustees who were employed and those who were retired.

| Table 4.8 Respondent Data Set: APPOINT by OCCUPAT |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|                 | Business | Educat. | Fin. Services | Gov. | Industry | Insur | Legal | Med | Other | Real Estate | Tot |
| BOE              | 21       | 17      | 6             | 2    | 5        | 2     | 5     | 8   | 6     | 1             | 81  |
| CC               | 28       | 16      | 9             | 4    | 6        | 0     | 3     | 1   | 9     | 4             | 94  |
| G                | 26       | 11      | 4             | 3    | 6        | 3     | 7     | 7   | 6     | 2             | 89  |
| Total s          | 75       | 44      | 19            | 9    | 17       | 5     | 15    | 16  | 21    | 7             | 228 |
| Results          | $\chi^2 (13, N = 228) = 18$, $p = 0.5055$ |

Table 4.8 shows that of the 264 respondents, 32.89%, or 75 trustees, were involved in some aspect of business; 19.30%, or 44 trustees, were involved in some aspect of education; 9.21%, or 21 respondents, were identified as other than what was
listed; 8.33%, or 19 respondents, were involved in some aspect of financial services; 7.46%, or 17 respondents, had occupations related to industry; 7.02%, or 16 respondents, were in the medical profession; 6.58%, or 15 respondents, were involved in the legal profession; 3.95%, or nine respondents, were involved in either local, state, or federal government; 3.07%, or seven respondents, were involved in real estate; and 2.19%, or five respondents, were involved in insurance.

With a chi-square test of independence, \( x^2 (13, N = 228) = 18, p = 0.5055 \), Table 4.8 shows that there was no significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and OCCUPAT. With a \( p = 0.5472 \), the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and OCCUPAT had no significant relationship, was not rejected.

Comparing the top two categories in the respondent data set to the top two categories in the sample data set, there were 34.39% trustees involved in some aspect of business in the sample data set and 32.89% involved in business in the respondent data set. There were 17.89% trustees involved in some aspect of education in the sample data set and 19.30% involved in some aspect of education. Table 4.9 shows a comparison between the percentile distributions in the employment status of trustees in the sample data set to that in the respondent data set.
The following set of analyses used the data provided by Part A: Individual Background Information of the board questionnaire. Appendix C provides the variable name, the description, and how each variable was operationalized for this study. Table 4.10 provides the overall results for the chi-square tests used to help answer Research Question Three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.9 Respondent Data Set: Trustee Professions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.10 Overall Chi-square Results for SERVICE Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*ORIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*TRUST_ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*DEVELOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*WORKWELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*PREPARE_W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE*EVALUATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant p<0.05
For the following analyses, the variable SERVICE, noting first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer, were used in each analysis. The other variables, which were categorical in nature, included ORIENT, TRUST_ED, DEVELOP, WORKWELL, and EVALUATE.

The first analysis examined the relationship between the SERVICE variable and the ORIENT variable. Table 4.19 shows that of the 256 respondents, 66.80%, or 171 respondents, indicated that their institutions had an orientation session; 30.47%, or 78 respondents, indicated that their institutions did not have an orientation session; and 2.73%, or seven respondents, indicated that they were unsure whether their institutions provided an orientation session or not.

Of the 59 first-term respondents who indicated a response, over 67.80%, or 40 first-term respondents, indicated that their institutions provided an orientation session; 30.51%, or 18 first-term respondents, indicated that their institutions did not provide an orientation session; and 2.73%, or seven respondents, indicated that they were unsure whether their institutions provided an orientation session or not.
orientation session, and 1.69%, or only one first-term respondent, indicated that he or she was unsure whether his or her institution had an orientation for new members.

Of the 197 respondents serving two or more terms, 66.50%, or 131 respondents, stated that their institutions had orientation sessions; 30.46%, or 60 respondents, indicated that their boards had no orientation at their institutions, 2.73%, or seven respondents, indicated that they were unsure whether their institutions had an orientation.

With a chi-square test of independence, $x^2 (5, \ N = 251) = 2, p = 0.8545$, Table 4.11 shows that there was no significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and ORIENT. With a $p = 0.8545$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and ORIENT had no significant relationship, was not rejected. Although there was no significant relationship between the two variables, of noted interest is that slightly one-third of both groups reported that their institutions did not provide an orientation session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.12 Respondent Data Set: SERVICE by TRUST_ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE(SEVICE) TRUST_ED(TRUST_ED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent, Row Pct, Col Pct, High Sch, Assoc D., Bachelor, Master’s, Doctor, Other, Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term: 5 5 23 13 11 3 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term: 14 17 84 40 31 11 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 19 22 107 53 42 14 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Missing = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics for Table of SERVICE by TRUST_ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic DF Value Prob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square 5 0.5632 0.9896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant $p \leq 0.05$
The next chi-square analysis examined the education level, TRUST_ED variable, of first-term trustees and trustees serving two or more terms. Table 4.12 shows that of the 257 respondents, 7.39%, or 19 respondents, indicated that their highest degree was a high school diploma; 8.56%, or 22 respondents, indicated that they had received an associate’s degree, 41.63%, or 107 respondents, indicated they had received a bachelor’s degree; 20.62%, or 53 respondents, indicated they had received a master’s degree; 15.7%, or 42 respondents, indicated they had received a doctorate; and 5.45%, or 14 respondents, indicated they had received other types of higher education degrees not listed on the survey.

With a chi-square test of independence, \( x^2 (8, N = 257) = 5, p = 0.9896 \), Table 4.12 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables APPOINT and TRUST_ED. With a \( p = 0.9896 \), the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and TRUST_ED had no significant relationship, was not rejected.

There were no trustees who indicated having less than a high school education or having obtained a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) or any other type of high school equivalency. The bachelor’s degree was the most common among the group, followed by the master’s degree, and then the doctorate.
The next analysis examined the number of board development opportunities trustees had experienced during their tenure. Table 4.13 shows that of the 259 respondents who indicated a response regarding board development opportunities, 7.72%, or 20 respondents, indicated that they had attended 0 to 1 board development opportunities. 39.00%, or 101 respondents, indicated that they had attended two to four meetings; 14.29%, or 37 respondents, indicated that they had attended four to six board development opportunities, and 39%, or 101 respondents, indicated that they had attended seven or more board development opportunities.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (3, N = 259) = 3$, $p<0.0001$, Table 4.13 shows that there was a significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and DEVELOP. With a $p = 0.0001$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables APPOINT and OCCUPAT had no significant relationship, was rejected.
Respondents serving two or more terms responded most frequently that they had attended seven or more classes, workshops, or retreats that provided information about their role as a community college trustee. The second highest response was two to four opportunities. First-term trustees selected two to four workshops as their primary response, with their second response indicating zero to two. Inherently, trustees serving two terms or longer indicated overwhelmingly that they attended more board development opportunities than first-term trustees which would be expected since they have served longer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.14 Respondent Data Set: SERVICE by WORKWELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE(SERVICE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WORKWELL variable provided trustee responses concerning their perceptions of how well their board members work together as a group. Table 4.14 shows that of the 257 respondents, 59.14%, or 152 respondents, indicated that their boards members worked well together as a group all of the time; 36.58%, or 94 respondents, indicated that their board members worked well together as a group most of the time; 3.11%, or eight trustees, indicated that their board members worked well
together as a group some of the time; and 1.17% or three respondents, indicated that their board members never worked well together as a group.

Of the 60 first-term respondents, 51.67%, or 31 trustees, indicated that their boards worked well together as a group all of the time, 45.00%, or 27 trustees, stated that their boards worked well together as a group most of the time.

Of the 197 respondents serving a second term or longer, 61.42%, or 121 trustees, indicated that their boards worked well together as a group all of the time, and 34.01%, or 94 trustees, indicated that their boards worked well together most of the time.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 257) = 3.999$, Table 4.14 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and WORKWELL. With a $p = 0.3991$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and WORKWELL had no significant relationship, was not rejected. Over 95% of both first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer indicated that their boards worked well together all of the time or most of the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.15 Respondent Data Set: SERVICE by PREPARE_W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE(SERVICE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency ,Percent , Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Missing = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics for Table of SERVICE by PREPARE_W
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6265</td>
<td>0.2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant $p = 0.05$
The variable PREPARE_W indicated how many hours each week trustees spent on board matters. Table 4.15 shows that of the 257 respondents who indicated a response, over 35.20%, or 92 respondents, indicated that they spent less than one hour per week preparing for board matters; 49.03%, or 126 respondents, indicated that they spent one to two hours per week preparing for board matters; 12.06%, or 12 respondents, indicated that they spent two to three hours per week preparing for board matters; and 11%, or eight respondents, indicated that they spent more than three hours per week preparing for board matters.

Of 60 first-term respondents, 41.67%, or 25 trustees, stated that they spent less that one hour a week on board business, and 51.67%, or 31 trustees, stated that they spent one to two hours on college business.

Of 197 respondents serving two terms or longer, 34.01%, or 67 trustees, indicated that they spent less than one hour a week on board business; 48.22%, or 95 trustees, indicated that they spent one to two hours a week on board business; and 14.21%, or 28 trustees, stated that they spent two to three hours on board business each week.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (6, N = 257) = 3, p = 0.2013$, Table 4.15 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and PREPARE_W. With a $p = 0.2013$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and PREPARE_W had no significant relationship, was not rejected. Of the 257 respondents, over 80% of all respondents spent from none to two hours on board business. Almost 50% of all respondents stated that they spent one to two hours a week on board business.
The AGE variable included ranges of ages that respondents had used to indicate their ages. Table 4.16 shows that of the 259 respondent, 0.39%, or one respondent, indicated that he or she was under the age of 29; 1.16%, or three respondents, stated that they were between the ages of 30 and 39; 9.65%, or 25 respondents, indicated that they were between the ages of 40 and 49; 27.80%, or 72 respondents, indicated that they were between the ages of 50 and 59; and 61%, or 158 respondents, indicated that they were 60 years old or older.

With a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2 (7, N = 259) = 4$, $p = 0.0789$, Table 4.16 showed that there was no significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and AGE. With a $p = 0.0789$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and AGE had no significant relationship, was not rejected. Although there was no significant relationship between variables, of the 259 respondents, over 80%, or 230 respondents were over the age of 50.
The SOURCE variable provided an opportunity for respondents to indicate their primary source of information regarding trusteeship. Table 4.17 shows that of the 259 respondents, 22.78%, or 59 respondents, indicated that the chairman of the board was their primary source for information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities as a trustee; 16.60%, or 43 respondents, indicated they relied upon formal training programs for their primary source of information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities; 1.93%, or five respondents, indicated that they relied upon literature, such as magazines, professional journals and specialized newspapers, for their primary source of information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities; 10.04%, or 26 respondents, indicated that they relied upon other board members for their primary source of information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities; 42.86%, or 111 respondents, indicated that they relied upon their college presidents as their primary source of information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities as a trustee; and
5.79%, or 15 respondents, indicated that they relied upon other sources from the ones listed as their primary source of information regarding their primary duties and responsibilities.

With a chi-square test of independence, \( \chi^2 (8, N = 259) = 5, p = 0.0346 \), Table 4.17 shows that there was a significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and SOURCE. With a \( p = 0.0346 \), the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and SOURCE had no significant relationship, was rejected. Over 40% of the trustees relied upon the president of the institution as their primary source of trustee information, while slightly over 20% relied up the board chair. Of the 259 respondents, only 16.60%, or 43 trustees, indicated that they relied up training as their primary source of information.

Table 4.18 Respondent Data Set: SERVICE by EVALUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE(SERVICE)</th>
<th>EVALUATE(EVALUATE)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Every 2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics for Table of SERVICE by EVALUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0116</td>
<td>0.5539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p > 0.05
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The EVALUATE variable provided the results respondents gave indicating how often their boards evaluated their performance. Table 4.18 shows that of the 259 respondents who indicated an answer, 24.71%, or 64 respondents, indicated that their boards never evaluated their performance as a group; 52.90%, or 137 respondents, indicated that their boards evaluated their performances as a group once every year; 3.47%, or nine respondents, indicated that their boards evaluated their performances as a group once every two years; 3.86%, or 10 respondents, stated that their boards evaluated differently from what was listed, and 15.06%, or 39 respondents, stated that they were unsure about their boards’ evaluation procedures.

A chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2(7, N = 259) = 4$, $p = 0.5559$, Table 4.18 shows that there was no significant relationship between the variables SERVICE and EVALUATE. With a $p = 0.5559$, the null hypothesis, which stated that the two variables SERVICE and EVALUATE had no significant relationship, was not rejected. Of the 259 respondents, almost 25% of the respondents indicated that their boards did not evaluate their performance; while over 50% of the respondents indicated that their boards evaluated themselves once each year. Notably, over 15% of the respondents were unsure whether their boards evaluated themselves or not.

Research Question Four

The EFFECT variable provided trustee responses related to the overall effectiveness of governing boards. Table 4.19 shows that of the 257 respondents who
responded to Part C, 0.78%, or two respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 1; 0.78%, or two respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 2; 0.78%, or two respondents rated their boards’ effectiveness a 3; 3.50%, or nine respondents rated their boards’ effectiveness a 4; 3.89%, or 10 respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 5; 2.33%, or six respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 6; 6.23%, or 16 respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 7; 21.40%, or 55 respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness an 8; 33.07%, or 85 respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 9; and 27.24%, or 70 respondents, rated their boards’ effectiveness a 10.

With the equality of variances results $t(59) = 1.02$ and $p = 0.9019$, Table 4.20 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(255) = -1.75$ and $p = 0.0817$, $d = -0.25709$, and $r = -0.12749$ the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer. Although both groups rated their boards’ effectiveness very high, trustees serving two or more terms rated their boards slightly higher (8.48) on average than first-term trustees (8.02).

**Research Question Five**

Part B of the board questionnaire had the *BSAQ*, which was comprised of 65 statements that related to board effectiveness. Twelve statements were specifically
written to address the education competency, or Builds Learning dimension, within Chait et al.’s (1993) conceptual framework. For all 65 statements, respondents had a scale of 0 to 3 to respond. See Appendix E for the actual scoring of the survey instrument. Table 4.21 provides the results for the multiple t-tests conducted for the 12 statements used for the education dimension. Appendix L provides the t-test results for the other statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First Term</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Second Term+</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 17</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 21</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 26</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 29</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 34</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 38</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 51</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each analysis, a contingency table was created that combined strongly agree with agree and strongly disagree with disagree for easier interpretation. For each analysis, a t-test was appropriately used because the SERVICE variable was dichotomous with two groups: trustees who were serving their first term and trustees who were serving their second term or longer, and the education dimension variables BL2 through BL51 were measured from 0 to 4, with 0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = agree, and 3 = strongly agree. For each analysis a contingency table is provided with strongly agree and agree combined and strongly disagree and disagree combined. For each t-test, the null hypothesis ($M_1=M_2$) stated that the means were equal between the two groups. The alternative hypothesis ($M_1\neq M_2$) stated that the means were not equal between the two groups. The confidence level for all analyses was set at $p<0.05$. In addition, for each
analysis, Cohen’s D, or d, and the Effect Size, or r, were calculated as well using a Web-based site at /http://www.uccs.edu/~lbecker/psy590/escalc3.htm/.

Table 4.22 shows that of the 255 respondents to Statement 2, 62.75%, or 160 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 37.25%, or 95 respondents, stated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 56.67%, or 34 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 43.33%, or 26 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 2. Of the 195 respondents serving a second term or longer, 64.62%, or 126 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 35.38%, or 69 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 2.

Table 4.23 shows that the results of Statement 2 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.57 (SD = 0.81), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.66 (SD=0.86).
With the equality of variances results $t(162) = 1.21$ and $p = 0.3911$, Table 4.23 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(253) = -0.75$ and $p = 0.4523$, $d = 0.014$, and $r = 0.00723$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served two terms or longer.

Table 4.24 shows that of the 255 overall respondents who answered Statement 10, 65.49%, or 167 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed; and 34.51%, or 88 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 59 first-term trustees, 66.10% or 39 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed; and 33.90% or 20 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 196 second-term trustees, 65.31% or 128 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed; and 34.69% or 68 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed.

Table 4.24: BSAQ Statement 10 Responses
At least once every two years, our board has a retreat or special session to examine our performance, how well we are doing as a board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service (SERVICE)</th>
<th>NewBL10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str_Agree,Str_Diss</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents, 66.10%, 39 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed; and 33.90%, or 20 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 10. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 65.31%, or 128 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 34.69%, or 68 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 10.

Of noted interest, Table 4.24 shows that of 259 respondents, 24.71, or 64 respondents stated that their boards never evaluated their performance; 52.90%, or 137 respondents indicated that their boards evaluated their performance once a year; 3.47%, or 9 respondents, stated that their boards evaluated their performance once every two years; 3.86%, or 10 respondents, indicated that they had another evaluation timeframe than that given; and 15.06%, or 39 respondents, were unsure about the frequency of evaluation.

Table 4.25 shows that the results of Statement 10 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.93 (SD = 0.91), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.92 (SD=0.99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL10 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.6958</td>
<td>1.9322</td>
<td>2.1686</td>
<td>0.9071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL10 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.7776</td>
<td>1.9184</td>
<td>2.0591</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL10 Diff (1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.3001</td>
<td>0.9789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variable | Method  | Variances | DF  | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|---------|-----------|-----|---------|------|---|
| BL10     | Pooled  | Equal     | 253 | 0.10    | 0.9242|

Table 4.25 T-Test: SERVICE and BL10

The TTEST Procedure

Statistics

T-Tests

Significant p<0.05
With the equality of variances results \(t(59) = 1.14\) and \(p = 0.5539\), Table 4.25 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results \(t(253) = -0.75, p = 0.4523, d = -0.11301\) and \(r = -0.5641\); therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer.

Table 4.26: BSAQ Statement 17 Responses
This board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing institutions like the one we govern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE(SERVICE)</th>
<th>NewBL17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Second-term | 132 | 62 | 194 |
| | 51.97 | 24.41 | 76.38 |
| | 68.04 | 31.96 |
| | 76.30 | 76.54 |

Total | 173 | 81 | 254 |
| 68.11 | 31.89 | 100.00 |

Frequency Missing = 34

Table 4.26 shows that of the 254 overall respondents who answered Statement 17, 68.11%, or 173 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 31.89%, or 81 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents who were serving, 68.33%, or 41 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 31.67%, or 19 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 17. Of the 194 respondents serving a second term or longer, 68.04%, or 132 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 31.96%, or 62 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 17.
Table 4.27 shows that the results of Statement 17 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.82 (SD = 0.65), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.76 (SD=0.72).

With the equality of variances results $t(59) = 1.21$ and $p = 0.3894$, Table 4.27 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(252) = 0.52$ and $p = 0.6043$, $d = 0.08$, $r = 0.04$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served two terms or longer. Of 254 respondents, almost 70%, or 173, indicated that their boards set aside time to learn more about important issues facing institutions like the one they governed.

Table 4.27 T-Test: SERVICE and BL17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL17 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6486</td>
<td>0.6507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL17 2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.6614</td>
<td>0.7165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.28: BSAQ Statement 18 Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE(SERVICE)</th>
<th>NewBL18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 12
Table 4.28 shows that of the 256 respondents who responded to Statement 18, 37.50%, or 96 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 62.50%, or 160 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 31.67%, or 19 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 68.33%, or 41 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 18. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 39.29%, or 77 respondents indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 60.71%, or 119 respondents, stated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 18.

Table 4.29 shows that the results of Statement 18 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.15 (SD = 0.73), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.25 (SD=0.75).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.9608</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.3392</td>
<td>0.7324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.1448</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.3552</td>
<td>0.7468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL18</td>
<td>Diff (1-2)</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.7435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the equality of variances results $t (59) = 1.04$ and $p = 0.8837$, Table 4.29 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t (254) = -0.91$ and $p = 0.3628$, $d = -0.13520$, and $r = -0.06744$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two
terms or longer. Over two-thirds of the respondents could not recall an occasion when their board acknowledged its responsibility for an ill-advised decision.

Table 4.30 shows that of the 255 respondents who responded to Statement 21, 56.08% or 143 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 43.92%, or 112 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 56.67%, or 34 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 43.33%, or 26 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 21. Of the 195 respondents serving two terms or longer, 55.90%, or 109 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 33.73%, or 66 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 21.

Table 4.31 shows that the results of Statement 21 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms.
or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.55 (SD = 0.70), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.56 (SD=0.72).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.3694</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.7306</td>
<td>0.6993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.4575</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>1.6604</td>
<td>0.7182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL21 Diff (1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.1986</td>
<td>0.7138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the equality of variances results $t(59) = 1.05$ and $p = 0.8298$, Table 4.31 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(253) = -0.09$ and $p = 0.9322$, $d = -0.01269$, and $r = -0.00634$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served two terms or longer. In comparison, Table 4.17 shows that of 259 respondents, over 40%, or 111 respondents, indicated that the president was the greatest source of information about roles and responsibilities and 10.04%, or 26 respondents, indicated that the board was the greatest source of information about roles and responsibilities.

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|------|---|
| BL21     | Pooled | Equal     | 253| -0.09   | 0.9322 |  |

**Table 4.32: BSQ Response 24** 
When a new member joins this board, we make sure that someone serves as a mentor to help this person learn the ropes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>NewBL24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency,</td>
<td>Percent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 12
Table 4.32 shows that of the 256 respondents who responded to Statement 24, 44.92%, or 115 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 55.08%, or 141 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 40.00%, or 24 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 60.00%, or 36 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 24. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 46.43%, or 91 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 53.57%, or 105 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 24.

Table 4.33 shows that the results of Statement 24 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.43 (SD = 0.72), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.46 (SD = 0.74).

Table 4.33 T-Test: SERVICE and BL24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.2469</td>
<td>1.4333</td>
<td>1.6198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>1.4592</td>
<td>1.5634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL24</td>
<td>Diff (1-2)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.1879</td>
<td>0.7355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF | T Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|------|---|
| BL24     | Pooled | Equal     | 254 | -0.24   | 0.8109 |

With the equality of variances results $t (59) = 1.05$ and $p = 0.8463$, Table 4.33 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t (254) = -0.24$ and $p = 0.8109$, $d = -0.03544$, and $r = -0.01771$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served.
two terms or longer. Over half of the trustees stated that their boards did not provide a mentor for a new member.

Table 4.34 shows that of the 258 respondents who responded to Statement 26, 73.26%, or 189 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 26.74%, or 69 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 56.67%, or 34 respondents, indicated they strongly agreed/agreed, and 43.33%, or 26 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 26. Of the 198 respondent serving a second term or longer, 78.28%, or 155 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 26. Of the 198 respondent serving a second term or longer, 78.28%, or 155 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 21.72%, or 43 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 26.

Table 4.35 shows that the results of Statement 26 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.75 (SD = 0.75), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.94 (SD = 0.72).
With the equality of variances results $t(197) = 1.10$ and $p = 0.6325$, Table 4.35 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(256) = -1.77$ and $p = 0.0774$, $d = -0.25802$ and $r = -0.12795$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There is no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served two terms or longer. Over 70% of the respondents indicated that they had been in discussions about their boards’ performances. In comparison, almost 80% of the respondents serving two terms or longer indicated that they had been involved in discussion about board effectiveness; while only slightly more than half of the first-term respondents indicated that they had.

Table 4.35 T-Test: SERVICE and BL26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL26 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.5561</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.9439</td>
<td>0.7507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL26 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.8389</td>
<td>1.9394</td>
<td>2.0399</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL26 Diff (1-2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.7249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-Tests

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|-------|
| BL26     | Pooled | Equal     | 256| -1.77   | 0.0774|

Table 4.36: BSAQ Statement 29 Responses
I have participated in discussions with new members about their roles and responsibilities of a board member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>NewBL29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>66.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Str_Agree</th>
<th>Str_Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>66.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 12
Table 4.36 shows that of the 256 respondents who responded to Statement 29, 66.41%, or 170 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 33.59%, or 86 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 59 first-term respondent, 57.63%, or 34 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 42.37%, or 25 respondents, stated that strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 29. Of the 197 respondents serving a second term or longer, 69.04%, or 136 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 30.96%, or 61 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 29.

Table 4.37 shows that the results of Statement 29 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.56 (SD = 0.60), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.75 (SD=0.73).

With the equality of variances results $t (58) = 1.51$ and $p = 0.0669$, Table 4.37 shows that the associated equal variances $t$-test results $t (254) = -1.84$ and $p = 0.0668$, $d = -0.23054$, and $r = -0.11451$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two
terms or longer. Of noted interest, slightly over 30%, or 61 of 197 respondents serving a second term or longer, had not been involved with discussions with new members about their roles and responsibilities.

Table 4.38 shows that of the 255 respondents who responded to Statement 34, 47.45%, or 121 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 52.55%, or 134 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 59 first-term respondents, 37.29%, or 22 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 62.71%, or 37 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 34. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 50.51%, or 99 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 49.49%, or 97 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 34.

Table 4.39 shows that the results of Statement 34 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms.
or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.29 (SD = 0.61), while the
mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.45 (SD = 0.74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.1273</td>
<td>1.2881</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>0.6173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.3449</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>1.5531</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL34</td>
<td>Diff (1-2)</td>
<td>-0.369</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>0.0476</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|-------|
| BL34     | Pooled | Equal     | 253 | -1.52   | 0.1299 |

With the equality of variances results $t(58) = 1.43$ and $p = 0.1090$, Table 4.39 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(253) = -1.52$ and $p = 0.1299$, $d = -0.2363$, $r = 0.1299$; therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no
significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served
two terms or longer. Notably, Table 4.22 shows the results of a similarly stated question:

*I have participated in board discussions about what we should do differently as a result
of a mistake the board has made.* Of the 255 respondents, 160 respondents indicated that
they strongly agreed/agreed and 37.25%, or 95 respondents indicated that they strongly
disagreed/disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE (SERVICE)</th>
<th>NewBL38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str_Agree,Str_Diss, Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>19.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second_term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>45.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.31</td>
<td>59.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.82</td>
<td>80.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>57.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 12
For the next statement, Table 4.40 shows that of the 256 respondents who responded to Statement 38, 42.97%, or 110 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 57.03%, or 146 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 51.67%, or 31 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 48.33%, or 29 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 38. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 40.31%, or 79 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 59.69%, or 117 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 38.

Table 4.41 shows that the results of Statement 38 item responses revealed a significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.56 (SD = 0.74), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.31 (SD=0.80).

With the equality of variances results t (59) = 1.16 and p = 0.4986, Table 4.41 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results t (254) = 2.19 and p = 0.0294, d = 0.33, and r = 0.16; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and those who have served two terms or longer. The magnitude of the difference between the two means and the effect size
were both moderately low. First-term respondents were almost evenly split on the issue of whether they received feedback regarding their performance. However, almost 60% of the respondents serving two terms or longer indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed that they never received feedback regarding their performance.

Table 4.42 shows that of the 251 respondents who responded to Statement 46, 29.88%, or 75 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 70.12%, or 176 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 28.33%, or 17 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 71.67%, or 43 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 46. Of the 191 respondents serving a second term or longer, 30.37%, or 58 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 69.63%, or 133 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 46.

Table 4.43 shows that the results of Statement 46 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms.
or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.23 (SD = 0.75), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.19 (SD = 0.72).

With the equality of variances results $t(59) = 1.17$ and $p = 0.4750$, Table 4.43 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t(249) = 0.34$ and $p = 0.7360$, $d = 0.050983$, $r = 0.025483$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer. Both first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer strongly indicated that they disagreed with the statement their board never sets aside resources for board education and development.

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF | t Value | Pr > |t|
|----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|------|
| BL46     | Pooled | Equal     | 249| 0.34    | 0.7360|

Table 4.44 BSAQ Statement 51 Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE(SERVICE)</th>
<th>NewBL51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct ,Str_Agree,Str_Disag,</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/Agree ,Disagree,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-term , 44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-term , 146</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total , 188</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 12
Table 4.44 shows that of the 256 respondents who responded to Statement 51, 73.44%, or 188 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 26.56%, or 68 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed. Of the 60 first-term respondents, 73.33%, or 44 respondents, stated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 26.56%, or 16 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with Statement 51. Of the 196 respondents serving a second term or longer, 73.47%, or 144 respondents, indicated that they strongly agreed/agreed, and 26.53%, or 52 respondents, indicated that they strongly disagreed/disagreed with the Statement 51.

Table 4.45 shows that the results of Statement 51 item responses revealed no significant difference between first-term respondents and respondents serving two terms or longer. The mean score for first-term respondents was 1.93 (SD = 0.73), while the mean score for respondents serving two terms or longer was 1.94 (SD=0.76).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.7439</td>
<td>1.9333</td>
<td>2.1228</td>
<td>0.7334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.8369</td>
<td>1.9439</td>
<td>2.0508</td>
<td>0.7592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL51</td>
<td>Diff (1-2)</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.2083</td>
<td>0.7533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variable | Method | Variances | DF   | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|----------|--------|-----------|------|---------|------|-------|
| BL51     | Pooled | Equal     | 254  | -0.09   | 0.9245 |

With the equality of variances results $t (59) = 1.07$ and $p = 0.7730$, Table 4.45 shows that the associated equal variances t-test results $t (254) = -0.09$ and $p = 0.9245$, $d = -0.01420$, and $r = -0.00710$; therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no
significant difference in the means between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer. Over 70% of the respondents indicated that their boards had been through an explicit examination of its roles and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLT 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.4976</td>
<td>0.5293</td>
<td>0.5611</td>
<td>0.1228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT 2</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.5339</td>
<td>0.5539</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.1432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT Diff (1-2)</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>0.1388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.46 shows that of the 258 respondents who provided responses for all 12 board learning statements, there was no significant difference between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer.

Research Question Six

Once responses were analyzed for the education or builds learning dimension, a data set containing BSAQ scores was created for further analysis. The BSAQ data set reflected the actual scoring of the instrument including reverse scored items. Appendix J, the BSAQ Data Set Code Sheet, provides each variable in the data set, along with a description and type of data entry.
First, univariate information was made available for all variables: both dependent and independent. The histograms and the box plots for the model data showed that most data for all variables were slightly skewed. Examining the bivariate relationships (Table 4.47), the Spearman correlations (r) demonstrated that six independent variables were significantly related to board effectiveness with p-values less than 0.05; however, at a moderately low predictive level with correlations ranging from a low 0.45 to a high of 0.61.

In addition, the results of the internal consistency reliability test showed that the model reached a Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (Raw) score of 0.40 and individual alphas between 0.34 and 0.36, both of which indicate a relatively weak relationship. The results show that the model, with both dependent and independent variables, may have had internal consistency reliability; however, the results show that other factors could have influenced the results. Appendix K provides the actual data used in the regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
<th>X₆</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT Builds Learning</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT Understands Context</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT Nurtures Group</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT Recognizes Complexity</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT Respects Process Shapes Direction</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDT Shapes Direction</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant p<0.05
Using multiple regression analysis to find the predictive value, overall board effectiveness scores were regressed on the linear combination of BLT, or builds learning dimension total, the UCT, or understands context dimension total, NGT, or nurturing group dimension total, RCT, or recognizing complexity dimension total, RPT, respects process dimension total, and SDT, shapes direction dimension total. The model containing these six independent variables accounted for $R^2=48\%$ of the variance in board effectiveness, $F(6.46), p<.0001$, with an adjusted $R^2=40\%$ (Rounded), showing a slight difference in results.

Beta weights (standardized regression coefficients) were reviewed to assess the relative importance of the six variables in the prediction of board effectiveness. Table 4.49 shows that the predictor variables, none significantly above zero, could be ranked from most to least important: NGT or nurturing group, is attributed with the largest weight of 0.33 ($p=0.0770$), UCT, or Understanding Context, with the next weight of 0.22 ($p=0.3272$), SDT, or Shapes Direction, with a weight of 0.14 ($p = 0.5488$), and BLT, or Builds Learning, with a weight of 0.11 ($p=0.4490$). All variables had $p$-values greater than 0.05, meaning that the beta weights were not significantly above zero, which indicated that the variables could possibly be unimportant in predicting board effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha (Raw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFECT Board Effectiveness</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLT Builds Learning</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT Understands Context</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT Nurtures Group</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT Recognizes Complexity</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT Respects Process</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDT Shapes Direction</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (Raw) = 0.40
effectiveness or that other factors could have influenced the results. Although the model was significant with a $p<0.0001$, the predictive qualities were weak with an $R^2$ of 0.48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLT</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDT</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.48$

$F = 6.35$

$P<.0001^*$

Significant $p<0.05^*$

In a regression model, a high variance or $R^2$ is expected--the higher the variance the better the model. In regression, when several predictors are highly interrelated, collinearity or multi-collinearity occurs. The absence of collinearity is essential for a multiple regression model to work effectively. Variation inflation is the consequence of multi-collinearity. In looking at the variation inflation (VIF) indicators for the variables in the first model, BLT had the lowest with 1.66 and RCT and SDT had the highest with 4.54 and 4.34 respectively. The variables RCT and SDT, the two variables with the highest variance inflation indicators, were removed to develop a newly revised model. Although $R^2$ remained basically the same in the new model, the beta weights or B actually improved. The variable NGT actually was identified significantly above zero, with a beta weight of 0.34 and a $p = 0.03$. The other three variables did increase their beta weights; however, they were not significantly above zero.
After examining the results of the multiple regression analysis, the mean of the overall average of the 49 boards used in the multiple regression analysis was a rather high 8.05, with a fairly large standard deviation of 1.13. However, the mean BSAQ sub scores were relatively moderate on a scale of 0.00 to 1.00: the BLT had a mean of 0.56; the UCT had a mean of 0.70; the NGT had a mean of 0.65; the RCT had a mean of 0.67; the RPT had a mean of 0.69; and the SDT with a mean 0.67.

As mentioned earlier, Chait et al. (1998) stated that BSAQ results were normally lower than the scores that trustees rated themselves. One possible explanation the BSAQ scores showed little if any relationship to trustee effectiveness scores is that North Carolina community college trustees could have overrated their own measure of effectiveness or based their analysis of effectiveness on different variables than Chait et al. (1993) used for their effectiveness model. For example, the Chait et al. (1993) model is based on more behavioral aspects of board effectiveness, whereas community college trustees may be basing their effectiveness score on an entirely different model.

Regardless, according to the six dimensional model, especially the revised model, board development could be considered an indicator of trustee effectiveness.

### Table 4.50: Regression Results for Board Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLT Builds Learning</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT Understands Context</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT Nurtures Group</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT Respects Process</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 0.48 \]
\[ F = 9.96 \]
\[ P < .0001* \]

Significant p < 0.05*
Responses to Open-Ended Questions

The open-ended questions provided additional feedback that may help explain or support the statistical data provided in the study. The responses were not included in any statistical analyses in the study.

Open-ended Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.51 Responses for Open-ended Question 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 Respondents</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Relationship with the president and president’s staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Relationship with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Implementing long-range planning, setting goals, and following mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Working harmonious and effectively among themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This first question of Part D asked the respondents in what areas did they perceive their boards as operating most effectively. Table 4.51 shows that of the 204 respondents who provided an answer, over 26%, or 54 respondents, stated that their boards were most effective in supporting and communicating effectively with the president and the president’s administrative staff. At least 22%, or 44 respondents, stated that their boards were most effective in providing the community with services and programs that would help citizens become better employees and more productive in their jobs. Over 18%, or 37 respondents, believed that initiating long-range planning, setting goals for the community college, and following the mission of the college were areas in which their boards performed most effectively. At least 14%, or 28 respondents, stated that their boards themselves were harmonious and operated effectively. For example, trustees stated that members within their boards communicated with each other
effectively, worked together with no special interests or issues interfering with decision-making, and respected each other for the opinions generated during discussion. Other areas that were recognized by respondents included creating policy to govern the institution, providing leadership for the college, and offering programs to the community that translated into employment. Appendix M provides a random listing of all the comments for Open-ended Question 1.

The second question asked respondents what could be done to increase the effectiveness of their boards. Of the 173 respondents who provided an answer, over 39%, or 68 respondents, stated that some aspect of board development would increase the effectiveness of their board. Respondents stated that better orientation sessions, additional or extended retreats, greater frequency of workshops, informative seminars or conferences, or mentoring sessions for new trustees would increase their board’s effectiveness.

Open-ended Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.52 Responses for Open-ended Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 11%, or 19 respondents, believed that their boards were currently operating effectively and saw very little, if any, room for improvement. Other areas with at least 5% of the respondents responses included adding more meetings to the board’s
schedule, having better trustee attendance at board meetings, using financial resources more appropriately, and attending additional events at their colleges. Appendix N provides a random listing of all the comments for Open-ended Question 2.

Open-ended Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>148 Respondents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fiscal Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Trusteeship: Responsibilities and roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Part D of the board questionnaire, the third question asked respondents what topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would they like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee.

Of the 148 respondents who provided an answer, at least 28%, or 41 respondents, stated that they wanted to learn more about financial situations regarding their college. Many respondents wanted more information about grants, any alternative funding resources, better financial management, and the state legislature’s process of allocating monies to the community college system. At least 25%, or 37 respondents, wanted to learn more about trusteeship. These respondents expressed interest in orientations, retreats, and workshops that would provide information that would help make them become more effective trustees. Over 12%, or 22 respondents, indicated that they wanted to know more about community needs. In addition, respondents also wanted to learn more about sharing information with trustees at other institutions, providing adequate
programs for students, implementing effective marketing plans, interacting more
effectively with the community, lobbying the legislature for adequate funding, and
understanding legal issues regarding trusteeship and the community college. Appendix O
provides a random listing of all the comments for open-ended question 3.

Open-ended Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>205 Respondents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Funding (in general) for community colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Facilities or the college’s ability to accommodate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Adequate technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Providing programs that reflect the workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Serving the Hispanic population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open-ended question 4 asked trustees what concerns they believed would be important five years from now. Respondents expressed that financially supporting community colleges will be the primary challenge in five years. Of the 205 respondents who provided an answer, over 47%, or 96 respondents, believed that funding would be the most crucial concern affecting community colleges five years from now. In order for the community college system to survive, respondents stressed that community college trustees and administrators needed to find alternative funding, such as federal, state, and local grants. Another concern expressed by almost 40%, or 81 respondents, was the community college system trying to accommodate an ever-increasing student body. Trustees stated that additional buildings were essential to provide classrooms, workshops, and computer labs for students, faculty, and staff. Over 10%, or 21 respondents, were concerned about the availability of appropriate and updated technology for students. Similarly, over 10%, or 21 respondents, stated that programs needed to reflect the ever-
changing workforce and that specific programs, such as biotechnology, should be incorporated into the curricula. Other areas that respondents believed would be important five years from now include addressing the Hispanic population or other non-English speaking populations, providing adequate salaries for community college personnel, honoring the open-door policy, addressing economic development, and retraining the workforce. Appendix P provides a random listing of all the comments for Open-ended Question 4.
Chapter 5
Conclusions, Implications for Practice, and Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined several components of community college boards of trustees in North Carolina. First, the study examined the demographics of a randomly selected sample of 580 trustees taken from the entire population of trustees in the state. The study examined the selections made by the three appointing agencies for community college trustees in the state: the local boards of education, the local boards of county commissioners, and the governor’s office. Secondly, the study focused on whether the respondent data set was compatible with the sample data set by comparing demographic data such as gender, race, and professions. Thirdly, the study examined various components of trusteeship such additional demographics and the ratings given to BSAQ statements. Finally, the study attempted to determine the effect that board development may have had on trustee effectiveness.

Board Composition

Similar to the results of other studies that have examined board appointments, the analysis of the sample data set indicated that an overwhelming majority, over 70%, of North Carolina community college trustees is predominately White, male, over the age of 50, college educated, and currently or formerly involved in some aspect of business or education. All three appointing agencies--the governor’s office, the local boards of education, and the local boards of county commissioners--select very similar individuals to community college trustee positions.

One of the more interesting findings in the research is that the governor’s office appointed the least amount of minorities to the community college boards of trustees
across the state. Boards of education appointed 43.97%, or 51, of the minorities in the sample data set; the boards of county commissioners appointed 31.03%, or 36, and the governor’s office appointed 25%, or 29, of the minorities in the sample data set.

While the governor’s office was the least likely to appoint a minority to a community college trusteeship, the boards of county commissioners were least likely to appoint a female to a community college trusteeship. The governor’s office appointed 38.75%, or 62, females in the sample data set, the boards of education appointed 33.13%, or 53, and the boards of county commissioners appointed 28.13, or 45, in the sample data set.

For additional comparison, *The North Carolina Community College Fact Book* (2003) shows that in 2001-2002 67.2% of curricular students and 65.1% of continuing education students were White; 25.4% of curricular students and 22.9% of the continuing education students were Black; 2.4% of curricular students and 8.2% of the continuing education students were Hispanic. Over 1.5% of curricular students and 1.3% of continuing education students were Native American; 1.9% of the curriculum students and 1.6% of the continuing education students were Asian; and all remaining students were labeled “Other”. In addition, of the 257,396 curriculum students across the state, 39.7%, or 102,137 students were male and 60.3%, or 155,259 students, were female, while of the 561,333 continuing education students, 51.1%, or 286,565 students were male and 48.9%, or 274,768 students, were female.

Vaughan and Weisman (1997) stated that board composition was “something that should be approached carefully and thoughtfully” (p. 190). Vaughan and Weisman (1997) suggested that if a board did not believe its composition reflected the college’s service
areas there were steps that it could take to increase diversity. One step offered was to select a member of the under-represented group to fill an unexpired term. In addition, board members could create a list or pool of minorities and women who they believed would be potential board members (Vaughan & Weisman, 1997). In their study of community college trustees, Vaughan and Weisman (1997) offered the following recommendation regarding diversity:

Current board members should not ignore the value of diversity. The increasing numbers of minority students need role models. In addition, the college needs to assure that it represents all segments of the community. Often this requires a physical presence, especially if equal representation is to have meaning to those from minority groups. (p. 191)

Although the current composition of North Carolina community college governing boards may represent most segments of the student population or even the state’s population, there are some segments that may be underrepresented. In 2001-2002, females represented over half of the curriculum students and slightly less than half of continuing education students (NCCCS, 2003). However, female trustees represented less than 30% of the total number of trustees who were currently serving at the time of this study. There were few Hispanics or Native Americans, identified as “Other,” in the sample data set, and none were identified in the respondent data set. Of course, there may be a possibility that of the seven trustees who did not provide their race or ethnicity in the respondent data set one or more could have been a minority other than Black. With over 8% of Hispanics enrolling in continuing education classes, there may be a focus on recruiting Hispanic trustees in the very near future.
In responses to the open-ended questions, few community colleges trustees mentioned board composition as relevant to effectiveness. Those who did mention board composition included one trustee who believed that boards needed to recruit more members who were still in the workforce. A few others stated that community college governing boards needed to be more concerned with the Hispanic population. One trustee stated, “Increasing the diversity--ages, occupations, gender, and ethnicity--on the board would increase its effectiveness.” Another trustee stated, “Extremely old board members are generally ineffective.” Finally, one trustee stated, “More diversity [is needed] to truly understand [the] needs of the community.”

One interesting finding of this study is that over 60% of the sample data set included trustees who were actually employed. Having so many community college trustees employed is advantageous to the community college system because the governing boards can be more aware of the economy and various trends in the job market. However, with increasing Hispanic and Asian student populations in North Carolina community colleges, appointing agencies may want to reconsider their current method of selection to one that may be more inclusive of these groups.

Several areas of future research could evolve from this section of the study. One such study could examine appointing agencies that select community college trustees in North Carolina to discover what they look for and expect in potential trustees and what they consider to be an effective governing board or trustee. Another project could include an examination of how trustees view the composition of their own boards, their strengths and weaknesses, and how the selection process could be improved in the future.
Another study could examine whether homogeneity or diversity equated to greater board effectiveness.

**Board Development**

The results of this study (Table 4.11) showed that more than 33% of the trustees indicated that their institutions did not provide an orientation session or were unsure whether their institutions provided an orientation session. In addition, Table 4.40 also showed that over 33% of the trustees indicated that they had not been in any discussion with new members about their roles and responsibilities. Vaughan and Weisman (1997) strongly advocated an orientation for new trustees “if they are to understand their role and fulfill that role effectively” (p. 186). In addition, Chait et al. (1996) stressed that orientations can be for all trustees, both newcomers and returning trustees as well, as a way to update and reeducate one’s self about trusteeship.

Many community college governing boards could implement and then extend the orientation experience by assigning mentors to help new trustees (Chait et al., 1996); however, over 55% of the respondents (Table 4.32) indicated that their boards did not provide mentoring to new members. Chait et al. (1996) stressed that mentoring is helpful to new member by “unraveling the intricacies of institutional history and to interpret the organizational culture to a new trustee” (p. 77).

With both the statistical results and open-ended responses, most trustees considered board development an integral part of trusteeship. According to responses for Statement 46, over 70% of the trustees (Table 4.42) indicated their governing boards allocated monies for board education and development. In open-ended responses, trustees stated overwhelmingly that they wanted additional workshops, retreats, and
mentoring that focused on areas of trusteeship or current topics associated with community colleges. Over 90% of community college trustees indicated that they had attended two or more professional development opportunities since their appointment (Table 4.13); moreover, trustees indicated overwhelmingly in open-ended responses that they were very interested in additional seminars, retreats, and workshops. In addition, over 25% of the respondents to Open-ended Question 3 wanted additional information about their role and responsibilities as community college trustees.

Although trustees indicated their involvement with board development and their desire to continue board development activities, Table 4.30 shows that over 55% of the respondents indicated that they agreed/strongly agreed with Statement 21, which indicated that members on their board tended to rely on observation and informal discussions to learn about their roles and responsibilities. In addition, over 42% of the trustees identified the college president as being their primary source of information regarding their role and responsibilities (Table 4.17), while only 16% indicated that training provided the essential information they needed to know in order to fulfill their role and responsibilities. The results of this study tend to show that trustees support board development; however, according to the responses, orientation sessions and mentoring need more attention than they have received in the past. With overwhelming interest in board development, trustees should understand the necessity of orientations and mentoring programs. Moreover, in their research, Chait et al. (1993) found these two components in highly effective boards.

One area of future research could focus specifically on trustee training or board development. The study could focus on implementing orientation and mentoring
programs in community colleges where none exist. Another study could examine the
types of board development community college trustees receive and what trustees may
actually need in the way of training. In this initial study, trustees indicated topics that
they would like to know more about in order to become more effective trustees or
governing boards. Topics for board development activities included workforce
development, the funding mechanism at various levels of government, board self-
assessment, diversity, fundraising, economic development, college transfer, globalization,
technology, distance education, and assessing community needs. A researcher working
directly with organizations, such as the NCACCT, ACCT, or AGB, could develop a
study that would be beneficial in getting needed assistance and support for trustees.

Board Effectiveness

Table 4.14 shows the results from this study that indicated over 95% of the
respondents indicated that their board members worked well together as a group all or
most of the time. Interestingly, in response to an open-ended question, one trustee stated:
“I was appalled at my last meeting in Raleigh to hear so many board members from
across the state tell of the divisiveness of their boards, in fact 2/3 of them.” However, an
overwhelming percentage of trustees responded that their boards worked well together,
and many did not believe that their boards could become any more effective than they
currently were.

Table 4.18 showed that over half of the respondents indicated that their
governing boards evaluated the overall board’s performance once every year. However,
almost 40% of the trustees indicated that their boards never evaluated themselves or were
unsure whether their boards evaluated themselves. Yet, in responding to Statement 10
(Table 4.24), over 65% of the respondents indicated that at least once every two years, their boards had a retreat or special session to examine their performance, and Table 4.34 indicated that over 73% of the respondents had participated in board discussions about the effectiveness of their performance. One of only two statements presented a significant difference between first-term trustees and trustees serving two terms or longer. Statement 38 (Table 4.40) stated that the trustee had never received feedback on his or her performance as a member of the board. First-term trustees were almost split 50/50 between agreed/strongly agreed and disagreed/strongly disagreed, while almost 60% of the trustees serving two terms or longer indicated that they disagreed/strongly disagreed.

Chait et al. (1996) stated that self-assessment instruments, such as questionnaires, were probably the most common approach trustees used to evaluate board performance. Self-assessment instruments, such as the AGB’s Self-Study Criteria, rate various aspects of the board’s performance with respect to areas such as mission and policy, physical facilities, board-staff relations, and institutional planning. Chait et al. (1996) stated that self-assessments offered “simplicity, economy, and efficiency” (p. 33). However, Chait et al. (1996) stressed that most questionnaires were “unreliable as a gauge of a board’s actual as opposed to perceived performance” (p. 33). In addition, Chait et al. (1996) stated, “For reasons that range from ego protection to the lack of sound basis for comparison, most trustees cannot judge their own board’s performance accurately” (pp. 33-34).

The regression analysis in this study may not have found board development as a more important predictor of effectiveness because the Chait et al. (1993) model is behavioral in nature. Rather than consider specific behaviors in rating their overall
effectiveness, community college trustees may have rated themselves on a more checklist approach of what their boards accomplished throughout the year. For example, one behavioral component that Chait et al. (1993) included in their conceptual framework was board self-reflection. Over 37% of the respondents indicated that they had not participated in board discussions about what they should do differently as a result of a mistake their board had made. In a related question, over 60% disagreed/strongly disagreed that they could recall an occasion when the board acknowledged its responsibilities for an ill-advised decision. Other previously mentioned areas or behaviors, such as providing orientation sessions and mentoring, were also considered inadequate among the community college governing boards across the state. The low dimensional score of 0.56 for education or board learning can be attributed to these missing components or behaviors in board development.

As stated previously, The BSAQ, which was based on the six dimensions of board effectiveness, offered the advantage of a behavioral focus (Chait et al., 1996). Chait et al. (1996) stated that “the BSAQ measures the board’s performance on specific behaviors associated with effective trusteeship, pinpoints areas that a board needs to strengthen, and offers various suggestions to remedy areas of relative weakness. The BSAQ provides more guidance for the board that wants to move from self-evaluation to self-improvement” (p. 34).

According to Appendix K, respondents used in the regression analysis rated board effectiveness on a scale of 1 to 10, with a mean of 8.05. However, using a scale of 0.00 to 1.00, the BSAQ effectiveness scores were rather moderate or average within an established effective range: a mean of 0.56 for the education or builds learning
dimension; a mean of 0.70 for the understanding context, or contextual dimension; a mean of 0.65 for the nurturing group or interpersonal dimension; a mean of 0.67 for the recognizes complexity or analytical dimension; a mean of 0.69 for the respects process or political dimension; and a mean of 0.67 for the shapes direction or strategic dimension. These sub scores, especially the education dimension, proved to be very weak predictors of effectiveness as a result of the regression analysis.

For comparison, Michael et al. (1999), who conducted a similar study of board effectiveness using community college governing boards, noted that the results from their survey instrument, designed upon a conceptual framework very similar to Chait et al.’s (1993), showed lower scores for the educational or board development dimension. More importantly, in studies conducted by Chait et al. (1996) after they developed their framework of effectiveness, the BSAQ was used as a pretest and posttest, with a facilitator instructing trustees about the six dimensions of effectiveness between the pretest and posttest. Afterwards, scores were compared to note any progress. Comparing overall effectiveness scores and BSAQ sub scores may be problematic because the criteria for board effectiveness may vary from board to board. Although some observers in higher education may propose using evaluative instruments, such as the BSAQ, to evaluate a board’s performance, there are obviously some drawbacks in scoring as noted in this study.

Future research could examine the evaluative processes and assessment methods used by North Carolina community college governing boards. As a follow-up to this research project, one possible study could implement Chait et al.’s (1991) six-dimensional framework for effectiveness within board development opportunities. With
the baseline sub scores established with this study, additional research could incorporate workshops using the six-dimensional framework and then use the BSAQ as a posttest to indicate any changes in sub scores.

Also, researchers in higher education can use the responses to the open-ended questions to continue additional research regarding trustee effectiveness. Many of the responses generated from the open-ended questions can be used as catalysts for future research. Appendices L through M provide verbatim responses trustees gave to open-ended questions 1 through 4.

This study has provided a profile of North Carolina community governing boards and the trustees that comprise these boards, a broad examination of board development activities, and overall effectiveness scores and sub scores using Holland and Blackmon’s (1994) BSAQ, which is based on Chait et al.’s (1993) six-dimensional framework of board effectiveness. It is hoped that this research study is only the beginning of a series of similar studies concerning community college trusteeship in North Carolina. Vaughan and Weisman (1997) offered the following:

Community college trustees give hours of their time to the myriad of tasks that accompany membership on the governing board. They know, or soon discover after joining the board, that community colleges, regardless of the size, location, sources of funding, students served, or courses offered, are complex entities that require much care and feeding if they are to be successful. (p. 12)

With such responsibility vested in community college trustees by the public, additional research is essential in areas such as governing board composition, board
development or trustee education, and governing board effectiveness to ensure the very best quality in community colleges across North Carolina for years to come.
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APPENDIX A

Sample Data Set
Code Sheet

The sample data set used for this study was created by randomly selecting trustees from a 2003-2004 NCACCT data set containing community college trustees serving in North Carolina. The following information provides the variable name, a description of the variable, and the type of entry for each variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANDOM</td>
<td>Assigned Random Number</td>
<td>Numerical - 6 digits 1.00000 to 100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Trustee Identification Number</td>
<td>Combination Alphabetical/Numerical Two letters/Two numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each trustee had a special ID. A two-letter abbreviation of the institution and a two-digit number for the trustee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Alphabetical - Varied Dr. - Medical (only) Honorable - Judge Mr. - Male Ms. - Female Sheriff - Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>Participant’s Last Name</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>Participant’s First Name</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>Trustee Status</td>
<td>Alphabetical - one letter T = Trustee C = Chairperson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A

(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **WORK**      | Employment Status | Alphabetical - one letter  
|               |             | E = Employed  
|               |             | R = Retired  |
| **OCCUPAT**   | Trustee Occupation | Alphabetical - varied  
|               | Current/Former | 1. Business  
|               | See Appendix I | 2. Education  
|               |             | 3. Financial Services  
|               |             | 4. Government  
|               |             | 5. Industry  
|               |             | 6. Insurance  
|               |             | 7. Legal  
|               |             | 8. Medical  
|               |             | 9. Not Given  
|               |             | 10. Other  
|               |             | 11. Real Estate  
|               |             | 12. Volunteer  |
| **STREET 1**  | Street Address of Trustee | Varied  |
| **STREET 2**  | Street Address of Trustee | Varied  |
| **CITY**      | City/Town of Residence | Varied  |
| **STATE**     | State of Residence | Alphabetical  
|               |             | NC  |
| **ZIP_CODE**  | Assigned Postal Zip Code | Numerical - Varied  
|               |             | 5 to 9 Digits  |
| **APPOINT**   | Appointing Agency | Alphabetical - Varied  
|               | Identified the proper appointing agency for each trustee | G=Governor  
|               |             | BOE=Board of Education  
|               |             | CC=County Commissioners  |
| **RACE**      | Race/Ethnicity | Alphabetical - One letter  
|               |             | M=Black/African American,  
|               |             | Hispanic, Asian, or Native  
|               |             | American)  
|               |             | W=White/Caucasian  |
APPENDIX A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>Alphabetical - one letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F = Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM_END</td>
<td>Last year of current service</td>
<td>Numerical - 4 numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending year of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Abbreviation of</td>
<td>Alphabetical - two letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Alamance Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Beaufort Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Bladen Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Brunswick Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Cape Fear Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Carteret Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Catawba Valley Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Central Carolina Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Central Piedmont Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Cleveland Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Coastal Carolina Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>College of the Albemarle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Craven Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Davidson County Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Durham Technical Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>Edgecombe Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Fayetteville Technical Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FR = Forsyth Technical Community College
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Abbreviation of Community College</td>
<td>Alphabetical - Community two letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GA = Gaston College
GU = Guilford Technical Community College
HX = Halifax Community College
HY = Haywood Community College
IS = Isothermal Community College
JS = James Sprunt Community College
JO = Johnston Community College
LN = Lenoir Community College
MR = Martin Community College
MY = Mayland Community College
MD = McDowell Technical Community College
MT = Mitchell Community College
MG = Montgomery Community College
NA = Nash Community College
PL = Pamlico Community College
PI = Piedmont Community College
PT = Pitt Community College
RA = Randolph Community College
RI = Richmond Community College
RK = Roanoke-Chowan Community College
RB = Robeson Community College
RG = Rockingham Community College
RC = Rowan-Cabarrus Community College
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Abbreviation of Community College</td>
<td>Alphabetical-two letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SM = Sampson Community College  
SH = Sandhills Community College  
SP = South Piedmont Community College  
SE = Southeastern Community College  
SW = Southwestern Community College  
ST = Stanly Community College  
SU = Surry Community College  
TC = Tri-County Community College  
VG = Vance-Granville Community College  
WK = Wake Technical Community College  
WY = Wayne Community College  
WP = Western Piedmont Community College  
WL = Wilkes Community College  
WT = Wilson Technical Community College
APPENDIX B
Board Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this study of North Carolina community college boards of trustees. Read each question carefully and mark your answer in the appropriate bubble. Please use a #2 pencil and completely fill in the bubble.

A. Individual Background Information

1. How would you describe your current trustee position?
   ○ First Term
   ○ Second Term+
   ○ Term recently expired not reappointed
   ○ Recently resigned

2. Does your institution provide its own orientation session for new trustee who join the board?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Unsure

3. What is your highest level of education?
   ○ Less than high school diploma
   ○ GED/High School equivalency
   ○ High school diploma
   ○ Associate degree
   ○ Bachelor’s degree
   ○ Master’s degree
   ○ Doctorate (Ed.D, Ph.D, M.D., JD.)

4. Since you joined the board, how many classes, workshops, and/or retreats have you attended that provided information about your role as a community college trustee?
   ○ 0 to 1
   ○ 2 to 4
   ○ 4 to 6
   ○ 7 or more

5. Do the members of your board work well together as a group?
   ○ All of the time
   ○ Most of the time
   ○ Some of the time
   ○ None of the time

6. How much time during the average week do you allocate to college business?
   ○ Less than 1 hour
   ○ 1 to 2 hours
   ○ 2 to 3 hours
   ○ More than 3 hours

7. Under which range would your age fall?
   ○ 29 and under
   ○ 30 - 39
   ○ 40 - 49
   ○ 50 - 59
   ○ 60 and over

8. When you first became a board member, what or who was the primary source of information concerning your duties and responsibilities?
   ○ Chairperson of the board
   ○ Formal training program
   ○ Literature (Magazines, etc.)
   ○ Other board members
   ○ College president
   ○ Other

9. How often does your board evaluate its performance as a group?
   ○ Never
   ○ Once every year
   ○ Once every 2 years
   ○ Other
   ○ Unsure
B. Self-Assessment Questionnaire

1. This board takes regular steps to keep informed about important trends in the larger environment that might affect the institution. 

2. I have participated in board discussions about what we should do differently as a result of a mistake the board made. 

3. I have had conversations with other members of this board regarding common interests we share outside the institution. 

4. I have been in board meetings where it seemed that the subtleties of the issues we dealt with escaped the awareness of a number of the members. 

5. Our board explicitly examines the “downside” or possible pitfalls of any important decision it is about to make. 

6. Orientation programs for new board members specifically include a segment about the institution’s history and traditions. 

7. This board is more involved in trying to put out fires than in preparing for the future. 

8. The board sets clear institutional priorities for the year ahead. 

9. This board communicates its decisions to all those who are affected by them. 

10. At least once every two years, our board has a retreat or special session to examine our performance, how well we are doing as a board. 

11. Many of the issues that this board deals with seem to be separate tasks, unrelated to one another. 

12. In discussing key issues, it is not unusual for someone on the board to talk about what the institution stands for and how that is related to the matter at hand. 

13. Values are seldom discussed explicitly at our board meetings. 

14. If our board thinks that an important group or constituency is likely to disagree with an action we are considering, we will make sure we learn how they feel before we actually make the decision. 

15. Differences of opinion in board decisions are more often settled by vote than by more discussion. 

16. This board delays action until an issue becomes urgent or critical. 

17. The board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing institutions like the one we govern.
18. I can recall an occasion when the board acknowledged its responsibility for an ill-advised decision.

19. This board has formed ad hoc committees or task forces that include staff as well as board members.

20. This board is as attentive to how it reaches conclusions as it is to what is decided.

21. Most members of this board tend to rely on observation and informal discussions to learn about their role and responsibility.

22. I find it easy to identify the key issues that this board faces.

23. When faced with an important issue, the board often “brainstorms” and tries to generate a whole list of creative approaches or solutions to the problem.

24. When a new member joins the board, we make sure that someone serves as a mentor to help this person learn the ropes.

25. I have been in board meetings where explicit attention was given to the concerns of the community.

26. I have participated in board discussions about the effectiveness of our performance.

27. At our board meetings, there is at least as much dialogue among members as there is between members and administrators.

28. When issues come before our board, they are seldom framed in a way that enables members to see the connections between the matter at hand and the institution’s overall strategy.

29. I have participated in discussions with new members about the roles and responsibilities of a board member.

30. This board has made a key decision that I believe to be inconsistent with the mission of this institution.

31. The leadership of this board typically goes out of its way to make sure that all members have the same information on important issues.

32. This board has adopted some explicit goals for itself, distinct from goals it has for the institution as a whole.

33. The board periodically requests information on the morale of the professional staff.

34. I have participated in board discussions about what we can learn from a mistake we have made.

35. Our board meetings tend to focus more on current concerns than on preparing for the future.
36. At least once a year, this board asks the board chairperson to articulate his/her vision for the institution’s future and strategies to realize that vision.

37. I have been present in board meetings where discussions of the history and mission of the institution were key factors in reaching a conclusion on a problem.

38. I have never received feedback on my performance as a member of this board.

39. It is apparent from the comments of some of our board members that they do not understand the mission of this institution very well.

40. This board has on occasion evaded responsibility for some important issue facing this institution.

41. Before reaching a decision on important issues, this board usually requests input from persons likely to be affected by the decision.

42. There have been occasions where the board has acted in ways inconsistent with the institution’s deepest values.

43. This board relies on the natural emergence of leaders, rather than trying explicitly to cultivate future leaders for the board.

44. This board often discusses where the institution should be headed in five or more years.

45. New members are provided with a detailed explanation of this institution’s mission when they join this board.

46. This board does not allocate institutional funds for the purpose of board education and development.

47. Recommendations from the administration are usually accepted with little questioning in board meetings.

48. At times this board has appeared unaware of the impact its decisions will have within our service community.

49. Within the past year, this board has reviewed the institution’s strategies for attaining its long-term goals.

50. This board reviews the institution’s mission at least once every five years.

51. This board has conducted an explicit examination of its roles and responsibilities.
52. I am able to speak my mind on key issues without fear that I will be ostracized by some members of the board.  

53. This board tries to avoid issues that are ambiguous and complicated.  

54. The administration rarely reports to the board on the concerns of those the institution serves.  

55. I have been in board meetings where the discussion focused on identifying or overcoming the institution’s weaknesses.  

56. One reason I joined this board was that I believe strongly in the values of this institution.  

57. This board does not recognize special events in the lives of its members.  

58. The board discusses events and trends in the larger environment that may present specific opportunities for this institution.  

59. Former members of this board have participated in special events designed to convey to new members the institution’s history and values.  

60. This board provides biographical information that helps members get to know one another better.  

61. This board seeks information and advice from leaders of similar institutions.  

62. This board makes explicit use of the long-range priorities of this institution in dealing with current issues.  

63. This board understands the norms of the professions working in this institution.  

64. Members of this board seldom attend social events sponsored by the institution.  

65. More than half of this board’s time is spent in discussion of issues of importance to the institution’s long-range future.
C. Board Effectiveness

1. One a scale of 1 to 10, please rate your current board’s effectiveness, with 1 being very ineffective, 5 effective, and 10 being very effective. Please bubble in only one response.

   01  02  03  04  05  06  07  08  09  10

D. Your comments

1. In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?

2. What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?

3. What topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would you like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee?

4. What concerns do you believe will be important to your board five (5) years from now?

   Remember that you do not need to put your name on the questionnaire. All information will be kept confidential, and your anonymity will be honored. Please mail the completed survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided with the packet.

Thank you for your time.
The respondent data set was created from the board questionnaire responses trustees returned during the study. The respondent data set contained identical demographic information found in the sample data set. Moreover, the respondent data set contained additional variables related to the board questionnaire.

**Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>Number of years as a community</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>college trustee</td>
<td>1=First Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Second Term+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Term recently expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Recently resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENT</td>
<td>Orientation sessions at</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institution</td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST_ED</td>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1= &lt;high school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=GED/Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=High school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Associate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D, M.D., J.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOP</td>
<td>Board Development Opportunities</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=2 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=4 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=7 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORKWELL</td>
<td>How the board works together as a group</td>
<td>1=all of the time, 2=most of the time, 3=some of the time, 4=none of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP_W</td>
<td>Preparation time during the week for board work</td>
<td>Numerical, 1=less than 1 hour, 2=1 to 2 hours, 3=2 to 3 hours, 4=More than 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Age of the trustee</td>
<td>Numerical, 1=29 and under, 2=30-39, 3=40-49, 4=50-59, 5=60 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>Primary source of information regarding trusteeship</td>
<td>Numerical, 1=Chairperson of the board, 2=Formal training program, 3=Literature (magazines), 4=Other board members, 5=College president, 6=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATE</td>
<td>The frequency of board evaluations</td>
<td>Numerical, 0=Never, 1=Once every year, 2=Once every two years, 3=Other, 4=Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Part B

RC1 to SD65  BSAQ responses  Numerical  
3=strongly agree  
2=agree  
1=disagree  
0=strongly disagree  
(Underlined items represent reverse scoring.)

CONTEXT  Competency #1: Understands context: UC6, UC12, UC13, UC30, UC37, UC39, UC42, UC45, UC50, UC56, UC59, and UC63;  
LEARN  Competency #2 Builds learning: BL2, BL10, BL17, BL18, BL21, BL24, BL26, BL29, BL34, BL38, BL46, and BL51;  
NURTURE  Competency #3 Nurtures group: NG3, NG15, NG20, NG27, NG31, NG32, NG43, NG52, NG57, NG60, and NG64;  
COMPLEX  Competency #4 Recognizes complexity: RC1, RC4, RC5, RC11, RC22, RC23, RC28, RC47, RC53, and RC61;  
PROCESS  Competency #5: Respects process: RP9, RP14, RP19, RP25, RP33, RP41, RP48, and RP54;  
DIRECT  Competency #6: Shapes direction: SD7, SD8, SD16, SD35, SD36, SD40, SD44, SD49, SD55, SD58, SD62, and SD65.

Part C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>Range of effectiveness</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=ineffective</td>
<td>1=ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=effective</td>
<td>5=effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10=very effective</td>
<td>10=very effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Permission from Dr. Holland

From: Tom Holland
To: Stephen Hawkins
Date: Friday - October 11, 2002 12:15PM
Subject: Re: Question

Stephen: the 6 dimensional board self-assessment questionnaire has been used by hundreds of boards, many in the educational field. I have no separate data exclusively from community colleges but would expect many have used it for their own purposes. I would be happy for you to use the instrument for studies of that particular type of institution.

Tom Holland

Stephen Hawkins wrote:

Dr. Holland:

>I am currently preparing information for a dissertation regarding board of trustee effectiveness. I wanted to know if you have ever had anyone use the 6-dimensional profile and Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire for community college boards of trustees?
>>
>>
>
Stephen Hawkins, Director
Learning Resources Center &
Distance Education
Lenoir Community College
PO Box 188
231 Hwy. 58 South
Kinston, NC 28502-0188
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Part B: BSAQ Scoring Guide

Using a Likert-type scale, statements were scored by assigning a 3 to a response of strongly agree, 2 to agree, 1 to disagree, and 0 to strongly disagree. Appendix E provides a list of statements that were reverse-scored to indicate consistency within dimensions. After completing these steps, each respondent’s score was added in each competency set, and then the total score for each set was divided by the number of items composing that set. For example, the analytical dimension or competency has 10 questions. Once the responses for that competency were added and totaled, then that total was divided by 10. After dividing by the number of questions, that dividend was then divided by 3, which provided a score that was then interpreted on a scale for that set of questions ranging from 0.00 to 1.00. For the purposes of this study, the final scale representing a board’s total sub score in each of the six dimensions or competencies was interpreted as the following: 0.00 to 0.24 as very ineffective, 0.25 to 0.49 as ineffective, 0.50 to 0.74 as effective, and 0.75 to 1.00 as very effective. Afterwards, for each governing board that had at least five respondents who completed and returned a survey instrument, a composite BSAQ score was provided by using the mean of the 6 sub scores.
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#### Competency 1: Understanding Context

**CONTEXT variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>Orientation programs for new board members specifically include a segment about the institution’s history and traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>In discussing key issues, it is not unusual for someone on the board to talk about what the institution stands for and how that is related to the matter at hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 13</td>
<td>Values are seldom discussed explicitly at our board meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 30</td>
<td>This board has made a key decision that I believe to be inconsistent with the mission of this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 37</td>
<td>I have been present in board meetings where discussions of the history and mission of the institution were key factors in reaching a conclusion on a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 39</td>
<td>It is apparent from the comments of some of our board members that they do not understand the mission of this institution very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 42</td>
<td>There have been occasions where the board has acted in ways inconsistent with the institution’s deepest values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 45</td>
<td>New members are provided with a detailed explanation of this institution’s mission when they join this board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 50</td>
<td>This board reviews the institution’s mission at least once every five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 56</td>
<td>One reason I joined this board was that I believe strongly in the values of this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 59</td>
<td>Former members of this board have participated in special events designed to convey to new members the institution’s history and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 63</td>
<td>This board understands the norms of the professions working in this institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Competency 2: Builds Learning

**EDUCATE variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>I have participated in board discussions about what we should do differently as a result of a mistake the board made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>At least once every two years, our board has a retreat or special session to examine our performance, how well we are doing as a board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 17</td>
<td>This board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing institutions like the one we govern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>I can recall an occasion when the board acknowledged its responsibilities for an ill-advised decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 21</td>
<td>Most people on this board tend to rely on observation and informal discussions to learn about their role and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 24</td>
<td>When a new member joins this board, we make sure that someone serves as a mentor to help this person learn the ropes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 26</td>
<td>I have participated in board discussions about the effectiveness of our performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 29</td>
<td>I have participated in discussions with new members about the roles and responsibilities of a board member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 34</td>
<td>I have participated in board discussions about what we can learn from a mistake we have made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 38</td>
<td>I have never received feedback on my performance as a member of this board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 46</td>
<td>This board does not allocate organizational funds for the purpose of board education and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 51</td>
<td>This board has conducted an explicit examination of its roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Competency 3: Nurtures Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRAP Variable</th>
<th>Statement 3</th>
<th>I have had conversations with other members of this board regarding common interests we share outside this institution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 15</td>
<td>Differences of opinion in board decisions are more often settled by vote than by more discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>This board is as attentive to how it reaches conclusions as it is to what is decided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 27</td>
<td>At our board meetings, there is at least as much dialogue among members as there is between members and administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 31</td>
<td>The leadership of this board typically goes out of its way to make sure that all members have the same information on important issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 32</td>
<td>This board has adopted some explicit goals for itself, distinct from goals it has for the institution as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 43</td>
<td>This board relies on the natural emergence of leaders, rather than trying explicitly to cultivate future leaders for the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 52</td>
<td>I am able to speak my mind on key issues without fear that I will be ostracized by some members of the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 57</td>
<td>This board does not recognize special events in the lives of its members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 60</td>
<td>This board provides biographical information that helps members get to know one another better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 64</td>
<td>Members of this board seldom attend social events sponsored by this institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competency 4: Recognizes complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYZE variable</th>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>This board takes regular steps to keep informed about important trends in the larger environment that might affect the institution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>I have been in board meetings where it seemed that the subtleties of the issues we dealt with escaped the awareness of a number of the members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>Our board explicitly examines the “downside” or possible pitfalls of any important decision it is about to make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>Many of the issues that this board deals with seem to be separate tasks, unrelated to one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>I find it easy to identify the key issues that this board faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 23</td>
<td>When faced with an important issue, the board often “brainstorms” and tries to generate a whole list of creative approaches of solutions to the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 28</td>
<td>When issues come before our board, they are seldom framed in a way that enables members to see the connections between the matter at hand and the institution’s overall strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 47</td>
<td>Recommendations from the administration are usually accepted with little questioning in board meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 53</td>
<td>This board tries to avoid issues that are ambiguous and complicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement 61</td>
<td>This board seeks information and advice from leaders of similar institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Competency 5: Respects process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>This board communicates its decisions to all those who are affected by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If our board thinks that an important group or constituency is likely to disagree with an action we are considering, we will make sure we learn how they feel before we actually make the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>This board has formed ad hoc committees or task forces that include staff as well as board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I have been in board meetings where explicit attention was given to the concerns of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The board periodically requests information on the morale of the professional staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Before reaching a decision on important issues, this board usually requests input from persons likely to be affected by the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>At times, this board has appeared unaware of the impact its decisions will have within our service community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>The administration rarely reports to the board on the concerns of those the institution serves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competency 6: Shapes direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This board is more involved in trying to put out fires than in preparing for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The board sets clear institutional priorities for the year ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This board delays action until an issue becomes urgent or critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Our board meetings tend to focus more on current concerns than on preparing for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>At least once a year, this board asks the board chairperson to articulate his/her vision for the institution’s future and strategies to realize that vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>This board has on occasion evaded responsibility for some important issue facing this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>This board often discusses where the institution should be headed in five or more years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Within the past year, this board has reviewed the institution’s strategies for attaining its long-term goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I have been in board meetings where the discussion focused on identifying or overcoming the institution’s weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>The board discusses events and trends in the larger environment that may present specific opportunities for this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>This board makes explicit use of the long range priorities of this institution in dealing with current issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>More than half of this board’s time is spent in discussion of issues of importance to the institution’s long-range future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Holland & Jackson, 1994)
APPENDIX F
Email Message to Community College Presidents

November 21, 2003

PO Box 000
000 Elm St.
Any City, NC 00000

Dear Mr. Smith:

Over the past two years, I have been studying in depth the dynamics of lay governing boards in higher education. This interest was piqued when I discovered how truly valuable governing boards are to the American higher educational system and our nation’s democratic ideals. As a result, my dissertation topic for my doctoral research at North Carolina State University (NCSU) pertains to board development and its impact on the effectiveness of community college boards of trustees. The purpose of this correspondence is to make you as a community college board chair aware of a questionnaire packet that I plan to distribute to members of your board. You as a board chair may or may not be included in the study because trustees were randomly selected from all community colleges across North Carolina. As expected, all participants and community colleges will remain anonymous in any reporting. Also, Dr. George Vaughan, who has written extensively about community college presidents and more recently about community college boards of trustees, will help supervise the study.

In the next few days, ten (10) randomly selected trustees from your board will receive a questionnaire packet. The packet will contain a cover letter, a questionnaire, a self-addressed stamped envelope, and a pencil. Each trustee should be able to complete the questionnaire in a manner of minutes in the comfort of his or her own home. I will need a minimum of six (6) completed questionnaires from each community college board to generate board effectiveness scores for any given institution. Once effectiveness scores are tabulated, I will share the results with each board chair. It is hoped that the effectiveness scores generated from the study will provide board chairs and their respective trustees insight into their strengths and weaknesses as a group.

I have contacted Ms. Helen Dowdy, executive director of the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees (NCACCT) and her associate Mr. Hal Miller. Both are aware of the study and have in fact expressed interest in receiving a copy of the data analysis for their own future planning. I have also contacted Dr. Ken Boham, current president of the North Carolina Association of Community College Presidents (NCACCP), who has notified community college presidents via the association about the study.

Again, in closing, the purpose of this correspondence is to make you aware of the upcoming questionnaire packet ten (10) randomly selected trustees from your board will receive shortly. If you have any questions or comments related to the questionnaire or any aspect of the research process, then please contact me via phone or email. Thank you for serving as a North Carolina community college trustee and for all your support regarding this study.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hawkins
NCSU Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX G

Board Chairperson Informational Letter

November 21, 2003

PO Box 000
000 Elm St.
Any City, NC 00000

Dear Mr. Smith:

Over the past two years, I have been studying in depth the dynamics of lay governing boards in higher education. This interest was piqued when I discovered how truly valuable governing boards are to the American higher educational system and our nation’s democratic ideals. As a result, my dissertation topic for my doctoral research at North Carolina State University (NCSU) pertains to board development and its impact on the effectiveness of community college boards of trustees. The purpose of this correspondence is to make you as a community college board chair aware of a questionnaire packet that I plan to distribute to members of your board. You as a board chair may or may not be included in the study because trustees were randomly selected from all community colleges across North Carolina. As expected, all participants and community colleges will remain anonymous in any reporting. Also, Dr. George Vaughan, who has written extensively about community college presidents and more recently about community college boards of trustees, will help supervise the study.

In the next few days, ten (10) randomly selected trustees from your board will receive a questionnaire packet. The packet will contain a cover letter, a questionnaire, a self-addressed stamped envelope, and a pencil. Each trustee should be able to complete the questionnaire in a manner of minutes in the comfort of his or her own home. I will need a minimum of six (6) completed questionnaires from each community college board to generate board effectiveness scores for any given institution. Once effectiveness scores are tabulated, I will share the results with each board chair. It is hoped that the effectiveness scores generated from the study will provide board chairs and their respective trustees insight into their strengths and weaknesses as a group.

I have contacted Ms. Helen Dowdy, executive director of the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees (NCACCT) and her associate Mr. Hal Miller. Both are aware of the study and have in fact expressed interest in receiving a copy of the data analysis for their own future planning. I have also contacted Dr. Ken Boham, current president of the North Carolina Association of Community College Presidents (NCACCP), who has notified community college presidents via the association about the study.

Again, in closing, the purpose of this correspondence is to make you aware of the upcoming questionnaire packet ten (10) randomly selected trustees from your board will receive shortly. If you have any questions or comments related to the questionnaire or any aspect of the research process, then please contact me via phone or email. Thank you for serving as a North Carolina community college trustee and for all your support regarding this study.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hawkins
NCSU Doctoral Candidate
Trustee ID

November 25, 2003

PO Box 111
1934 Elm Street
Any City, NC 00000

Dear Mr. Doe:

Over the past two years, I have been studying in depth the dynamics of governing boards in higher education. This interest was piqued when I discovered how truly valuable governing boards are to the American higher educational system and to our nation’s democratic ideals. As a result, the dissertation topic for my doctoral research at North Carolina State University pertains to the effectiveness of community college boards of trustees.

Rather than conduct this study in isolation, I have contacted others who share my interest in boards of trustees. For example, Helen Dowdy and Hal Miller, both with the North Carolina Association of Community College Trustees, are aware of the study and have expressed interest in receiving results to plan future NCACCT workshops and conferences for trustees. I have also contacted Dr. Ken Boham, current president of the North Carolina Association of Community College Presidents, whose organization supported the study in last month’s executive session. Finally, I have contacted your board chair and president regarding the study. The results should provide several groups with valuable information to help support current and future community college governing boards and trustees.

In the packet, I have provided a questionnaire that is divided into four parts. The first part provides questions related to information such as trustee educational level and age. The second part gives a series of statements with a rating scale. Read each statement carefully and mark accordingly. Using a 10-point scale, the third section gives you an opportunity to provide an overall effectiveness rating for your current board. Finally, the last part has four general open-ended questions related to trusteeship. The questionnaire should take no longer than 10 minutes of your time.

A major section of the questionnaire relates to board effectiveness. With a minimum of six completed questionnaires from your governing board, I can generate composite board effectiveness scores. Therefore, your participation is essential. Once individual scores have been calculated and compiled, I can provide overall composite scores, along with any explanatory material, to each board chair. Of course, you have been selected randomly from a list of trustees, so your identity will remain confidential. It is hoped that the effectiveness scores generated from this study will provide board chairs and their respective trustees insight into their strengths and weaknesses as a group. Also, Dr. George Vaughan, who has written extensively about community college presidents and more recently about community college boards of trustees, will help supervise the study. As stated previously, all participants and community colleges will remain anonymous in any reporting.

Please complete and return the questionnaire before December 19. During the holidays, I will compile, analyze, and interpret the data. Early next year, the results should be available to your board. I have provided a pencil and a self-addressed stamped envelope for you to complete and return the questionnaire. If you have any questions or comments related to the questionnaire or any aspect of the study, then please contact me via phone or email.

In conclusion, as the director of the Learning Resources Center and Distance Education at Lenoir Community College in Kinston, I want to thank you for serving as a North Carolina community college trustee and for all your support regarding this study.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hawkins
NCSU Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX I

Professional Categories of Trustee Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Financial Services</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Ex. Officer</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer</td>
<td>K-12 Teacher</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Owner</td>
<td>K-12 Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Not Given</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerk</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Orthodontist</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal</td>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ophthalmologist</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinarian</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>Funeral Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

*BSAQ* Data Set Code Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC1 to SD65</td>
<td>BSAQ responses</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=strongly agree</td>
<td>2=agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=disagree</td>
<td>0=strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Underlined items represent reverse scoring.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency #1: Understands context: UC6, UC12, **UC13**, UC30, UC37, **UC39**, UC42, UC45, UC50, UC56, UC59, and UC63;

Competency #2 Builds learning: BL2, BL10, BL17, BL18, **BL21**, BL24, BL26, BL29, BL34, **BL38**, BL46, and BL51;

Competency #3 Nurtures group: NG3, **NG15**, NG20, NG27, NG31, NG32, **NG43**, NG52, NG57, NG60, and **NG64**;

Competency #4 Recognizes complexity: RC1, **RC4**, RC5, **RC11**, RC22, RC23, **RC28**, RC47, **RC53**, and RC61;

Competency #5: Respects process: RP9, RP14, RP19, RP25, RP33, RP41, **RP48**, and **RP54**;

Competency #6: Shapes direction: SD7, SD8, **SD16**, SD35, SD36, **SD40**, SD44, SD49, SD55, SD58, SD62, and SD65.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLT</td>
<td>Builds learning dimension</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Understands context dimension</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGT</td>
<td>Nurturing group dimension</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Recognizing complexity dimension</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>Respects process dimension</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDT</td>
<td>Shapes direction dimension</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECT</td>
<td>Overall Board Effectiveness Score</td>
<td>Numerical</td>
<td>0 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX K

*BSAQ* Sub Scores with Separate Overall Effectiveness Rating

(Colleges are arranged randomly.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>BLT</th>
<th>UCT</th>
<th>NGT</th>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>RPT</th>
<th>SDT</th>
<th>EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

T-Test Results for BSAQ: UC, NG, RC, SD, and RP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First-Term</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Second-Term+</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 37</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 39</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 42</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 45</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 50</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 56</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 59</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First-Term</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Second-Term+</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 31</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 52</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 60</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05
APPENDIX L

T-Test Results for RC: Recognizes Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First-Term SD</th>
<th>Second-Term+ SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 23</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 53</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 61</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05

T-Test Results for SD: Shapes Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First-Term SD</th>
<th>Second-Term+ SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>2.223</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 16</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 35</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 36</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 44</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 49</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 58</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 62</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 65</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05

T-Test Results for RP: Respects Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>First-Term SD</th>
<th>Second-Term+ SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 14</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 19</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 25</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 41</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 48</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant p<0.05
APPENDIX M

Part D: Your Comments
Responses for Open-ended Question 1

In what areas do you perceive your board as operating most effectively?

Answers (Arranged Randomly)

1. Providing programs and activities to meet the needs of a diverse group of people.

2. Supporting our president—who is very effective.

3. Conservative management and a Board that has the same goals.

4. Long-range Planning

5. I wish I knew of one! The Board of which I am a member is not in charge—The President is. --I am probably the only experienced member who is willing to make this statement. --There are two new members, who, in time, may help me effect change.

6. How to meet the present and future needs of the community in both development and personal needs of the community.

7. Being able to discuss issues without agendas of a personal nature.

8. Educating, training and re-training in all areas where needed. This includes partnering and job linkage with business and industry.

9. 1. Response to community needs. 2. Involving community leaders in our decisions. 3. Morale of faculty, staff, & students.

10. 1. Providing opportunities for all members to be as involved as they wish. 2. Dealing with government agencies.

11. Long-range planning.

12. The board understands our role in governing the college, and the president's role in carrying out the policies.

13. Meeting community needs for education and training.

15. Facilities expansion; response to enrollment demands

16. Program development.

17. I have served on many boards; this one is the best!! The leadership is always open, always recognizing the strengths of each member, using those strengths to further the goals of the Board and the College.

18. Keeping the community college focused on the needs of the community.

19. I have been a member of this board for 1 year so I am still getting a feel for our strengths.

20. Willing to work together and analyze current and future issues--serve the community.


22. Helping our teachers secure a salary increase.

23. Presenting a united front to public at large.

24. Communication

25. Thorough understanding of roles and responsibilities. --Open communication. -----Enthusiasm. --Respect for staff and their willing to let them do their job.


27. During our recent president search, our board demonstrated that it understood its mission and objectives and selected the president based on the institution's needs.

28. The board has done the best job with setting the agenda for the college over the next five years and seeing that strongest administration it could afford is in place.

29. 1. Visionary planning. 2. Measuring community impact of decisions


31. Long-range planning. Staying within budget.

32. Long-range planning. Little dissention among board members. Good cooperation.
33. Community services--expanding educational opportunities.

34. I feel that we are currently operating effectively.

35. Curriculum. Programs.

36. Long-range planning.

37. We have two buildings under construction regret now so that is the board’s main focus.

38. Handling or facing up to problems, situations, opportunities brought to its attention.

39. Operating within the budget. Continuing with adequate staff & facilities.

40. Long-range goals & mission.

41. Efficient board meetings, active committees planning for future, insuring quality education.

42. Academics.

43. Long-range planning. Focus on institution’s mission.

44. Budgeting, meeting current academic needs, expanding and maintaining facilities.

45. Planning and administration

46. Building programs & financial mgt.

47. Working with the President.

48. Working as a group to solve problems.


50. Sincere dedication to the job.

51. Four (4) operating committees of the board meeting monthly ensures board members are aware of day-to-day activities.

52. *In support for the institution. *Good wisdom from board members. *Good working relationships among members.
53. Our Board tries to look at present and future needs in our community so we can be prepared to meet these needs.

54. Administration support without micro-managing oversight.

55. a. Keeping abreast of funds and developing technical and academic programs with state/community focus and needs. b. Keeping trustees informed on issues affecting the college. c. Using individual talents of trustees to provide guidance.

56. Can’t respond. Have only attended 2 board meetings & a state sponsored orientation for new board members.

57. I am in my ninth year as a trustee. We have a very efficient president of the board. He does about 95% of the talking. Very few questions are asked. However, we have about a 90% attendance rate. This is good and bad--sorry.

58. The board has a good relationship with the administration. The board is good at keeping the administration faithful to its mission.

59. Controlling appointments so chair & administration can stay in "power".

60. Education.

61. Open discussion of current needs and direction of college to address these needs.

62. Harmony with board members and president. Willingness to serve where needed.

63. Future planning.

64. Policy. Generating community support.

65. Long-range planning.

66. The actions of our board are not influenced by political, religious or racial factors. No factions are working in their own interests. I was appalled at my last meeting in Raleigh to hear so many board members from across the state tell of the divisiveness of their boards, in fact 2/3 of them.

67. Long-range planning.

68. Land acquisition for new bldgs. Search for and hiring of new president.

69. Ongoing operations of college & physical facilities needs.

70. The togetherness in which the board operates.
71. Working together, being able to discuss and agree on decisions.

72. Willingness to step in the fray to help solve problems. Support of the administration--wash our own laundry internally & use 1 spokesperson for the college. --Truly care about the college's mission. --Often spend our own $ to support areas in needs. Have a wide range of expertise in Board mem. & longevity of several.

73. Working together on major issues to advance the mission of the college.

74. Carrying out policy & discussing long-range planning.

75. Cooperation among members.

76. The way the board is split--it will not operate effectively.

77. All Areas.

78. Future growth & programs.

79. Representing the views of community constituents; quality control.

80. Building and finance, personnel, long-range planning.

81. The ability to work together in making decisions after pro & con discussion. The respect we have for each other.

82. Support of the administration, faculty, staff. Building programs for increase in students. Keeping up with changing economy, expanding technology.

83. Long-range planning, facility/capital expansion, setting policy for student/enrollment growth and curriculum expansion.

84. We have committees that meet prior to board meetings that bring a recommendation to the full board. This reduces the need for long discussions.

85. It doesn't. Majority does whatever President wants without questions.

86. Strategic planning. Monitoring ongoing operations. Setting policy.

87. Work extremely well together. Total respect for each member.

88. We have a great board.
89. The board sets policy and stays out of day-to-day operations.

90. In all areas the board communicates effectively.

91. Broad long-range outlook on the college's future.
92. All areas.

93. Identifying the needs of the administration, staff, students and community.

94. Welfare & fund of the student!

95. Working with the college president and staff. Providing resources. Working with legislators and issues that affect the college. Providing services needed by the community and local businesses and industry.

96. Being aware of what is going on.

97. Board-Administration relations. Board support of faculty and staff. Board - community relations.

98. Setting policy.


100. Financial stability. Educational services to less advantaged ***** County residents.

101. Policy making.

102. Long-range planning to meet community educational needs. Support of administration and tracking staff actions to support and meet the needs of students.

103. Finance. Lobbying governmental personnel both local and at state level. Monitoring personnel activities, & curriculum changes.

104. Strong collaboration between public education, college education and community.


106. In the area of governance, this board has always towed the line between setting policy and administration. The board has also been strong in willingness to make discussions.
107. Board decisions are made with the best interest of the students in mind. Decisions are made with the mission of *** paramount.

108. Policymaking, planning, professional development.

109. Recruiting & retaining students.

110. Relations with President and staff. --We allow the President to run the college. We deal with policy and direction.

111. Cooperativeness and mutual respect.

112. Making major decisions that affect the mission of the college.

113. Working together as a team.

114. Planning, curriculum, building & development.


116. Selecting president, budgeting, and developing master plan for facilities.

117. Providing the courses that best serve the needs of the community.

118. Trying to target persons who have lost their employment due to a factory closing etc. We offer help in re-education.

119. The relationship with senior staff members is very good. Facility planning and implementation have been quite effective

120. Meeting needs of community. Providing financial assistance to students. Up to date facilities.

121. Meeting the needs of the students and community.

122. Fiscal, personnel, growth of the college, new facility planning, professional education of the board, understanding educational programs, innovation in course offerings, getting along with each other.

123. Facilities planning. Pushing & guiding staff in 5-year program development. Promoting college in our community.

125. Board meetings & committee meetings.

126. Long-range planning.

127. Staff, student, board relationships and concerns.

128. I feel we have an excellent board. All trustees are interested in improving our total college & students’ educational opportunities. They all work well together.

129. Saying Yes to the President of the institution.

130. Our board operates very effectively. We have good attendance from our trustees and are able to effectively make decisions for the college.

131. Fund raising & facility improvement.

132. Helping administration to carry on the mission of the institution.

133. All phases of board responsibility! Policymaking & "president" responsibility.

134. In setting policy and allowing the administration to carry it out.

135. New programs & courses.

136. Budget.

137. Providing the different trade related education & input from the community.


139. Board members cooperative and supportive efforts in trying to accomplish the institution's goals.

140. Trust in each other and openness to differing views. Open dialogue with administration. Passion for the mission of our community college system.

141. All areas of our responsibilities are effective.

142. Understanding the need to train everyone in our community to get a job and be self-supporting.

143. Community responsiveness.
144. Keeping up with community needs & providing classes needed especially retraining when plants close.

145. Understanding the needs of our communities and businesses, and communicating these to the college administration.

146. Knowledge of classes being taught & why. Board is aware of community & its needs.

147. Finance & facilities. We are in a growth process.

148. Very active and concerned about the direction our college is going. Make sure students and faculty needs are met both scholastically and financially. We are a rural area. We must meet the needs, course wise, of these students plus further Ed. for college.

149. Mission development.

150. Program. Broadening community relationships. Student/Administration/Board members understanding.

151. Finances, building and grounds, personnel.

152. Very effective board; harmonious.

153. Our board operates in all areas of the curriculum effectively.

154. Building & construction. We are now beginning to help give direction to the administration.

155. The issues are discussed and resolved in committee meetings prior to bringing the issues before the board.

156. We are informed on all issues that we need to approve or amend. Our board works well with chairs & President.

157. Hiring & retaining an excellent President to run the college.

158. Generally a very effective board. Board asserts the networking of the school to the community.

159. Backing president and faculty in educating students in financing.

160. All areas are handled very effectively in my opinion.
161. Participation, interest, working as a team.
162. Working together.
163. Planning & Budgeting & policymaking.
164. In general, this board operates effectively in all areas.
165. Community - Students’ involvement - Industry.
166. Budget issues. Giving support to our faculty & staff.
167. My board is very attuned to planning for the future needs.
168. Planning for the future.
169. Meeting student needs--financial assistance, counseling.
170. The committee(s) help our board to function more effectively.
171. Keeping the best President available. Let the President run the college.
172. In all areas. I consider the Board to be very effective.
173. In accomplishing student success. --Financial responsibility. --Taking care of the needs of our community.
174. Policy development.
175. Building & grounds - growth & planning - development. 2) informed members. 3) Community & school adm. working closely.
176. Supporting our president when necessary.
177. Setting policy.
178. Supporting an able administration
179. Supporting staff & keeping in line with state laws.
180. Fiscal responsibility. Keep students first in all we do.
181. 1. Allow & support the College administration to "manage" the institution. 2. Working relationship with local elected officials and industry leaders in the county.
182. The long-range programs.
183. Decision making; cooperation with college president & administration; promoting very positive community image.
184. Future curriculum development.
186. We take our responsibilities seriously & work well together & with the President. We attend state meetings & have productive board retreats. We direct the President & don't try to supervise the faculty & administrative personnel.
188. Communication to community. Respect each other and value input from each other. Earned trust of the public--whom we serve.
189. Very effective Bd. handling what ever comes up.
190. Board works as team in all areas of responsibilities.
191. With property issues.
192. Budget, Building & Grounds, Accreditation standards.
193. Respect for each member by each member. Supporting decisions of in operating the college. Moving administration toward longer range focus & planning.
194. Maintaining close touch with President, and other Administration/Staff.
195. Financial oversight, & not becoming involved in the daily management of the college.
196. As a Team with Administration with other community leadership.
197. Employee morale.
198. Understanding and valuing staff and including their voice in decisions made for institutions.
199. Policy Not Administration.
200. Trying--and most times--doing so--to offer courses that our young folks want & need.

201. Administrative support. Greater community awareness.

202. Ability to work well together to achieve institution’s goals which most times coincide with the goals of the community at large.

203. Excellent attendance; willingness to speak & ask questions; full commitment to the mission of community college. Limit of 4 years in a position such as chair for bd members.

204. Working together as a team for the good of the students within the goals of the College.

205. Responding to community needs

206. Long & short term planning.

207. For the overall good of the institution.

208. Setting Policy

209. Long-range planning
APPENDIX N
Part D: Your Comments
Responses for Open-ended Question 2

What, in your opinion, could be done to increase the effectiveness of your board?

Answers (Arranged Randomly)

1. Possibly a better orientation program and bringing on board younger leadership.
2. Our board operates extremely well and people are not afraid to speak up.
3. I believe that the opportunities to ensure Board effectiveness are already being utilized.
4. Have more "off the record" meetings to hash out problems without fear of newspaper quotes.
5. Better orientation for new members.
7. More attendance at educational opportunities offered by & for CC trustees.
8. I believe we are on the right track.
9. Increase in board development. Formal evaluation (survey questionnaire) of the board--although this is done in discussion.
10. Clarify financial report--also simplify some.
11. I'm very pleased with the way it operates presently.
12. As chair, I have scheduled a board self-evaluation and planning retreat (first in many years).
13. Spend more time in working with new trustees.
14. More members attend college and community related activities etc. And attend ACCT and NCACCT meetings.
15. More stability in our president's office or long-term leadership by the same CEO.
16. Increased attendance at meetings and, at times, the willingness to ask questions and disagree with the majority if you have legitimate and informed reasons to question.

17. Have more business & corporate leaders on our boards.

18. Retreats which are starting soon.

19. Our board represents a Tri-County area and it is difficult to "socialize"; however, more social interaction might be beneficial.

20. More board retreats with professional facilitators.

21. Study and make use of data provided to trustees on programs and services.

22. We are rather efficient. More active committees.

23. One- or two-day gatherings for goal setting and long range planning, and for knowing each other and staff better. Orientation of new members. (Local board--not State Assoc.)

24. Probably more interaction between Board of Trustees and various community segments.

25. I think it would be helpful if all members could spend more time on campus other than at board functions.

26. Sometimes political appointees don't appreciate the importance of their role and it takes some time for them to become effective participants.

27. Availability of funds needed at the college.

28. New members need time to develop into good Bd. members.

29. An evaluation of board each year--which we have agreed to do in June 04.

30. Stay away from political issues.

31. Have seminars to provide trustees with information. Background research where professional expertise is lacking.

32. In my opinion, we have one of the best boards in the community college system, we work together, and attend state and national conferences and report back to the
full Board. All members are very concerned about the students, faculty & administration.

33. More time to just talk about things other than those we vote on--more retreats.

34. Board retreats to better define our understanding of a clear 5-year strategic plan.

35. Figure out how to exert more influence in the local and state governments that control (tightly) the purse strings!!

36. To become more aware of global education. Pursuing opportunities and resources. Learn more about economic development.

37. Better attendance at school functions.

38. All agenda items available in advance of board meeting.

39. More interaction/information sharing with college personnel departments to increase awareness of issues, needs, progress, accomplishments before problems arise.

40. Give to board members more jobs to get involved. I've been on my board 5 years and have been asked to do nothing but give money. Once I leave a board meeting it's over until next board meeting.

41. We are very effective because of continuity of the board & strong leadership from the administration.

42. Open dialogue with no hidden agendas.

43. Better leadership & less dependent on president for decisions.

44. The administration relies on consultants. The board is too uncritical of the consultant’s reports.

45. We have an effective Board and good communication to and from our College President so I do not have any additional ideas at the present time.

46. An annual retreat.

47. Very effective board.

48. Overall the board is very effective. Retreats periodically would help.

49. In an economic down turn, do not cut our funding. The only way our economy can restart is to have a trained student workforce.
50. Increase the diversity--age, occupation, gender, ethnic. More real discussion about the issues instead of just accepting the president's recommendations.

51. Many of our board members have been active for many years and are older members. We could adopt a mandatory term limit so that we would not have so many older members at one time.

52. Continue with our annual evaluation retreats. Increase the opportunity of attendance at state board seminars & national college association meetings.

53. More concentration on long range plans and vision for the college.

54. More overall discussion & trust among board members.

55. Keep doing what we are doing.

56. Major focus toward alternative sources of funding which are not government--ex. private funding.

57. More focus on self-evaluation.

58. Bring community leaders--once a year to board meeting with their ideas for our college & it's future. (Mayor--Co. Commissioners--Chamber of Commerce, etc.)

59. More training in the area of curriculum selection.

60. Additional learning as well as having the board take a look at the long & short-term goals of the institution.

61. More in-service workshops to discuss goals of college. 2. More information on "in-house" concerns.


63. Better communication between faculty & board, faculty & President. Perhaps a bi-weekly printed update of the goings-on from the President, maybe more input on hiring or transferring personnel. Perhaps two or 3 more social situations to put all members (esp. new ones) at ease.

64. Fundraising.
65. More local education of board members. Yearly tours of departments and campus buildings.

66. More involvement with staff & student organizations and committees.

67. Additional training.

68. Improved instruction from board attorney, re: closed meetings and similar issues for hearings.

69. Place persons on the board who are more in touch with the people you serve. Extremely old board members are generally ineffective!

70. Be better informed (briefed) by the administration on problems faced by the administration.

71. More experience. Our college was established in ****. We have only had two new board members appointed, and one of those was to replace a board member who died. We only have one living former member.

72. Some members are very busy and cannot always be present. A full board could have more input and new ideas.

73. Visit student classrooms; interact with students & instructors more.

74. Better orientation. 2. Concentration on larger issues. 3. Fundraising. 4. Retreats. 5. More advocacy by members of Board.

75. Better funding sources. More retreats together.

76. It is being done--advance information of meeting agenda and back up or support info.

77. Use more committees.

78. One member to resign. Our Board does a good job. However, like any other business there is always room for improvement. I look to the President for guidance. We do not micro-manage the college. We are a policy making board.

79. Per this questionnaire: A board retreat with a facilitator in direction of topics and issues the institution may have to address in the coming years--other than financial shortfalls!!

80. I think it does well as is.
81. Transfer to the President any appropriate areas of responsibility to allow the Board to force more or major and broad issues.

82. Keeping up with daily operations.

83. Evaluation by us of our effectiveness. Orientation for new board members.

84. Personal responsibility by each member to be better informed on issues and attendance at more college functions.

85. Change in statute to allow compensation to board members for service.

86. Replace the "yes men" with independent thinkers who have the best interest of the citizens of this community in mind.

87. Maybe a little more planning for a study of long range needs & issues.

88. Better use needs to be made of the skills of all of the persons on the board. Those persons not able to be big fundraisers for the board are often left with idle time.

89. Meet monthly rather than every other month.

90. Continue to be dedicated to doing those that will improve the lives of community we serve.

91. An evaluation of the Board's effectiveness & identifying areas for improvement.

92. Keep doing what we are doing.

93. Continue to provide pertinent information. Continue to promote and support all efforts possible to move the institution forward.

94. The President needs to stop interfering in board business. Stop working to get members he can control.

95. Ongoing continuing ed., annual retreats & thorough orientation for new members.

96. More detailed evaluation of board performance.

97. I feel we are very effective now.

98. Better communication among board members and between board and administration.

99. Board Retreats.
I had felt the need to change leadership (i.e., Committee chairs) but this has now been done. When people are given responsibility they are more involved and this is more effective, I think.

Involve more trustees in discussions of what to bring to our attention at meetings.

In my opinion, we are very effective, however, retreats and/or local workshops.

Perhaps a little more interaction between board and faculty. They know us--we don't know them.

Use individual members expertise and connections to community and local and state government to the advantage of the college.

Orientation and training for trustees.

Limit terms to shorter period. Experience on board may not be as valuable as early years of service energy.

Some members (especially one) stop being so negative.

Until recently I felt that the board should get updated on *** affairs more often. Our new president is now doing just that.

Our board is very effective & strong & does a GREAT job.


Recruit more members who are still in the workforce vs. retirees.

More retreats.

State funding for convention and meeting opportunities (for trustees) reinstated.

I think board members should be more involved in the community's awareness of the college--in needs, in opportunities & better advocates to local government

Nothing--operates well as is.

Subscriptions to state & federal CC publications.

An assessment of our effectiveness--need a facilitator.
118. Greater board member participation in the college special events.

119. Board is very effective.

120. Better communication of director of funding and parties involved.

121. Annual Evaluations.

122. Board evaluation & planning specific to the Board's performance.

123. More long range planning. Better communication with staff/faculty. Better communication with county commissioners. Note--Board leadership has changed--progress is being made.

124. News on Website.

125. Continued dialogue.

126. Change the way board members are appointed.

127. More open communication in retreats. Remove board members who are self serving.


129. Become more involved with student activities.

130. More frequent meetings--now in progress.

131. Our effectiveness could improve by making its members a little more actively involved.

132. 1. Not just rubber-stamp staff recommendations. Require more detailed information from staff before making decisions. 2. Make board smaller in number.

133. Board appears to be most effective in its present operations.

134. I cannot think of anything that his board could possibly do to become more effective.

135. More workshops & retreats.

136. Making certain we all have the same information before board meetings or during a time of crisis in our community. Bottom line--information.
137. Have retreat & get to know each other better.

138. Diversity in employment.

139. Nothing.

140. More money from state & local govt.

141. More diversity to truly understand needs of entire community.

142. Nothing specific. When concerns are presented to the board regarding policy, etc. they are dealt with effectively. We allow the president to manage the institution. We no not meddle.

143. Greater participation in events outside of board meetings.

144. More social interaction to better know one another.

145. New trustee training.

146. More orientation & information sessions.

147. I feel that we are effective; however, there is always room for improvement.

148. Become political. University system is using this: lobby.

149. A more diverse board membership (as in race, sex, socio-economic levels from throughout the community) needs to be included.

150. Two-three day retreat each year.

151. Our board is supportive of all programs. We get along well, respect each other's opinions, and recognize different areas at our meeting. We've started discussing having a retreat.

152. Review of Board. More training for new members.

153. One (1) member has too many absences--needs to recommit to the responsibilities of being a Board member or resign. Board chair is working with this one.

154. Board retreat.

155. Have more information available on a subject available to trustees before meetings if possible.
156. Move meeting time from 7 PM to earlier in day. Some board members have to travel over an hour to attend creating atmosphere of rushing through the agenda.

157. To be less political. Get objective board appointees. Realize that it's not only an honor but a responsible position.

158. Should be more involved in the planning process and in establishing real and 10-5 (5 yr.) range objectives and goals. Holding the Board as a whole and each individual trustee accountable for performance results. Should monitor the performance of the President more closely.

159. Perhaps add retreats.

160. Listening to more staff personnel.

161. Rid our board of a couple of members who appear to have a politically motivated agenda.

162. More interaction among board members outside of meetings. More frequent review of institutional goals & long range plans.

163. I feel our board is effective but if all trustees participated at a higher level we could more effective.

164. All members should attend seminars and conferences provided by the Department of Community Colleges: State & National.

165. Better orientation at local level. Have a retreat for board members every few years.

166. Establishing better rapport with legislators.

167. Our board is very effective. We attend most conferences and seminars. We compare our ideas and strengths with other com. colleges, sharing and learning.

168. Better understanding of all issues.

169. Streamlining the presentations of “reports” from staff. (We are working on this.)

170. Presently, the board is effective. Their influence spills over into all areas of education in the county.
171. We work very hard together and rank very well with Southern Association and are blessed with top administrators!

172. We are seeking building agreement. The student population is growing rapidly on all four campuses.

173. Increased involvement in campus activities.
APPENDIX O
Part D: Your Comments
Responses for Open-ended Question 3

What topic(s) related to community college trusteeship would you like to learn more about to become a more effective trustee?

Answers. (Arranged Randomly)

1. I would like to know more about scholarships to be obtained for students that need them to continue their education.

2. More time with peers; new things we need for future

3. I believe the annual ACCT meetings do an excellent job of educating the trustees.

4. Program development, funding, relationships with other colleges and universities.

5. Keep our trustees up to date on our newest programs so we can address questions ask by the general public.


7. How to gracefully effect the replacement of ineffective trustees.

8. How to communicate more effectively with ways to support the college by all groups in the community.

9. How the states decide on the amount of funding each college receives.

10. More benchmarking with other boards.

11. BOT assessment model.

12. Lobbying effectively to gain funding.

13. Any topic related to continued education and recruitment would be helpful.


15. Financial management.
16. Legislative issues; obligations of board member, re: responsibilities; continued dialogue, re: conflicts etc. Board needs more comfort with open meeting etc.

17. Details of state financing of CC system of NC.


20. The Trustees Association does a good job of presenting the basics of law, customs, etc. In addition, I would like to see: (1) Information on how best to convey what we have to offer to those in our service area. (2) Effective Fund raising.

21. Board's responsibilities regarding issues that should be in open or closed meetings.

22. None. We have great training and communications.

23. More emphasis on entrepreneur. Fundraising. Nontraditional activity--to develop sources of funding with over and above sources.


25. Keep doing what we are doing.

26. None come to mind as urgent just now!!

27. Administration.


30. Receiving grants and workforce develop.


32. Facility master planning. Critical thinking process.

33. Salary schedules, a more standard handbook.

34. Curriculum.
35. We did topics for our retreats.
36. Qualifications of Presidents & other Administrators.
37. Laws & regulations governing boards.
38. Increase visits to ongoing programs.
39. Role in the community and in public education Grades 1-12.
40. How to bring the college and the greater community closer together.
41. I am always interested in how other institutions are meeting their communities' needs and solving problems.
42. Duties.
43. 1. Finances. 2. Community needs.
44. The overall staffing/responsibilities of the institution.
46. A quicker orientation into the activities and responsibilities of the board.
47. Financing from the legislature. How the process could be improved to better meet the needs of the community college.
48. Duties and responsibilities of trustees under N.C. Law.
49. We are such a small college that every thing is familiar to everyone as to what is happening and needs to happen. We are a very compatible group and all have the same goals to help the growth of the college.
50. Our standing in NC Community College system. How we are seen by the community.
51. How other boards of trustees are used by their Presidents and staffs.
52. I'm where I would like to be.
53. The difficulty in running community colleges is keeping the curriculum relevant to the job market.
54. The potential student population.

55. None to suggest. I attend state and national meetings to gain continuing understanding of my role and strive to be a contributing member of the Board.

56. Funding. How a formula is established. What we can do to obtain more operating funds. Better salaries.

57. Budgeting and financial responsibilities of the board.

58. Individual responsibilities of a trustee.

59. ALL.

60. Long-range planning, particularly cooperative planning with the local school system, other integral agencies.

61. How do you effectively evaluate Board member leadership and input roles in the Community College without offending member who are not paid for one's service?

62. Trying to do this through seminars & retreat coming up.

63. Fiduciary responsibility.

64. Budgetary process and legal requirement on a state and local level.

65. There are so many mandates from the state that gives little latitude for college. We need more information on where we have discretion.

66. Been a trustee for 20 yrs.

67. Personnel policies. How to improve personnel attitudes and job satisfaction without interfering.

68. Diversity.

69. Very well informed.

70. Budgeting processes.

71. Cutting edge topics. What does it take to make us the best community college in NC?
72. How to reach out & interact to needs of community.

73. Programs understanding.

74. Meeting on what state law requires our admst. & staff to do or not to do--seems to not be clear.

75. a. Interaction of financial software between college and state and why systems are not compatible and mutually supportive. b. Research which has direct relationship to community college professional and academic programs.

76. More understanding of financial structure--Budget, funding sources & allocation, etc.

77. Raising funds. Possibly partnerships that will enhance the ability of the college to operate and continue to be effective.

78. Fundraising.

79. How we compare and contrast to other community colleges in North Carolina. Learn from what mistakes or successes they have had.

80. Fundraising. Budget. How to keep the great staff we have & do more for them!

81. Law & responsibility of board members.

82. Our leadership conferences are addressing these issues and are doing an excellent job.

83. Fundraising. Policy development.

84. I am not sure.

85. Economic development plans for our area.

86. Planning initiatives for future public policies for the achievement of our mission goals.

87. Finances. How to reach legislators to show them our need.

88. Effective marketing of CC to our community.

89. To understand the various curriculums better (what is offered).
90. How trustees can be more effective to help community colleges as a whole in NC-law making, lobbying, etc.

91. How the budget design can be effective for better service to community programming.

92. College transfer & computers.

93. I believe we receive enough material to justify whether we are performing effectively or not.

94. Future trends in education and how to better serve the changing demographics of our community.

95. How to get our legislators to understand how poorly they fund the community college system!!!

96. How does my institution compare with other NC community colleges?

97. Finances.

98. Fundraising.

99. More training and matching funds and grant programs.

100. Legal issues & how to stretch tax dollars.

101. How to get the president out.

102. How involved trustees should be with the administration and students.

103. Finances. Foundation Issues. Dealing effectively with the media.

104. Budget issues and becoming more aware of how we are funded.

105. Require a thorough understanding of bylaws should be discussed more frequently. More visits to various departments--planned & spontaneous--to all our campus branches.

106. The legal relationship.

107. The financial aspect.

108. The "real" purpose of a board.
109. Key issues that are now facing community colleges and what issues are seen to be in the future. Methods of funding other than state/local governments. How trustee boards monitor and measure their performance.

110. More information on how the state direction could be more effective in helping the college with our busy legislators.

111. None. I have been on Board 20+ yrs; 8 as chairman.

112. Board evaluation.

113. Finance.

114. How to stop the system's gradual movement to take over the colleges and limit local authority.

115. The true role of a trustee.

116. How a community college can supplement its financial support, and establishing stronger college foundations.

117. Ways to increase funding to CCs.

118. Laws and legislative regulations.

119. Effectiveness of a trustee.

120. I resent the college staff (President to groundskeeper) giving virtually nothing to capital gifts campaign while pushing trustees to give large amounts.

121. What more can we do out in the community without overstepping our responsibilities as a trustee.

122. Role/relationship to CC employees. Appropriate "visits" on campus to become more familiar. Aware/informed about CC life.

123. Interaction with other political groups, county commissioners, state & national congressional people.

124. All of the student aid programs.

125. Funding & finances.

127. Legal issues.
128. Legislative and congressional concerns related to community colleges.
129. The State Board supplies adequate info in their bulletins & prediction.
130. Financial.
131. I have been very informed by staff and the chairman.
132. Why the state withholds our budget money.
133. I have had opportunity over the years to learn a great deal about college trusteeship but can always learn more.
134. With state and national workshops, I feel there are many good offerings currently.
135. Better regional, national, & state workshop. Many classes put on by these organizations are just moneymakers! Not as effective as they need to be!
136. Alternative funding sources.
137. Financial decision making by state which creates significant $ for buildings but not sufficient $ to operate the building's use.
138. Ways trustees could have more influence on community college budget at the State level.
139. My 40 plus years as a trustee allows me to be open-minded to changing times, events and the needs in our community its they confront us.
140. Money problems continue major. Even after 8 years on the Board, I have difficulty understanding budgets. Budgets vs. Actual, etc.
141. Relationship of Administration to Board. Role of committees to board.
142. Ethics.
143. Impact of legislation and budget constraints on the institution.
144. As a trustee, I have access regularly to all the printed materials available. I read & discuss ideas and issues.
145. How to affect legislation regarding the funding of CC without endangering the success the colleges have had.

146. Staff process.

147. Governance.

APPENDIX P
Section D: Your Comments
Responses for Open-ended Question 4

What concerns do you believe will be important to your board five (5) years from now?

Answers. (Randomly Arranged)

1. Education direction: technical vs. 4-year college.

2. A. Changes in technology and relationship to program/policy needs. B. Assuring that money is available to provide staff training to keep pace with societal changes. C. Funding available for program needs so costs to students will not become prohibitive for attendance. D. Developing more on-line courses where content allows.

3. Competition from other educational institutions.

4. Unfortunately, I believe money (funding) will be an every increasing topic of importance. How do we meet increasing demands for services with what seems to be a shrinking funding source.

5. State Funding levels. 2. Job displacement re-education. 3. Facility needs in our region.

6. How do we make sure our students are job ready and educationally prepared for a global economy?

7. Funding by state & county. Tremendous growth in people we serve while decrease in funding. Diverse population.

8. More buildings, as our enrollment is steadily increasing.


10. Institutional growth. Funding.

11. Growth. Where will we place increased enrollment?

12. New buildings and programs to train people.

13. Meeting the needs of the Hispanics and other minorities. Diversity of staff and administration. Funding to meet growth needs.
14. Growth of the community and capital expansion. Programs and other services to meet the needs.

15. Funding sources and adequate funding. Competitive salaries for faculty and staff. Maximizing returns on monies expended for programs. Dropping those that do not give the best return for the investment.

16. Sources of revenue for growth and expansion.

17. Addressing enrollment growth & cost associated with increased technology with a negative budget environment.

18. For the state to set a budget and leave it alone.

19. Financing the programs that will or could be offered by the college.

20. Expansion of facilities and programs.

21. Funding and keeping curriculum in line with the ever changing needs of the work force 5 yrs. from now.

22. State funding.


24. Biotechnology and the impact of training the students.

25. State Funding. State Funding. State Funding (and lack thereof).

26. State Funding.

27. Funding of College.


29. Budgets.

30. Whether to continue as a community college.


32. Meeting needs of non-speaking English citizens and developing means to meet chg. labor force needs.
33. Both public & private money.

34. Availability of adequate funding. 2. Adequately facilitating worker transition from manufacturing jobs to newly opened positions.

35. As always--finance. --The community college system always needs more financial support.

36. Acquiring funds to educate a population in technological disciplines that require more costly faculty & facilities.

37. 1. Adequate finances. 2. Staffing of college with proper credentialed faculty & staff. 3. Where do we go from here?

38. The changing of our administrative staff. We have our president retiring in the next five years & others.

39. Keeping pace with technology and the information driven economy.


41. Curriculum salary of faculty and personnel.

42. The quality and moral of the teaching staff.

43. Actively recruiting and retaining first year students and the not so young that need additional education.

44. Realizing that more responsibility to manage the "fewer" dollars for the benefit of the student is necessary. Be innovative for subject & courses. Work more closely with other CCs.


46. How to finance the needs that growth in students attending *** will require.

47. At the present time, it seems that it might be space. Our campus is cramped. More students than space to put them!

49. Space. Acquisition of more property. Need to turn out twice the # of nurses &
    that won't meet the demand. Run full schedule at night too. Start engineering
department. Must get more pay for faculty. Get a 2nd in command so Pres. can
devote full time to community. Getting $. Participation in ed., etc. Get alumni
more involved in helping present students. Grow in Biotechnology.

50. Staff compensation. Courses of study. Funding.

51. I believe that the funding for community colleges will be the most important
    issue of the next five years.

52. Remediation. Capital $. Continuing to honor "open door" policy.

53. Our role in the local economy.

54. 1. Leadership. 2. Response to business needs. 3. Economic development
    4. Finances.

55. Development of programs to meet work force educational needs. Funding &
supporting programs with other higher ed. Inst.

56. The Hispanic influx! Dollars.

57. Funding the colleges. Community college's role in economic development.

58. Training students now for the future work force. Meeting demands for new
technology training. Faculty pay. Classroom needs.

59. Growth of student body & rising costs on building & general day to day
    operations.

60. Funding--considering the current political environment of tax reduction at all
    levels of government.

61. Where will the money come from?

62. Funding from both counties & state.

63. Five years from now facilities will be a concern. Evaluation of the curriculum
    and services offered will need to be assessed.

64. Meeting the needs of a growing community.
65. The shortage of money and continuing the many programs offered with local funding.

66. Capacity and infrastructure to handle growing demands of a growing student population with rapidly changing skill requirements.

67. Lack of funds.

68. Meeting the needs of the work force & training for needed industries.

69. Same concerns as today.

70. Amount of funding we receive--local--state & federal. 2. Support of political commissioners--local. 3. Keeping our local autonomy.

71. Funding.

72. The community college vision without proper and adequate legislative funding being carried forth.

73. Money.

74. Space for students. Adequate Nursing instructors. Funding.

75. How will we have handled Biotech industries and programs?

76. Technology.

77. Environment and jobs relating to all changes. Agriculture. What will help the farmers’ choice of product to sell since tobacco will be gone? Water shortage. How it affects our area. Unemployment. Preparing for a change in careers.

78. Funding.

79. Continual need to prepare our citizens for work force with whatever industries come our area. We continue to grow and our building program. Quality instruction must be maintained. We have been so blessed to have very strong leadership with our top level staff positions and remain to continue to be the best system in the state. This MUST be a priority for us being one of the best. I believe we are!

80. Continued recognition of the importance of technical skills education. Graduate job prepared students.
81. Maintaining ability to service community. Strong administrative & board leadership.

82. Dealing with increasing enrollment, economic development and providing new technology.

83. How to effectively serve a changing consumer base. Will the "No Child Left Behind" impact what we do & when we do it? How to position ourselves in technology to serve today AND serve tomorrow. How to work within the challenges of being and serving in a Tier 1 county.

84. Planning for an ever-changing work force training need.

85. The growth of our comm. college.

86. Lack of space to serve our area.

87. Enrollment & how we will meet the financial requirements to serve our students. It seems we are constantly asked to do more with fewer financial resources.

88. Indigent population increase.

89. More job training. Our county is losing jobs.

90. Funding. Space Allocation. Growing enrollment outpacing funding.

91. Increasing enrollment.

92. Continuation of small business assistance military base closings? Tourism.

93. Money.

94. How to cope with growth of the comm. college.

95. Level of state funding for community colleges. Impact of "Distance Learning" on teaching & facilities. What are the jobs & training required in 5 yr.?


97. Finance. Key leadership positions (succession planning).

98. How Community Colleges will be able to fund new and emerging needs with budget deficits as they have been for the past few years?
99. Meeting the needs of our future students in a changing workplace.
100. Funding. Faculty retiring--replacements.
101. Making sure that the College is effective in training and retraining of students to effectively take on jobs that will be available.
102. Financial Support (student grants/loans). 2. Classroom space (due to student increases). (We're up 20% over last year). 3. Decreased financial support from the state.
103. Preparing a work force for future world of work.
104. Distance learning. Evolving needs of a more computerized work environment.
105. Funding from the state.
106. The changing needs of the work force.
108. Funding.
109. Having to suffer for a year with high growth before getting funds to support it.
110. Duties. Money (Budget). Quality of teachers.
112. Being able to provide adequate space & faculty.
113. Fiscal problems.
116. Continuity of staff leadership including the president.
117. Addressing budget needs to meet job-training challenges in society.
118. Where are financial resources to fund this college to serve this community and region?
119. Job opportunities for graduates. How do we address the issue from an educational standpoint?
120. Funding. Maintaining local control.

121. Securing funds to take care of more demands on our community colleges. We have an outstanding president.

122. Too long to predict.


124. FTE always. Probably a presidential search during the 5-year period. Funding from the state and local governments.

125. The most important concern is how well or how poorly the legislature funds the system.

126. Diversity in student population funding. / Transition in area's economy.

127. Increased enrollment. Rising tuition costs. Meeting the needs of community requirements.

128. A more diverse administration and staff.

129. To continue to meet the needs of our students--whatever the case may be.

130. Money is always a concern because we need funds to finance programs needed in our community and to hire and keep good instructors for our institution.

131. At present what the president wants he gets.

132. Funding for quality-level faculty. Coordination with public schools. Raising expectations of community and students. Fostering community economic growth & preparing students for it. Keeping focused on needs of community--college’s role in it.

133. Financial support for the college. How to select a new president. Present one will be eligible to retire. Election of new trustees.

134. Physical plant growth and new tech programs.

135. Meeting educational needs for whatever key industries are alive in this area at that time (unknown now).

136. Creating education opportunities for future skill job markets.
137. Larger enrollment (more students). More money for operation of college and building additional classrooms, etc., housing for students, more campus parking, increase number of programs of study, etc.

138. Enrollment. It is growing every day since students recognize the bargain they are getting in the CC.

139. Biotechnology. How to continue effective education for our students.

140. Meeting the challenges of training a work force for new industries with limited resources.

141. Economic development and work force issues. Technological advances.

142. Population and demographic shifts. Political tug of war, which affects funding.

143. Working with new business to gather information to provide courses for students. Job changing creates a need for preparation in their education.

144. Keep up with the trends in education and value the importance of technology as related to instructional delivery.

145. (1) Improving salaries must be addressed if we are to recruit and retain topnotch faculty and staff. (2) Adjusting to meet needs of our state's changing workplace.

146. Needs of our community.

147. 1) Space. 2) Tech. equipment for teaching. 3) Industry & business support & coop.

148. Improving the use of technology.

149. Funding and budgets.

150. Long-range educ. plan. Assessment of needs in community 5 to 10 ys.

151. Technology enhancements. Funding for long-term growth.


153. 1. Industrial training. 2. Increase in student population vs. building needs vs. financing. 3. State/Local Financial support.

154. Growth, diversity.
155. Need to know what industries in area need from our college to train their new employees. Also need to inform all students what a BARGAIN we are for 2 yrs.

156. Many of the same one's we have now--facilities, enrollment, budget.

157. Funding ($$!) New innovative programs.


159. Security. Funding.

160. How to operate with less state/federal funds.

161. Networking with local boards & governments.

162. Did this Board’s long-range projections (5 year) hit its mark & if not where did we come up short?

163. Funding for new buildings.


165. Trends in distance education. 2. State funding sources.

166. Our concerns will remain the same in 5 years as they are now. That is to take our clients as far as they can go in the learning process using the very best academic surroundings and facilities. At the same time we will provide a competent product for the business, professional and health practitioners within the area we serve.

167. Dealing with increasing numbers of students and less money.


170. Additional state and local funding to accommodate the numbers and needs of students as both are continually increasing.

171. Technology. Distance Learning.

172. Continued lack of state funding for our school. Some board members serve more than 2 terms.
173. Updating curriculum & equipment in light of severe budget cuts. Recruiting qualified teachers & being able to keep them on staff.

174. Student retraining. Coordination with economic growth. Advancing technology. Expanding student opportunities online & through non-traditional classrooms.

175. Appointments of Board members who have the best interests of college not personal agendas.

176. Growth & funds.

177. How to cope with enrollment growth due to expanded number of college transfer students attending our college.

178. Classes not taught in classroom.

179. The same as now. (1) Keeping our course offerings on the cutting edge of fulfilling the skill needs of business and industry in our service area. (2) Generating enough funds to be able to offer these courses. (3) Communicating what we have to offer to the general public in our service area.

180. Lack of resources given the increasing number of students seeking our services.

181. 1. Helping people to aspire to the Biotech skills needed to be a productive person. 2. Continue to provide opportunities for people to develop new skills.

182. Keeping the technology current with the curriculum.

183. Making education available so that it can be afforded by the community, particularly the economic disadvantage.

184. Greater opportunities for students to learn skills and develop personally.

185. Remaining a Tech school.

186. To have adequate finances to meet the increased enrollment.

187. State Budgeting & financial resources. High tech & high tech training.

188. Funding. Facilities--enough space.

189. Maintaining technical training for students.

190. The needs of a fast growing and changing population. Must find ways to serve a new world!
191. Funding from state and impact from the changing job market.

192. Continued lack of state funding and still meeting the needs of our area.

193. Funding. Public resources will continue to be an issue. Allocation of funds from state for large institutions. Continued growth in programs for work force training.

194. Financial status. (b) Adequate facilities for an increasing enrollment.

195. Student needs for re-training for a different job atmosphere.

196. 1. Sufficient infrastructure to provide/maintain/improve present level of service.  
   2. Accommodate more 2 yr. college transfer students as cost of 4 yr. higher education increases.


198. Continued aggressive approach to career goals of community.

199. Finance/funding.

200. Funding and meeting the needs of an area that continues to feel the effect of job lay offs and low level of adult education. (There are now. Future would relate to meeting the needs of new employees who may be here 5 yrs. From now.)

201. Remaining effective in meeting the educational & training needs of the community population; i.e., diversity in curriculum. Feeling the “pulse” of the people.

202. Financial resources.

203. Technology advancement, scholarships, and work force programs.


205. Staying abreast of the changes in our society so that we become more computer dependent knowledgeable.