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The problem of this study was to describe inservice education programs for members of local boards of trustees and to assess the knowledge and attitude toward inservice of participating and non-participating board members.

The major purposes of this study were to describe training programs carried on in selected school districts, and to assess and compare the knowledge and attitudes toward inservice education of board members who do and do not participate in those training programs.

The project involved the identification of skill areas necessary for board members, the development of instruments to measure knowledge and attitudes toward inservice, the selection of boards of trustees from six school districts for an experimental and a control group, the description of inservice education programs in operation in districts comprising the experimental group, and the assessment of knowledge and attitudes of members of the experimental and control groups.
Some of the major findings from this study were the following.

1. The inservice education programs described in this study were not designed to increase knowledge in any of the skill areas identified as necessary for board members. Their primary objective was goal-setting.

2. No significant difference was found between scores of participants in formal programs of inservice education and non-participants on the knowledge assessment instrument.

3. Participants in inservice education programs had significantly higher scores on the attitude assessment than did non-participants.

Findings resulting from the study led to the conclusion that inservice education programs for board members which are currently in operation and described in the study have no significant effect on the knowledge of board members in skill areas identified. Participation in the inservice programs described in this study was found to make a significant difference in board members' attitudes toward inservice.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

States began to take a more active role in providing education for American children toward the end of the nineteenth century when private efforts at the local level were shown to be inadequate. A direct result of this increased state activity, according to Philadelphia's Leadership Training Institute, was the creation of local governing boards in an attempt to ensure that a comprehensive system of local schools would be properly controlled and accountable to the local public (11). In most cases these boards were elected, although some were appointed by locally elected officials. In a study of American education in the 1920s, Counts concluded that the ordinary individual suffers from such limitations in knowledge of education that he is "inadequately equipped to participate in the shaping of educational policy" (9, p. 618). However, election or appointment seemed to be an effective way to allow the local citizenry a voice in the education of their children, and most state legislatures have continued to leave general school management, including curricular matters, to state and local boards of education.
Local control has many advantages, one of them being that board members come from varying backgrounds and assorted experiences. Goble of the Pennsylvania Association of School Boards states that because board members are laypersons, they assume their positions on the board with public education orientation developed largely from their own educational experiences (15). It is often difficult for them to understand what constitutes effective "boardmanship" and the extent of their authority. Yet, board members are decision makers who establish the relationship between the schools and the community. Their actions as well as their decisions determine the attitude of the community toward its schools, the morale of the employees of the district and the future direction in which the district will move. Rather than merely conducting meaningless formalities they are making decisions, according to Svenson and Bryson (42).

Boards of education have the responsibility of setting policy, while the administration has the responsibility of seeing that the policies are effectively carried out. Boards of education are responsible for the fiscal operations of the district: levying taxes, approving budgets, and authorizing expenditures. Boards of trustees act upon administrative recommendations concerning the employment of personnel, the execution of programs, and the maintenance and use of physical facilities. They are perceived to be
experts on issues of concern to both the local community and the news media. They are called upon to make decisions in a variety of areas and derive this authority from state and federal law. With this authority, however, come certain restraints with which board members must be familiar.

According to the National School Boards Association, America is today entrusting the business of running its public schools to approximately 95,000 men and women from all ethnic and economic groups who serve on 16,000 school boards (37). The view held by the public of these 95,000 individuals conflicts sharply. For example, former Connecticut school board member and public relations consultant Brodinsky reports that some people say that boards of education are politically motivated, that their decisions are often actually harmful to children, and that they are "meddlers in a profession too complex even for the expert" (6, p. 8). The opposite viewpoint is that through the time given (generally without pay) by these individuals, the parent and taxpayer rightfully retain control over education so that local community values and beliefs can be inculcated through the schooling process.

Over the last decade, citizens have found their voices to be heard most clearly at the local level on the topics of control of government and taxation (15). Local governments and school districts, particularly in their taxing capacity,
have found themselves under close scrutiny, and the elected officials who serve those entities have found it necessary to be well-informed on a variety of subjects. Issues raised in election campaigns, topics discussed in public forums, and decisions which must be made by the elected officials—all require a great deal of study.

Increased interest and participation in the processes of government are desired (47). At the same time, the elected official may find that he is put in a position of responding to questions and making decisions on issues for which he is ill-prepared.

State associations of school boards and the National School Boards Association sponsor conferences and workshops which include sessions covering many areas about which board members are expected to be knowledgeable. These programs are planned according to the expressed needs of board members and school administrators and present a good deal of information in a short period of time. They are not designed, however, to present a structured inservice session on a particular topic to a group of board members from one specific district. Their purpose is to expose the board members to as many topics and issues as possible in large-group presentations (37).

The importance of inservice education at the local level for members of boards of trustees receives repeated emphasis
throughout the literature (2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31, 34, 45, 47). It is also emphasized that the inservice education sessions should be provided for all board members, and not be restricted to newly elected members (4, 11, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 32, 35, 43, 46).

Locally designed programs for school board members allow for individualization and informality while providing knowledge and understanding on topics of importance. Local inservice programs can speak to current issues in a timely manner or provide training to prepare for future conflict and decision making.

The project completed for this study described local inservice education programs in three Texas public school districts. It assessed the knowledge and attitude toward inservice education of both participating board members in these three districts and board members in three selected Texas public school districts with no formal local inservice education programs. While this study was not able to control the content of the inservice programs, it makes descriptive comments about the training programs and how the test scores of board members related to the content of the programs. Although this study was limited to public school board members, it may be adapted to other local entities which have elected boards.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to describe inservice education programs for members of local boards of trustees and to assess the knowledge and attitude toward inservice of participating and non-participating board members.

Purposes of This Study

The purposes of this study were the following:

1. To describe training programs carried on in selected Texas public school districts and their relationship to test scores of respective board members;

2. To assess the knowledge gained and attitude toward inservice education of board members participating in those training programs (experimental group) and of board members who do not participate in formal local inservice education programs (control group);

3. To compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group members among themselves;

4. To compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group with that of the control group; and

5. To provide information to the public and other appropriate groups, organizations or agencies concerning the results of the study.

Research Questions

To carry out the purposes of the study, the following questions were addressed.
1. What common elements are present in formal inservice education programs for members of the boards of trustees of selected Texas public school districts?

2. Does participation in a formal program of inservice education affect the knowledge of members of the boards of trustees of local school districts?

3. Does participation in a formal program of inservice education affect the attitude toward inservice education of trustees of local school districts?

4. Does the knowledge of participating board members vary according to the components of the inservice education programs?

Background for the Study

Modern America has given its school boards a difficult set of challenges. The board must design a quality educational program to prepare children for an ever-changing world. It must oversee what is often the biggest employer in the community with the largest budget in the community. It is proper for the community to expect its elected board members to be leaders and to make well-informed decisions. It is also proper for the members of the board to expect public support for their efforts to improve themselves (30).

Members of local boards of education for public schools are given responsibility for the management of the school plant and district fiscal resources, the hiring of personnel,
the setting of policy and the approval of curricular programs. However, Foster of the Recruitment Training Institute of Philadelphia states that average citizens who are elected to serve on school boards are "ill-prepared to cope with their dual role: as representatives of the people and as directors of the bureaucracy" (11, p. 9).

Decisions of board members touch the lives of everyone in the community--citizens, staff members and children. In order to understand the issues and the problems they will face, to keep abreast of the rapid changes which affect every area of modern life, and to be able to act decisively and effectively, board members need to have an on-going orientation and professional development program. Neubauer, an education coordinator with Research for Better Schools in Philadelphia, believes that "as important as orientation is for new board members, special interest programs relating to new or potential district problems are important for all board members" (26, p. 24).

Numerous studies, as described below, have shown that few, if any, new board members receive any formal orientation. Although state and national associations of school boards conduct annual orientation programs, studies have shown that attendance by board members is minimal. Other studies, also described below, have found that rarely is there a planned program of inservice education on any topic at the local level for board members, whatever their experience.
A 1970 study by Francois found that the "average board-man's orientation and training consist of little more than being given reading materials, having a private conference with the superintendent, and touring a few schools" (12, pp. 9-10). In 1972, Snyder found strong support for a locally-developed training program for new board members among southern California school board members and superintendents (45).

While developing a study to identify critical issues for orientation programs in 1976, Allman determined that not only was orientation of new school board members inadequate and often non-existent, but also that literature available on the subject was insufficient (3). Fifty percent of new school board members in the St. Louis metropolitan area who responded to a survey conducted by Prywitch in 1975 stated that they received no orientation upon taking office, and that any learning which did take place occurred after significant decisions had been made by the board (31).

Many school districts rely on state or national association workshop sessions for orientation and training of board members, both new and experienced. The National School Boards Association and the state school board associations conduct periodic sessions for board members. However, Jones, assistant editor of the American School Board Journal, concluded that "most (90 percent in some states) of the newly elected school board members don't participate" 21, p. 22).
According to the Texas Association of School Boards, Texas statistics are very similar to those quoted above—a majority of those elected do not attend the workshop sessions (17). They cite the following factors as contributing to the low attendance: the meetings are held very close to the time of the elections—newly elected board members are perhaps still too new, small districts have no budget for school board travel, many superintendents and school board members do not have the commitment to training, and the distance between the local district and Austin, where many of the meetings are held, may be hundreds of miles.

Jones also found that many states were in the process of developing more formalized, and possibly mandated, programs. Oklahoma and Texas are presently the only states requiring inservice education for board members. The Oklahoma mandate is only for newly-elected members (35). The Texas requirement was enacted in July 1984 with passage of House Bill 72, which amended the Texas Education Code to direct the State Board of Education to appoint an advisory committee to develop standards based on the duties of school board members. Annually, board members are to participate in training activities consistent with the standards (44). The program is currently in the developmental stage. While board members feel a definite need for better inservice programs, both Calloway in his 1974 study and Doyle in his 1976 study
concluded that board members and superintendents would oppose an orientation program that was mandated by state law (8, 10).

Studies conducted to determine the extent of orientation or inservice for new or experienced board members have generally also included a discussion of the topics respondents feel should be part of a program of inservice education for board members. Jinks (20), Doyle (10), Neubauer (26), and Snyder (45) found a need for increased emphasis on finances, policy, and legal responsibilities. Another problem area mentioned frequently by survey respondents in studies by Andrews (5), Brodinsky (6) and Snyder (45) was public relations.

Neubauer found that there were some items which could be appropriately handled at the state and national levels, such as federal funding, federal and state court decisions affecting education, and how to deal with pressure groups. She also found, however, that board members need to see how state and national items relate to local ones and need specific local information, such as how to read line items on their budgets and the definition of "pupil personnel services" (26).

The average national tenure of school board members is presently 2.8 years, according to the National School Board Association (37). This figure must take into account the
fact that the term of the board members varies from state to state. The most common terms, however, are two year and three year.

According to a study of school board members in Texas, conducted by the Texas Association of School Boards in 1982, the average length of service of school board members is 4.5 years (17). Members of school boards in Texas are elected for three-year terms. The Texas Association of School Boards reported that in April of 1974, 1,400 board members were elected for the first time, for a turnover rate of 19 percent, with the percentage of new board members elected increasing each year (17).

If lay control of education is to be effective and productive, board member orientation and continuing education is a necessity. According to Steere, a member of the Joplin, Missouri school board and a professor of education at Missouri Southern State College, the sincerity and honorable intentions of school board members will not make their decisions as rational or effective as those made by members who have become knowledgeable about issues, procedures and alternative solutions to problems which may develop (40). An added benefit to both the board member and the community, according to Jones, is that orientation programs would allow new board members to become functional more quickly, therefore making the total board more effective (21).
A number of authors have developed and recommended inservice education programs, as described below, which are designed to be administered at the local level. There are no reported studies, however, showing the knowledge and understanding (aptitude), or attitude toward inservice education of the participants.

Steere has recommended a preservice program for board candidates which would be conducted soon after candidate filing ended, and would include the subjects of school finance, school plant, school law, school district policy, and relations with special interest groups (teacher organizations, parent organizations, students and the news media). Names of candidates who participated in the program would be marked with an asterisk on the election ballot (41). There is no reported school district where this program is in use.

Herman, superintendent of schools in West Bloomfield, Michigan, feels his program of orientation and training is one which could be utilized by other superintendents. He has not, however, conducted any experimental studies to determine the effectiveness of his program. He begins orientation with board candidates prior to the election, and schedules tours, interviews, and question and answer sessions with newly-elected board members immediately after they are seated on the board (18).

Another training program which begins prior to election is held in Keansburg, New Jersey. As with Herman's, this
program has no assessment component. All prospective board members in the county attend a free seminar at the community college, sponsored by the county board of education. An all-day orientation seminar is held following the election, for both new and experienced board members, which includes both board-related topics (the agenda, role of the secretary, litigation) and school curriculum and faculty matters (position descriptions, case studies, budgets). The evening is devoted to recreation, with families joining the board and staff members. Throughout the year, the Keansburg board meets every week, with only one week per month devoted to regular business. The other three are used for discussions of curriculum, moderated by administrators, workshop meetings in preparation for regular meetings, and an "administrator round-up" where everyone has the opportunity to advance topics for informal discussion (2).

In a paper prepared for the Office of Occupational and Adult Education, Department of Education, by the Leadership Training Institute, an independent management training facility in Philadelphia, a curriculum was outlined which detailed necessary skills, possible resources and suggested training activities in each of two categories: board member responsibilities as representatives of the public and the school community, and as bureaucratic decision-makers. Their program also includes two three-month training
programs for both new and experienced board members (11). There are no reported studies showing that the program has been utilized or assessed by any school districts.

Another program with no evidence of either use or effectiveness was developed by Jones. The conference-style program is scheduled in a weekend retreat setting utilizing large part participation on a mock board of education. The conference includes audiovisuals, simulations, gaming devices and case studies (21).

Other suggested orientation and inservice programs have been published, but not necessarily implemented or assessed (4, 16, 24, 27, 28, 29, 33, 39). It seems clear from the literature that programs which have been implemented focus only on training and are not assessed to determine their effectiveness. One study, reported by Brown, which involved a United Way affiliated agency and not a school district, did show that an experimental training program was effective in changing behavior in all areas except financial understanding (7).

The only evidence of assessment in the literature is a board testing program conducted by Bippus, superintendent of schools in Salmon, Idaho. There is no training involved, however. Bippus tests his board of education members each October on legal issues, board procedures, local school district policies, and other information board members
"ought to know." The test does not measure competencies and members often regress from year to year because they are not using what they know. Although this is merely informal assessment, and while he has no training program in place, Bippus feels the experiences of his board members show the importance of teaching board members to find answers and to provide training on a subject immediately prior to the time when it will be used (1).

As discussed previously, the following topics have been cited as items about which school board members should be knowledgeable: school finance (including federal funding), policy, legal responsibilities (including federal and state court decisions affecting education), public relations (including relations with special interest groups), and the relationship of state and national issues to local ones.

In Texas, members of boards of trustees of local school districts are elected in April. Immediately following election, board members are faced with decisions which require knowledge of school law and school district policy. Additionally, budget development will have likely already begun, with decisions on the scope of programs, salary schedules, and rate of taxation to be decided by August. Results of the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills must be made public in June. Both of these events draw media attention with which board members must deal. For a program
to educate board members adequately in the skills needed for their tasks, it should address the previously stated topics and the events which board members face immediately upon election. To determine the effectiveness of such a program, an assessment instrument should be constructed to measure knowledge in those areas.

**Significance of This Study**

This study involved the description of formal inservice education programs currently in operation at the local level for members of boards of trustees of selected Texas districts. Members of those boards and members of a like number of school boards whose districts had no formal inservice education program at the local level were assessed in two areas: knowledge and attitude toward inservice. Responses among and between the two groups of board members were compared for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of the relative characteristics of the groups being compared. This study did not control the local inservice education programs; therefore, there were no inferences made between participation in inservice education and the results obtained on the knowledge and attitude assessment instruments. It was assumed, however, that a significant relationship between the two existed. This study described the characteristics of the training programs, and described and compared the results of participants and non-participants on the assessment instruments.
While other reported studies have been limited to the training of board members and lack the characteristic of assessment of knowledge and attitude toward inservice education, this study has the assessment component. There were also no reported studies describing inservice education programs for members of local boards of trustees in Texas. Data from this study should fill that current void and should also give clear direction to later experimental studies that could produce clear-cut results. The study should also have implications in the development and evaluation of programs designed for school board members, especially in response to the legislative mandate of House Bill 72.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used.

Inservice programs.--A structured session dealing with specific subject matter, offered at a time not normally scheduled for business.

Local board of trustees.--Persons elected to serve as the governing body of a largely independent educational organization—a public school district—according to the laws of the state in which they are elected.

National School Boards Association.--A voluntary, non-profit, national organization established to serve local school districts in the United States. The NSBA is a
service organization supported through member fees and
governed by its members. Approximately 10 percent of the
nation's school boards are direct affiliates of the NSBA
(37).

Texas Association of School Boards (TASB).—A voluntary,
non-profit, state organization established to serve local
school districts in Texas. The TASB is a service organiza-
tion supported through member fees and governed by its
members. About 99 percent of the school boards in Texas are
members of the TASB (17).

Limitations

There were three limitations inherent in this study.
1. Knowledge and skills gained or learning which occurs
outside of, but concurrent with, the formalized inservice
education program could affect the aptitude test results of
both the experimental and control groups.

2. Members of both the experimental and control groups
had the opportunity to attend seminars, workshops, and train-
ing sessions conducted by the NASB and the TASB. Whether or
not they attended, and whatever knowledge may have been
gained by their attendance, could not be controlled and may
have affected the test results of members of both groups.

3. Because of the diversity of tasks engaged in by
members of local boards of trustees, the knowledge areas
which were tested were not all-inclusive on any subject.
The assessment instrument was designed to measure generalized knowledge in a number of representative areas where decision-making is necessary by board members.

Basic Assumption

It was assumed that local boards of trustees which had participated in formal inservice education programs (experimental) would have received training in many of the skill areas to be assessed on the instrument measuring knowledge.

Development of Instruments Used

Skills needed by school board members were identified from the literature, from research studies which had been conducted, from interviews with twelve professionals in education and related fields (detailed in Chapter III), and from the Texas Association of School Boards. A panel consisting of three school superintendents and four currently-serving school board members, also detailed in Chapter III, confirmed the list of skills which was developed.

From the final list of skills, a test to measure concepts and knowledge related to the skills was developed by persons determined to have expertise in that area (example: professor of school law for legal questions, newspaper reporter for press relations). The resulting test was used as the assessment instrument for knowledge. The test was submitted to a panel made up of school administrators, an
attorney, a university professor, school board members, and a journalist (panel members detailed in Chapter III). The panel determined the clarity and acceptability of each question. If a question was determined not to be clear or acceptable by a majority of panel members, it was removed from the test.

To obtain a scale to be used to measure the individual board member's attitude toward inservice education, research literature was reviewed, including *Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes* by Shaw and Wright. The measurement scale which was developed was administered to members of two school boards. Their comments and suggestions as to the acceptability of the measurement scale were incorporated into the final instrument.

Selection of the Sample

The Texas Association of School Boards identified six school districts which had formal programs of inservice education for board members. Their programs varied in intensity and coverage. From these six school boards, three were randomly selected to constitute the experimental group. One was selected which had a program which had been in operation for a number of years, one which had a program which had been in use for less than four years, and one which had just begun local training (two years or less). All three programs were conducted during weekend retreats,
with the formats differing somewhat. Use of outside consultants was limited. Administrators were included in all programs. Follow-up consisted of a second group meeting to discuss and clarify what had been decided during the retreat. Activities which came about as a result of the inservice education programs included workshops and information sessions evenings or weekends, and presentations during school board meetings. A table comparing the inservice programs in operation in districts selected to comprise the experimental group can be found in Chapter III.

From the school boards remaining in the state (with no formal inservice education program for board members), districts were identified which were found to be similar to those selected for the experimental group according to the characteristics of student enrollment, assessed valuation, and local value per student. Using a table of random numbers, three school boards were selected from this list to constitute the control group. A table summarizing the characteristic information of the experimental and control groups may be found in Chapter III.

Procedures for the Collection of Data

The project was discussed with the superintendent and school board president of each of the six identified districts. Permission to include the district in the program was secured from the superintendent and the school board president.
As soon as the school boards had been identified and had consented to participate, the researcher met with the full board of each selected district, outlined the program, and administered the knowledge and attitude measurements. The researcher met with the members of the experimental group for an extended period of time to gather information about the district's formal program of inservice education. Details about the development of the program, including what prompted the district to institute a local program of inservice, the scope of the program, the material covered in the program and the reactions of board members to the program were assembled. Written materials about the program and items which were used as resource materials in the program were collected.

Research Design

This study was designed to describe local inservice education programs in place for members of local boards of trustees and to assess the knowledge and attitude toward inservice education of board members who did and did not participate in formal inservice education programs. Comparisons were made between results on the two measurement instruments both among the members of the experimental group and between the experimental and control groups. This was accomplished by the following means: (1) differences among
and between groups in scores on the knowledge assessment instrument, and (2) differences among and between groups in responses to the scale measuring attitude toward inservice education.

This study was not a true research experiment due to the fact that the "treatment," which was the participation in the inservice education program, was not controlled. The study did, however, evaluate the data collected by the knowledge and attitude measurement instrument in a quasi-experimental manner. The research design for this study was Stanley and Campbell's Pre-Experimental Design Number 3—the Static Group Comparison (38). This design measured two intact, non-equated groups after one group had received treatment. The design had two possible sources of internal invalidity: group equivalency and participant mortality. To more completely control internal variables which were related to selection, the group selection process for this study utilized preliminary matching of school districts by their similarities in four areas. Any threat which occurred from mortality of the subjects should have affected both groups equally. It should also be remembered that the data gathered from the measurement instruments were used to obtain a better understanding of the relative characteristics of the groups being compared and concluded that relationships did or did not exist between participation in inservice education
programs and the knowledge and attitude of participants and non-participants.

**Procedures for Analysis of Data**

Following administration of the assessment instruments, the data were analyzed by doing a t-test for independent groups. This was to determine if there was a significant difference between scores on the aptitude and attitude measurement instruments. The t-test is commonly used in causal-comparative studies and is used when the sample size is small. Additionally, even if the assumptions underlying the t-test were violated, it would still provide an estimate of the level of differences between sample means.

**Reporting the Data**

Descriptions of the local inservice education programs are detailed in narrative summary. Data based on computations which were made from the analysis of the assessment instruments are presented in narrative summary and in tables for ease of reporting and interpretation.
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CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The role of a school board member in a local community has changed drastically over the last 100 years as the roles and responsibilities of the local school have changed. Rosenberg observes,

Given the present tone of educational change in fiscal support and administrative process resulting from definition of "thorough and efficient" education, given the ever increasing need to involve the total membership of the community in the process of education, given the economic impact of school operations in a community, given expansion of the role of labor negotiations, and given the necessity for improved management techniques and accountability, the role of the individual board of education member is becoming more demanding and of increasing importance (21, p. 9).

As education has become more complex, as demands for accountability have increased, and as financial sources have been created, dissolved, restricted or otherwise changed, local school board members have found themselves in need of both primary and continuing education. According to Anderson (4, p. 228), persons elected or appointed to school board positions are leaders, but "few have had training relevant to the complex, demanding leadership roles they occupy on a school board."

Individuals serving as school board members have recognized their inabilities to be knowledgeable in every area.
in which decisions must be made. School board members also realize that an understanding of methodologies such as decision-making, policy development, goal-setting, and evaluation is necessary for effective boardmanship.

Comprehensive surveys conducted in recent years have concluded that insufficient literature is available on the specifics of training school board members (3, 5, 11). Some of the studies of school board members have attempted to provide rationale for programs, to identify areas to be addressed for education of board members, to identify current educational programs available to board members, and to develop pre-election, orientation, and continuing education programs for board members.

There have been no reported studies to assess the effectiveness of any education programs for board members on their knowledge, performance, or their attitude toward the programs. However, Bippus (1) has routinely tested his own board of education each year on a variety of topics and has found that some of the members forget the answers to questions they once answered correctly because they did not use what they know. His conclusion is to teach board members to find answers as the need arises.

While a study by Brown (10) did not relate to education, it is related to the topic of the education of board members. Brown looked at training as a means of changing the functioning behavior of a board of directors of a voluntary agency.
Effectiveness was viewed within the context of the functions of policy-making, program review, community liaison, financial provisions, and board management practices. The criteria for effectiveness were problem-solving, survival, structure, and rational planning in organizational theory. Brown concluded that training contributed to increased effectiveness in all areas except financial provisions. Secondary findings showed a preference for ad hoc situations in training and increased effectiveness as a functioning unit.

Need for Programs

Individuals who come to serve as members of local boards of trustees often have little or no knowledge of that which they are to do. If they are elected, they often have run on one specific issue of interest and have no knowledge or real interest in other issues which will need to be handled by the board as a collective body. If they are appointed, they are often serving in a political capacity and may find their decisions based on aggressive demands of the person or persons who appointed them to the position. Research has shown that board members see themselves as having less authority than the public believes them to have and that board members do not agree on what should be expected of them (74, p. 21).

Following a study of American education Chapman and Counts (12), writing in 1924, stated that education had
become such an intricate enterprise that persons should be well trained for the task of governance. Ten years later, Counts (14) noted that members of boards were generally from the business community and education had come to be regarded by many "as a form of business enterprise." This attitude generated the expectations that forms of management and decision-making common in commerce and industry should be transferred to the management of public schools.

As individuals representing all segments of the local population began to be appointed or elected to local school boards, the assumption that precepts of the business community should be applied to the school setting was no longer accepted without question. In many communities, members of the school board were not only not businessmen, but they resisted the notion that schools should be run as businesses. According to Counts (13), writing in the 1950s, they saw the "community" as controlling the process of education through its activities and institutions. Counts then reiterated his contention that individuals with authority to make decisions and shape policy must have special training.

According to some observers, funds for training school board members are often the first to be cut when budgets must be trimmed (7, 19, 46, 71). In business and industry, participation in a seminar, workshop, or conference is highly publicized in the trade journals, house organs, and in the
local newspaper. Noggle (46) asks if perhaps as educators we are failing to operate from the position that investments in human development today will result in greater gains tomorrow.

To accomplish their tasks, school board members need skills and knowledge, and learning-by-doing is a dangerous way for members to approach the important tasks of a school board. Weiner believes that each school board should develop its own program of continuing education for new and experienced board members and states,

> It has been said that education is too important to be left to the educators. By the same token, it is too important to be trusted to the totally unskilled hands of a school board that does not participate in an integrated program of continuing education designed specifically for school board members (71, p. 1).

Gaining acceptance of time and money spent by board members in training is accomplished more easily with a formal policy covering board training, and openness about board members' needs for training. Iger (30) believes that school board members have a moral and legal obligation, and a professional responsibility to be well-informed. He suggests that the board's commitment to education of board members be well-known, and that board members inform the public about their participation in training sessions, the benefits of the sessions, and any plans to implement changes which were generated during or from the sessions.
Snyder (60) emphasizes the need for training because of the high turnover rate in school board membership. He cites the study of Hurwitz which showed that over half of the New Jersey school board members were serving their first term of office. The National School Boards Association (58) cites an average national tenure of 2.8 years. The Texas Association of School Boards (26) reports that the average school board member in Texas serves 4.5 years. In April, 1984, 1,400 of the approximately 7,700 school board members in Texas were elected for the first time. With the potential turnover of school board members in this country being at least 33 percent each year, there is an apparent need for continuous education for both new and continuing school board members. It is also an advantage to the local community to attract and retain well-informed board members. Gobel (24, p. 6) believes that "a wide range of local, state and national orientation programs and continuous inservice training are imperative."

The Pennsylvania School Boards Association (23) devotes a great deal of its resources to school board training due to the increasing turnover rate of board members, and has developed mini-courses for local training as well as its programs for statewide application. Jinks (31) concluded that board inservice should be provided on a continuous basis due to the relatively short tenure of board members, and recommended greater financial support for board training.
While some of the decisions made by board members could be made by anyone (accepting the low bid on an item, approving a donation to a school by a Parent-Teacher Association), the majority of decisions made by board members are what Fox (19) calls "people decisions," decisions which deliver the most appropriate use of resources and people to help children learn.

According to Neal (42), board members are therefore the most important persons to receive training. The superintendent is the next most important person to receive inservice. In the same vein, the Pennsylvania School Boards Association states that "structured, well-planned, competent inservice education is a crucial element in fostering positive board-superintendent dialogue" (52, p. 14). Members of the Texas Legislature would apparently agree. House Bill 72, passed in special session during the summer of 1984, amended the Texas Education Code to require training of school board members.

Sec. 23.33. Member Training and Orientation. (a) The State Board of Education shall appoint an advisory committee to develop statewide standards on the duties of a school board member. The committee shall consist of at least 15 persons knowledgeable in the management of the public schools of the state, and no less than five members of the committee shall consist of individuals currently serving as locally elected school board members.

(b) Copies of the standards shall be sent to the president of each local school board on an annual basis, and local board members shall participate in training activities consistent with the statewide standards.

(c) The State Board of Education may provide for a course to be offered by the regional education service centers and may approve private organizations to offer
courses following the board's review of an outline of the proposed courses to determine its conformity with the statewide standards. Registration for a course offered through service centers must be open to any interested person, including current and prospective board members, and the state board may prescribe a registration fee designed to offset the costs of providing that course.

(d) Each accredited course must issue a certificate of completion to each person successfully completing the course (66, p. 87).

Other sections of House Bill 72 set requirements for training of administrators in management practices, as a complement to board training (66, pp. 65, 66).

It appears that few local school districts have educational programs for board members. While state and national school board associations offer a number of educational programs for school board member development, they can only serve their purpose if board members recognize how important their own development is to the community's educational commitment. In addition, these state and national programs are designed to focus on the needs of the "larger group," and to be delivered in a short period of time.

A study by Neubauer (43) indicated that local school districts too often delegate provision of inservice to the state and national associations. However, statistics from both the National School Boards Association (58) and the Texas Association of School Boards (26) show that while attendance in orientation programs, workshops, and seminars is significant, it is but a small percentage of the total number of school
board members who belong to the organizations. Jones (32) states that the highly praised and widely imitated orientation program in New Jersey, conducted since the mid-1960s, attracts less than 40 percent of the new board members in the state. By not keeping up with the rapidly-changing issues in school governance, board members may not only lose effectiveness, but the next election.

Gallo (22) investigated the use of seventy-eight selected techniques for increasing the effectiveness of first-term school board members in New York State. He considered the roles of the board, the staff, and related agencies. School board presidents in 680 districts indicated the use, non-use, and value of the techniques. Gallo found that techniques in use by related agencies, including professional associations, were indicated to be most used and of most value. He also found, however, that less than half of the techniques were in use at all and recommended a study to determine why the techniques were not in use at the state, regional or local level.

The National School Boards Association has had participants list the following as benefits gained from board development activities: "learning of specific ways to cut costs, improve programs, solve problems; exposure to new ideas, information and politics; psychological support; and a perspective of your school system's concerns compared to others" (7, p. 1).
School board members and school superintendents have participated in a number of studies designed to verify the need for pre-election, orientation, and continuing education programs for board members. Menacker and Pascarella (38) tested 299 inner-city and suburban Chicago educators and board members on their knowledge of major Supreme Court decisions affecting education. With the exception of Brown v. Board of Education (1954), all were decided between 1968 and 1978. The group averaged 64.4 percent correct responses on the ten-item test.

Francois (20) surveyed board presidents and superintendents in forty-five school districts nationwide. The districts were scientifically selected on the basis of pupil enrollment, size and geographic location. Most of the respondents (69 percent) indicated that their districts had a minimum program of orientation, generally consisting of a private meeting with the superintendent, a tour of the campuses and reading materials. Thirty percent indicated a desire to have received a better orientation and felt they received only limited training after they were on the job.

In a study by Doyle (15) over 50 percent of the board members surveyed in Pennsylvania and West Virginia reported no orientation program for new board members in their districts. Respondents did indicate a need for both an orientation program and other training to be held during a board member's first two years in office.
Sales (56) surveyed board members in forty-nine districts in four counties in the Philadelphia area and found that very few districts provided their new board members with any type of locally prepared orientation program or handbook. Board members and superintendents agreed that an orientation was "very important" and that the need is "continuous." In this study, orientation was seen as taking from six to eighteen months to complete.

Prywitch (51) surveyed 325 school board members in the metropolitan St. Louis area to determine what was being done to provide training at the local level for board members. While 72 percent of the respondents indicated that an orientation program for new members was very important, 50 percent reported a greeting by the superintendent to be their only orientation. Seventy percent believed, however, that after one year they had sufficient knowledge to make significant contributions to the district.

Snyder (60) interviewed thirty new school board members, their board presidents and superintendents in thirty California school districts. Ninety-five percent of the board members and 80 percent of the superintendents agreed that new members would be interested in a training program if it were available. Sixty-seven percent of the board members and 57 percent of the superintendents felt a program should be mandatory. Those interviewed agreed that continuous inservice, including
experienced board members, was desired. In his conclusion, Snyder states that "an organized and formal training program appears to be the most viable alternative to ensure more adequate performance" (60, p. 4).

In a study of members conducted by the Texas Association of School Boards (26) to determine legislative priorities, "require school board members to receive training after they are elected to local boards" received a 2.4 rating, using the following rating scale: 1 = highest priority, must be included in 1985 Texas Association of School Boards Legislative Program; 2 = important, should be included; 3 = fairly important, may or may not need to be included; 4 = no need to include this item; and 5 = I disagree with this item.

When training of school board members was recommended by the Texas Governor's Select Committee on Public Education to the Texas legislature to be mandated by law (67), the Texas Association of School Boards adopted a position of support for the recommendation (68). The resulting legislation was included in House Bill 72, amending the Texas Education Code. Section 23.33 was cited earlier in this section.

In summary, while authors and survey respondents may not agree on the amount of time needed for orientation, how long it takes for a new school board member to become a "functioning" board member, or the specific focus of orientation programs, all agree that orientation programs
make school board members more effective faster than on-the-job training. All also appear to agree with Andrews (5) and Prywitch (51), who recommend that training begin as soon after election as possible. They also agree that due to the changing roles of both the school and the board member, continuous orientation or training is necessary for both new and experienced board members.

Topics of Study

Whenever school board members are questioned as to the areas in which they feel education is needed, the answers reflect both the general needs of school board members everywhere and specific local needs. Their answers indicate that board members are concerned about boardmanship and their different roles as board members. Their answers also often correspond with the areas educators mention in journal articles written for and about school board members.

While any training program developed will have similar elements to other training programs, Jones indicates that a specific training program that "may be ideal for one school district or even all school districts in one region or state may be of only limited usefulness to new board members from a different area" (32, p. 23). Board training should be organized in a comprehensive development plan, according to Wiles (74), assisting board members with skills dealing with organization, management concepts, and governmental relations.
Perhaps the focus of most journal articles on the subject of what school board members need to know is school law, especially as it relates to liability. Personal liability cases have increased dramatically since the 1960s. Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 provides for personal liability of board members and administrators if actions are taken or regulations are enforced which result in violations of statutory or constitutional rights of the individual.

Phay (49) believes that board members should be knowledgeable of the frequency of cases and the types of decisions handed down. Nolte (47), also writing about the personal liability of board members, states that board members should have knowledge of the constitutional rights of students as well as general knowledge of the law itself.

Francois (20) found in a survey of forty-five districts that the topics which should be stressed differed between board members and superintendents. Board members felt role delineation and the status of board members as individuals were the most important areas for orientation. Superintendents rated board policies and the "proper role as a board member" as most important. The surprise in his survey was that there was no mention made of specific problems such as collective bargaining, rights of students, or curriculum controversies.

Moore (40) found that participants in a seminar for new school board members, mostly black, in the South following
desegration asked for intensive sessions dedicated to one skill area (such as budgeting), and for take-home materials designed for follow-up and evaluation. Superintendents addressing a National Academy of School Executives seminar (29) indicated the most important topics for board training were dealing with pressure and understanding that board members represent the entire district from which they were elected.

O'Reilly (48) feels that there are two broad areas which should be addressed. The first is "business topics," which includes goals, board-superintendent relations, facilities, employee relations, school-community relations, and fiscal matters. The second is the relationship between board members. According to Gobel (24), more funds should be set aside for board training, and training should include educational issues and trends, self-evaluation, employee relations and negotiations, law, budget and fiscal matters, policy development, and curriculum items.

Following extensive surveys of board members throughout the nation and research into the literature, Kunder (34) listed areas which she found to be of major concern to board members: "community relations, curriculum, development of school policies, evaluation of schools and the board, personnel, school finance, school plant, status of board membership, and school law."
Jinks (31) surveyed 120 board members and 60 superintendents in Nebraska school districts. Specific items indicated by respondents which should be given particular emphasis in developing content for school board inservice were district financial position, legal responsibilities and constraints of board as a whole and individual board members, roles and duties of district personnel—particularly the superintendent, and the current negotiated agreement with personnel.

In a survey of 181 board members and superintendents in San Francisco, Neubauer (43, 44) found that board members felt most skilled in the areas of managing time, influencing boards, community relations, and the evaluation of the superintendent. They felt least skilled in collective bargaining, applying scientific management, assessing legislation and court rulings, and citing school policies. They felt experience on the local board prior to their being sworn in and handbooks to be of the least value to them. The National School Boards Association (28) found the same items designated of least value in a survey they conducted.

Neubauer (43) believes that a needs assessment is critical, because board members appear to want to improve that which they know best and avoid that which makes them uncomfortable. The National School Boards Association (28) discovered the same trend. Members indicated a desire to
develop skills in areas in which they rated themselves highly, such as time management, influencing other board members, and communications.

Doyle (15) questioned board members in Pennsylvania and West Virginia and found the following six areas to be most important in the development of an orientation program for board members: board policy, school law, board minutes from the previous year, legal responsibilities of a board member, the duties and responsibilities of the board officers, and a visit with the superintendent.

St. John (55) indicates that there is no best way to orient new board members or train old ones. By planning to meet local needs, however, "brass tacks" should be included in any orientation or inservice program for board members: board operation and responsibilities; needs of the individual board member; problems, pressures and frustrations of board members; legal and fiscal matters; relations with news media representatives; relations with community power structures and special interest groups; basic information about education; management skills and techniques; staff member relations; community relations; and needs and trends in society and their implications for educational services.

Allman (3) questioned two executive board members from each state school boards association, the executive secretaries of all states having state school board
associations, and superintendents from Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. The major findings showed that school board responsibilities and functions, policies of the district, and overview of educational programs were the three most important topics for school board training. The least important areas were tenure and federal participation in education.

Prywitch (51) found that board members receive the greatest amount of information in the area of business and finance and the least amount in curriculum and instruction. Sales (56), too, discovered that training programs need to place more emphasis on curriculum and instruction and less on business and finance. Board members surveyed also indicated a need for an orientation handbook and a library of materials of special interest to board members. The Pennsylvania School Boards Association (23) feels the inclusion of the principles and advantages of local control are essential additions to local board training programs.

Gallup made the following statement to an audience of board members at the 1974 convention of the National School Boards Association: "My first suggestion is that you establish friendly relations with the press. The press, however, is not the best vehicle for telling the public just what the functions and responsibilities of school boards are. This task you will have to learn to do yourself" (9, p. 26).
Boardman and Cassell note that,

Boards of education need to be more aware of how the public views them. School boards need to examine their public images and do better jobs of communicating with their constituents. School boards must make use of all the channels of communication at their disposal, if the public is ever to get a true picture of how local schools are governed (8, p. 740).

Public relations was also found to be an important topic for board education in studies by Andrews (5) and Snyder (60). Andrews surveyed twenty first-term board members in Indiana and found that public relations was a major problem area for new school board members. Their second area of concern was school finance. Snyder found community relations, including community politics, public communication, and community grievances, to rank fifth in a list of training priority items.

The studies and surveys above have a number of common topics which have been cited as important for inclusion in a training program for board members. Table I summarizes those topics.

Training programs which have been developed for board candidates, for new board members, and for experienced board members all appear to have many of the elements determined to be necessary for their respective audiences. It does not appear, however, that programs for the three different audiences differ in their areas of concentration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Delineation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Election Programs

A number of programs have been designed for education of persons who have not yet been elected to the local board of trustees. This pre-election education often helps individuals to make a decision about whether or not to seek election to a board position.
In Monmouth County, New Jersey (2) board members are elected in February. In early December, prospective candidates are invited by the county board of education to attend a seminar held at the local community college. The county has 54 school districts, with approximately 150 board members up for election each year. Some of those in attendance had not yet decided if a board position was something they wanted. They wanted to know what their responsibilities would be as board members and what board service would entail. One newly-elected board member who attended the seminar stated that by knowing what to expect, a board member would be less likely to become disillusioned before the end of his term.

Herman (27), superintendent of the Bloomfield, Michigan schools, meets with board hopefuls as soon as they announce their candidacy. He discusses both the board members' responsibilities and the responsibilities of the superintendent. He also answers any questions the candidates might have about the district, boardmanship, role delineation, and specific educational issues.

When all announced candidates meet to draw for places on the election ballot, the superintendent, assistant superintendents, and public information director of the Hurst-Euless-Bedford schools in Texas (70) discuss the district budget, give an overview of programs and discuss administrative roles. The superintendent also schedules a private
meeting with each candidate to discuss current issues, to

tour campuses, and to answer questions.

While a member of the Joplin, Missouri school board,
Steere (62, 63) developed a program for school board candi-
dates which not only provides education to the candidate but
is designed to notify the electorate of the candidate's
participation in the training program. The pre-election
program is provided by the superintendent of schools and
designed by the State Board of Education. The program covers
school finance; school plant; school district policies; school
law; media, teacher groups, special interest groups; and
curriculum and instruction.

On the ballot, an asterisk (*) identifies the candidate
as one trained for board membership. Board candidates are
not required to attend the educational sessions, but the
omission of the asterisk indicates to the public that the
candidate has not attended the training sessions.

In a 1974 study, Calloway (11) developed a pre-service
training program designed to help prospective board members
become better versed and more learned in areas and in
competencies needed to "become an effective board member."
The program was the result of a survey of board members and
superintendents of all 146 public school districts in the
State of Tennessee. Also included in the survey were the
state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and in her eight bordering states. The Urban Education Coalition, a group of Ohio citizens in Columbus, hosts over forty school board candidates and incumbents participate in two Saturday sessions. Educators from Ohio State University spend the first Saturday discussing boardmanship, school finance and local issues. During the second session, a mock school board, composed of candidates, meets to discuss real problems with a real superintendent in front of an audience filled with angry parents, a teacher with a gripe, newspaper reporters, other interested observers, and television cameras. Sections of the workshop are broadcast over cable television, giving the public a chance to learn about both the problems of boardmanship and the prospective candidates (32).

Most of these pre-election programs have been in operation for a number of years. Attendance is voluntary and has generally been light. There is no reported evidence that participation in these pre-election programs has aided in the election of a board member or resulted in more effective board membership, once elected. Participants in the programs, however, have had a "taste" of what is to come, and several have in fact withdrawn their candidacy after participation.
Orientation-Inservice Education Programs

A Kansas superintendent once remarked, "I haven't the time nor the patience to train a bunch of dummies who haven't the slightest idea about how public education works and how schools are run" (72, p. 3). Neubauer (43) suggests that we reject the "mushroom theory" of board education, in which we put a new board member in a dark corner, cover him with manure, and leave him alone to see if he will grow.

While many superintendents share the view of the Kansas superintendent, or have employed the "mushroom theory" with new board members, there are educators and non-educators alike who are interested in training individuals to be effective board members. A number of authors have investigated orientation or inservice education programs currently in operation across the nation and have gathered information about programs which have been developed for use by local school board members but have yet to be put into practice.

Managing the school system and defining roles seem to be elements in place in all programs discovered by investigators. Requiring campus visitations is another common element in educational programs for board members. In her hints to new board members, veteran Ruys (54) lists learning district history and then living it by visiting campuses frequently as the two most important things board members can do.
"Re-occurring inexperience" can be dealt with, says Monk (39), by a planned program of orientation and continuing education. An orientation packet should include copies of personnel contract forms, the current budget, faculty, parent and student handbooks, and the board policy manual. A private session between the full board and the superintendent should be included in the orientation of new members, with emphasis on the conduct of public meetings, parliamentary procedure, and public participation in the meeting. Finally, all members, old and new, should be reminded of the unwritten rule of "look and listen."

The Ontario School Trustees' Council (41, 61) developed a series of inservice sessions designed to acquaint trustees with modern approaches to the operation of school districts. Workshops were held with local school boards in a leadership course format using simulation exercises taken from problems experienced by school board members in actual situations. The first series was based on the Davies-Brickell system of school board management. The second series had to do with priorities and evaluation, and the third with major educational issues. While the major focus was to bring problems of the school district to light, a natural outgrowth became planning to solve the identified problems.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon (57) has developed the "Keys to Boardmanship"
Project. A series of workshops and training materials were developed for use by school board members in Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Idaho, and Montana. The workshops teach board members to handle their time more effectively, and cover leadership skills, conflict management, teamwork, roles, communications, school improvement, and board self-assessment. The goal is an informed and confident board member who takes an active role in all facets of board activities.

The Texas Association of School Boards (26) has developed two programs for orientation of new board members. They have a packet which includes thirty-three questions a new school board member "should" ask. These questions cover the areas of district goals and objectives, policies, board and district management, school law, financial information, curriculum and instruction and communications.

The second program is that in the Educational Leadership Series (59), a continuing compilation of publications and audio-visual materials. "Orientation and Organization: Keys to School Board Effectiveness" sets up an individual, self-paced orientation plan detailing what printed materials the school board member should review, what information should be gathered from the administration concerning the budget, for example, frequently used terms, role delineation, and evaluation.

Gray (25) states that an essential piece of equipment for new trustees is a "cast iron, built-in crap detector."
While orientation may not be able to provide that, Gray and the British Columbia School Trustees' Association have developed a program which encourages questioning and strives to limit the board from serving as merely a "protective shield" for the district staff. The program has two parts--identify the role of the board member and provide basic information to be used to assess programs proposed to the board. This part of the program can be accomplished at the state or local level. Locally, districts are then to lay out a plan of activities to quickly give trustees an understanding of the district and its programs. Follow-up and updating round out the education of the board member, with the result ideally to be a board member who cannot be manipulated by the staff and who is truly a representative of the people who elected him.

Newly elected board members in Clark County, Nevada (36) attend eleven two-hour sessions which cover the topics of boardmanship, budgeting and finance, law, personnel and negotiations, curriculum and program development, and visits to all district facilities. Experienced board members, administrators, and other state and county educators participate in the sessions.

Goal-setting is also a basic activity in board training. The Lunenburg, Massachusetts (65) school board set aside four days to develop goals for its entire system. Instructors at
Fitchburg State College outlined training sessions which followed the Individually Guided Education (IGE) method. The sessions included human development activities, decision-making exercises, and a process which identifies fundamental beliefs, allowing goals to be established. Long-range goals were developed, which were supported by short-range objectives. Once goals were set, the administration set management objectives within the framework of priorities established by the board.

In Keansburg, New Jersey (2), which participates in a county-wide pre-election program, there is also an extensive orientation program soon after the election. Included in the orientation is the highest vote-getter who did not win in the election (if a seat opens up, there is a "pre-trained" person to be appointed). The all-day seminar is held in a school library and includes key administrators. The day is divided into ten sessions, with each session including at least two and as many as nine parts, including case studies. After introductions, there is discussion of roles, an explanation of administrative positions, discussion of curriculum, the board's public relations program, legal matters, finance and budgeting, and the roles of the state and national associations. Family members join participants for an evening of food and fun to round out the seminar. The Keansburg board meets weekly, with three of the meetings each month devoted to training or education of board members.
In the "Evaluation Training Project," Marcussen and Calendine (37) initiated training in the practical applications of research and evaluation tools in sessions for board members. While their project was geared to Research Directors and their staffs, knowledge by board members of the role and uses of research and evaluation was included to emphasize that research and evaluation programs are not areas reserved for specialists.

Jones (32) developed a home study training kit which can be used by a local school district for orientation of new board members. The kit covers five areas of study: school-community relations and general responsibilities, curriculum and instruction, business and management, personnel and organization, and facilities. Within the five areas are forty-eight "topics," prepared by the local district's educators, board members can read to help groom a board member in the "ways and whys" of the school board and member roles and responsibilities.

Northside Independent School District (17) in San Antonio, Texas, schedules an evening for discussion of board responsibilities and then schedules weekly meetings with key administrators for information-gathering in specific areas. Monthly presentations by department heads at board meetings and cooperative inservice with administrators keep new and experienced board members alike informed of district needs, progress in targeted areas, and general district happenings.
The Recruitment Leadership Training Institute (18) has developed orientation and training programs which include skill development in dealing with both facts and people. Topics include group processes, sociology of education, legal matters, dealing with pressure groups, budget, school plant, personnel and curriculum. In addition are schedules for implementation of three monthly mini-workshops for new and experienced board members to carry the above topics into more depth.

Kunder (34) has found in her studies that many state and local programs have the same basic ingredients. Citing the Oklahoma State School Boards workshop schedule, that of the Sachem Central School District in Holbrook, New York, the Woodland Joint Unified School District and the Ventura Unified School District, both in California, she discovered a number of common elements: distribution of printed materials, discussion of key trends and issues in education, legal status of Parent-Teacher Association groups and other advisory committees in the schools, organization of the board, and communications.

Several colleges and universities have become involved in developing training programs for board members. Bearden (6) notes that a school district in Northwest Louisiana initiated a college course, "Education Problems," which had a number of benefits: three semester hours of college credit,
a time for study away from public scrutiny, utilization of a variety of resource people, interaction between board members, and self-evaluation.

Drahmann (16) developed the Education Board Inservice Series (EBIS), a year-long series of monthly sessions for Catholic school boards in Minneapolis-St. Paul. Approximately 100 board members from 35 schools participated, identifying seven areas for training: board functions, board relationships, finances, board leadership roles, teamwork, planning and evaluation, and Catholic education issues. Held at the College of St. Thomas, monthly three-hour sessions produced requests for individual help on issues, specific content needs for future sessions, and resources, including models, sample agendas, discussion articles, and lists of printed, audio-visual, and human references.

Reviews of programs by Anderson and Snyder (4) revealed that those focusing on planning, problem-solving, and communications seemed to best meet the needs of board members. Based on that, a leadership training retreat was developed for school board members in Fort Worth, Texas. An analysis of needs identified role satisfaction, skills already held, and skills needed. The workshop covered role responsibilities, system concepts, communications techniques, approaches to problem-solving, organizational analysis, and goal-setting. Two follow-up workshops were held to complete
goal-setting and to conduct similar training of the administrative staff.

The Genesee Valley School Boards Institute (50) is one of twelve in New York State which is centered at a college or university and co-sponsored by the New York State School Boards Association. Four to six major programs are held each year to deal with current issues in education, and mini-courses and special workshops are scheduled to meet the needs for basic and specific preparation in content and skill areas.

Summary

It would be encouraging, indeed, if one could say that educational programs for school board members, whether new or experienced, needed only these basic ingredients, in the words of White, "planning, diplomacy, good timing, common sense, and a bit of old-fashioned politicking" (73, p. 20). Those ingredients are not enough, however, for today's board member. Jones observes that training is critical, but does not specify topics.

Indeed, for effective lay control of public education to be preserved in its current school board form, for boards to remain fit to fulfill their policy-making (not rubber-stamping) reason for being, more than an ounce of several preventive medicines is needed today. Probably the most worthwhile potion, although not a cure-all, is training (32, p. 21).

Board members themselves see the problems they face with inadequate training. In the words of an Illinois board member,
We get on-the-job training by fulfilling our responsibilities, attending board meetings, serving on committees, and reading backup materials. But this form of education is slow, fragmented, and in my experience, incomplete. There are always important gaps in our knowledge that we don't fill in for a variety of reasons, no matter how long we are on the job. We are too timid to ask about what we don't know in public for fear of appearing stupid; we don't want to take up valuable time by continually requesting supplementary information; and we deal mostly with people (even fellow board members) who don't fully realize the depth of our ignorance about their subject, and therefore make little attempt to present us with a comprehensive, jargon-free, well-organized presentation (43, pp. 9-10).

Inservice training is needed for board members. But what is also needed is well-planned training which will give them what they need to build their confidence and help them with management and organizational tasks while covering the topics which have been cited as important to be included in school board training.

Of the existing programs cited in this chapter, only four cover many of the topics cited as most important in the literature and in surveys: Keansburg (2), Jones (32), Clark County (36), and Recruitment Leadership Training Institute (18). The other programs concentrate their efforts on organizational skills, leadership skills, goal-setting, or role delineation to the exclusion of other topics, including law, finance, school plant, policy development, curriculum, and public relations. Table II summarizes the four studies which include topics cited as necessary for board members.
## TABLE II

**INSERVICE PROGRAMS FOR BOARD MEMBERS WHICH INCORPORATE TOPICS CITED AS ESSENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Topics Included</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keansburg</td>
<td>day-long seminar</td>
<td>curriculum, roles, public relations, finance, plant personnel</td>
<td>case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>home study kit</td>
<td>public relations, curriculum, plant, personnel, finance</td>
<td>topic areas prepared by district staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>eleven sessions</td>
<td>boardmanship, law, finance, personnel, curriculum</td>
<td>campus visitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLTI</td>
<td>skill development</td>
<td>law, public relations, plant, finance, curriculum</td>
<td>monthly mini-workshops for in-depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the above programs contain topics which have been determined to be necessary for the education of board members, they, too, are incomplete. They are comprehensive training programs, but are inadequate because there is no assessment of effectiveness, and no longitudinal evaluations. What is missing from these programs is what this study proposes to do: assess the effectiveness of training programs currently in operation.
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CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLECTION
AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section describes the identification of skill areas necessary for board members. The second section describes the development of the two instruments used in the collection of the data. One instrument relates to the acquisition of knowledge and understanding; the other questions board members' attitudes toward inservice. The third section presents the procedures for the collection of the data. The fourth section explains the procedures for the analysis of data.

Identification of Skill Areas

A list of areas where knowledge and understanding would be needed by board members was compiled following a careful review of the literature and applicable research studies, a review of information supplied by the Texas Association of School Boards, and interviews with twelve professionals in education and related fields. These individuals included two school superintendents, consultants from both the Texas Association of School Boards and the National School Boards Association, a Regional Education Service Center administrator, two public school administrators, an attorney, two
school board members, and a university professor. Table III represents a list of persons interviewed and their positions.

### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 930 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Coordinator</td>
<td>Texas Association of School Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Specialist</td>
<td>Texas Association of School Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Consultant</td>
<td>National School Boards Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Education Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Officer</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 20,700 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Business</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Attorney</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 32,800 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Educational Administration</td>
<td>Major University, Texas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the review of literature and research, review of Texas Association of School Boards materials, and the interviews, a listing of seven major areas where knowledge and understanding of subject matter and methodology are necessary for school board members was compiled. More specific topics within the seven general areas were added, and topics which overlapped were identified. This listing was presented to the seven persons identified in Table IV. Each was asked to confirm the areas or skills listed. Confirmation of each area by four of the seven persons resulted in inclusion of the area in the final listing. Table IV represents the list of the seven persons who judged the skills listed.

TABLE IV
CONFIRMATION JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Board President</td>
<td>Third Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>Central Texas, 1,978 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Secretary</td>
<td>Second Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>Second Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>First Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>East Texas, 607 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>West Texas, 1,199 enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the seven general areas was confirmed by the judges. In addition to each of the specific topics confirmed, several were added by the judges and included in the final listing (Appendix C)

Development of the Instruments

For the purposes of this study a test was developed to assess knowledge and understanding of topics related to the skills identified as needed for school board members. The professionals listed in Table III were given the final list of skills and asked to generate items for the test of knowledge relating to the skill items. These individuals were asked to write the test items because of their expertise in the areas to be covered.

One hundred test items were developed and the entire pool of questions was circulated to each of the professionals listed in Table III. Each was asked to check "yes" or "no" for the inclusion of each statement in the final instrument. "Yes" responses from eight of the twelve persons resulted in the inclusion of the item in the final form of the test. Of the 100 statements presented to the twelve individuals, 73 were selected for inclusion in the final instrument.

The 73 items selected for the final instrument were submitted to a panel of nine persons whose task it was to determine clarity of content and the acceptability of each question. If a question was determined not to be clear or
acceptable by a majority of panel members, it was removed from the test. Members of the panel included a school superintendent, an attorney whose practice is largely founded on school law in Texas, two school administrators, members of the print and electronic media, a university professor in the area of education administration, and two currently-serving school board members. Table V represents a list of the individuals and their professions.

Of the seventy-three questions presented to the panel, sixty were determined to be clear and acceptable by a majority of the judges. Panel members indicated that the test should be kept to a length of less than fifty questions. Therefore, every fourth question was eliminated and the final test instrument consisted of forty-five questions (Appendix D).

A scale was developed for use in the project to measure the individual board member's attitude toward inservice education. In preparation for development of the instrument, research literature was reviewed for existing measurement scales (1, 5).

Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, by Shaw and Wright, contained two rating scales designed to measure attitude toward any subject and attitude toward any practice (5). The scale measuring the attitude toward any subject was developed by Silance and Remmers in 1934. It is a forty-five-item, Thurston-type scale. In 1960, Remmers
### TABLE V
PROFESSIONALS DETERMINING CLARITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 16,200 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Attorney</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 16,200 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Education Administration</td>
<td>Major University, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Reporter</td>
<td>Metropolitan Newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Anchorperson, Weekend</td>
<td>Major Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Business and Finance</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Support Services</td>
<td>Suburban School District, 17,400 enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

used this scale as a basis for a shorter scale to measure attitudes toward the same referent. The Silance and Remmers scale was constructed upon a large sample (several thousand) of high school students and college undergraduates. Persons were asked to respond by checking items with which they agreed, and the median of the scale values of the items selected by the respondent constituted the score.

When using both high school and college students, and using different school subjects such as referents for
attitude, the authors reported equivalent-forms reliabilities of from .81 to .90. Content validity was validated by Bolton in 1938 using the subject of mathematics and measuring interests and values. Strunk (1957) obtained a correlation of .39 between scores of subjects on a scale of interest in psychology and this scale, advancing concurrent validity. According to Shaw and Wright, the scale is "reasonably valid and reliable" (5).

The scale used to measure attitude toward inservice education for members of boards of trustees of local school districts was a measure of attitude toward any practice, developed by Bues (1934), which used the method of equal-appearing intervals. The scale consists of two forms, each with thirty-seven items, selected from a pool of 150 items. It is of a more general nature than the scale developed by Remmers, measuring any attitude rather than an attitude toward a class or classes of objects. Subjects for validation included four groups of twenty-five persons each. The groups were drawn from a Young Women's Christian Association, a Sunday School, a fraternity, and a sorority, and respondents were asked to place a plus (+) sign before each statement with which they agreed. A high score would then indicate a favorable attitude toward the practice under consideration.

Bues did not report reliability on this scale, but Remmers (1960) experienced reliability coefficients ranging
from .71 to .92. The known-groups method, using specific referents, was used for validation. Shaw and Wright report that the scale has "adequate reliability, and the limited evidence concerning validity is encouraging" (5).

The measurement scales (Appendix E) were administered to school board members in two Texas districts. One district, in west central Texas, had an enrollment of approximately 1,200 students. The second is in south central Texas and had an enrollment of approximately 2,000. In addition to the school trustees, the superintendents of the two districts were asked to react to the attitude scales. Each respondent was asked to mark any statement which seemed to be confusing, unclear, or could otherwise be determined to cause a person not to be able to respond candidly.

Members of a school district board of trustees in a suburban district were also asked to informally assess the clarity and understandibility of the instrument. The test was not administered to them, however. The suggestions of all participants were incorporated into the final measurement instrument.

Procedures for Collection of the Data

The Texas Association of School Boards identified six school districts which had formal programs of inservice education for board members. According to the Texas Association of School Boards, these programs varied in their scope,
format, history, and intensity. Appendix A includes the list of identified districts.

From the six identified districts, three were selected which were different from each other with respect to size, geographical location, and wealth per student. These three school boards constituted the experimental group. Table VII, in Chapter IV, details the characteristics of the inservice education programs in the districts comprising the experimental group.

From the school boards remaining in the state (with no formal inservice education program for board members), nine districts were identified which were found to be similar to those selected for the experimental group with respect to size, geographical location, and wealth per student (Appendix A). Using a table of random numbers (4), three districts were selected from the nine to constitute the control group. Table VI gives characteristic data of the districts comprising the experimental and control groups.

After the testing instrument and the attitude measurement scales were developed, a letter which indicated the purposes of the project, detailed its procedures, and included an invitation to participate was sent to the superintendent and board president of each of the identified districts (Appendix B). Approximately one week later, each of the superintendents was contacted and the project was discussed.
### TABLE VI
CHARACTERISTIC DATA OF SELECTED DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Wealth per Student</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>$3,190,748,000</td>
<td>$277,456</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>45,792</td>
<td>2,457,735,000</td>
<td>53,662</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>408,170,000</td>
<td>111,217</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District D</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>4,272,820,000</td>
<td>321,264</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District E</td>
<td>36,607</td>
<td>4,873,273,000</td>
<td>133,149</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District F</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>463,045,000</td>
<td>210,475</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case, the superintendent had already discussed the project in detail with members of his board, as well as the invitation to participate in the project. All six districts expressed an interest in the project and were willing to participate in it.

A schedule was developed with each district for administration of the knowledge and attitude measurements. The schedule included an extended meeting with the superintendent and the president of the board of trustees of each district in the experimental group. The purpose of the meeting was to gather information about each district's formal program of
inservice education for board members. Details about the development of the program, including what prompted the district to institute a local program of inservice, the scope of the program, the material covered in the program, and the reactions of board members to the program were to be discussed during the meeting.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data from the various instruments used in the project were compiled and reported in tables (1, 2, 3). The .05 level of significance was used to determine if knowledge or attitude was affected by a formal program of inservice education.

Research question one asked what common elements were present in formal inservice education programs for members of the boards of trustees of selected Texas public school districts. Information gathered during the interviews was detailed in narrative summary. Questions discussed during the interviews are listed in Appendix F.

Research question two asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education had an effect on the knowledge of members of the boards of trustees of local school districts. To answer the question, the number of correct responses on the knowledge assessment objective test were calculated for each subject. A t-test for independent
groups was run to test for differences between the experimental and control groups, and among members of the experimental group.

Research question three asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education had an effect on the local school trustee's attitude toward inservice. Item responses on the attitude assessment instruments were tabulated according to their scale values, and a median score determined. A t-test for independent groups was run to test for differences among members of the experimental group and between the experimental and control groups. A high score indicated a favorable attitude.

The fourth research question asked if knowledge varied according to components of the inservice education programs in which board members participated. Responses to questions on the knowledge assessment instrument were tabulated and a determination was made that specific areas of knowledge did or did not appear to have been significantly affected by various elements of the training programs, based on the number of correct or incorrect responses to a particular question.

In summary, six Texas school districts were identified to participate in this study. Board members in districts which had a program of inservice for board members were interviewed to determine the common elements which existed
in their programs. A testing instrument which had as its purpose to assess knowledge and understanding of board members was developed through a process involving a number of education professionals and members of local boards of education. Questions asked were related to skills which were identified in the literature, by educators, and by the Texas Association of School Boards as necessary for board members. The test was administered to board members who did (experimental) and board members who did not (control) participate in inservice training. Board members' attitudes toward both the practice and the subject of inservice were measured. Finally, responses to questions on the knowledge assessment instrument were analyzed to determine the relationship of correct and incorrect answers to components of the inservice programs.


CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The problem of this study was to describe inservice education programs for members of local boards of trustees and to assess the knowledge and attitude toward inservice of participating and non-participating board members. The purposes of this study were to describe training programs carried on in selected Texas public school districts and their relationship to test scores of respective board members, and to assess the knowledge and attitudes toward inservice education of board members participating in those training programs (experimental) and of board members who do not participate in formal local inservice education programs (control). Additional purposes of the study were to compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group members among themselves, to compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group with that of the control group, and finally, to inform the public and other appropriate groups, organizations and agencies of the results of the study.

Data for this study were collected from superintendents and board members during the fall of 1984. Data analysis was done with the statistical package for the Model Ten Hewlett
Packard calculator as well as by the North Texas State University Computing Center.

The presentation of the analyses of data is related to the research questions formulated in Chapter I. Data collected through the study are presented in this chapter under the appropriate questions. Tables are used to present salient features of these analyses of data.

The Population

Out of a total of forty-two board members who volunteered for the study, thirty-seven completed both the aptitude test and the attitude survey. Of the five board members who did not complete both instruments, one was from the experimental group and four were from the control group. Four of the board members were not in attendance at the meeting at which the instruments were given. One chose not to participate after receiving the instruments.

Board members in both the experimental and control groups represented diversity in age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, length of service as a board member, and attitude toward the project. The experimental group included thirteen men and six women. Seventeen were employed full-time and two were retired. The occupations represented a dairy farmer, several engineers, an oil field worker, a mortician, business executives, a hospital administrator, a realtor, a water district administrator, a printer, and a junior college teacher. Both
retired members had been teachers. Fourteen members of the experimental group were white, four were Hispanic, and one was black. Their ages ranged from the early forties to the early seventies. Of the nineteen experimental group members, thirteen had served four or more years on the board of trustees of the local school district. Three were in their first term and three were in their first year of service.

All members had children who were students or former students in the districts in which they were board members. It is interesting to note that one board in the experimental group consisted of seven current or former educators. On the same board, all three officers were women.

The control group included fifteen men and three women. All but two were employed full-time. One member was a retired teacher and one was a former teacher who was a housewife. Sixteen members of the control group were white, one was black, and one was Hispanic. Their occupations included a geologist, several attorneys, a minister, a contractor, a company president, a pilot, several self-employed businessmen, a vocational school teacher, a realtor, and the executive director of a volunteer agency. Ages of the members ranged from the mid-thirties to the mid-sixties. Four control group members were in their first term and one was in his first year of service. One member had served twenty-one years and one sixteen years. Three members of the control group were not parents of current or former students.
At least one board member voiced concern over participation in the project, due to a fear of lack of anonymity. This board member did, however, participate. One board member in the control group decided against filling out the instruments after receiving them.

Research Question One

The first research question asked what elements were present in formal inservice education programs for members of boards of trustees of selected Texas public school districts. To answer this question, board members in the three districts comprising the experimental group were interviewed to gather information about each district's formal program of inservice education. This section discusses details of the development of each program, including what prompted the district to institute a formal program of inservice, the scope of the program, the material covered in the program, and the reactions of board members to the program. Table VII details the characteristics of the inservice education programs in districts comprising the experimental group. Written materials about the programs are included in Appendix G.

The three programs which were identified by the Texas Association of School Boards as being formal inservice education programs consisted principally of goal-setting activities. These programs were not designed to address the skills
identified as necessary for board members and do not focus on skills or knowledge. The following discussion of each program illustrates these points.

**TABLE VII**

**INSERVICE PROGRAMS IN OPERATION IN DISTRICTS COMPRISING EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Features</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>retreat</td>
<td>retreat</td>
<td>retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Consultant</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>two days</td>
<td>one day</td>
<td>three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>goal setting</td>
<td>goal setting</td>
<td>goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Features</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>workshops</td>
<td>information meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District A was identified by the Texas Association of School Boards to have an in-depth program of school board inservice. In the 1973-1974 school year, a board retreat was held to identify district-wide goals. Once a month since that time, district personnel have presented an instructional "program" to board members consisting of topics which relate to the district-wide goals and activities underway to achieve those goals. Each presentation lasts approximately one and one-half hours, with a question
and answer period to follow. Every Thursday during the school year, board members and central office administrators visit a campus in the district to observe instruction.

After ten years, the board and administration felt a need to reassess those district-wide goals identified in 1973-1974 and scheduled that activity for a board's planning retreat, held in January of each year. The annual retreat began on Friday afternoon and concluded late on Saturday. The objectives for the retreat were to review the district-wide goals, and add to, delete, or reconfirm them. The next step was to reprioritize the goals to provide direction for the administration as they developed their own objectives for management. During the 1984 retreat, board members also discussed House Bill 246 (Chapter 75) and its relationship to the district goals.

When questioned as to the advantages and disadvantages of the goal-setting activity, board members agreed that the greatest advantage was that the district had a sense of direction. The board also found that when reaching a goal might take more time, energy, money or professional resources than they wanted to direct to it, they had the ability to redirect or reorder their priorities without sacrificing the goal completely. Having goals also enabled them to educate "one-issue" board members or diffuse the pressure of special interest groups by pointing out the direction in which the district as a whole was moving.
Board members and administrators agreed that the biggest disadvantage to the process was time. In addition, the desire to include any interested community members in the process through open invitations to the planning retreats could also cause an uncomfortable situation when discussion might evolve into something board members might prefer to voice opinions on in a private session. As a result of its most recent goal-setting activity, District A plans to schedule a goal-oriented inservice session on an annual basis, and to include progress reports on goals as they relate to expenditures in its summer budget retreat. District A had no written materials about their inservice program.

District B has had three superintendents in its history. The last superintendent was the chief executive officer of the district for fifty years. When the current superintendent was elected, he reviewed activities of the board and made goal-setting one of his inservice education priorities. He started with district administrators, scheduling a two-day retreat at a local hotel. Campus objectives were set which were keyed to the superintendent's goals.

The superintendent then scheduled a retreat for board members dedicated to goal-setting. All of the board members in the district are either current or former educators and therefore had experience in setting goals for their own activities. Transferring that experience to goal-setting
for the district was not a difficult task, and board members picked up on the process quickly.

The goal-setting process began with a "laundry list" developed by community groups such as citizens advisory committees, the Parent-Teacher Organization, and employee organizations. Board members added their own concerns, pared the list down to a reasonable size, and then prioritized the remaining items. Play money was used to spend on priorities, with the concerns receiving the most money selected for development into goals. Selecting the final goals was the most difficult part of the task; however, "spending" money on the areas helped to focus attention on the most important concerns.

After the goal-setting process was completed, the board and administration decided to consolidate the board goals and superintendent's goals into one set of comprehensive district goals. Having district-wide goals has allowed the board and administration to tighten controls on things which could detract from student achievement, and to aggressively deal with problems faced by the district. According to the board president, a board member without any training is "dangerous," and specific goals which give the district direction force board members to be knowledgeable about all facets of the educational process. Inservice activities relating to the goals which have been set include
self-evaluation sessions by board members and Saturday workshops devoted to finance, law, planning, policy-making, and decision-making. The budgeting process is also tied to the goals which have been set.

The only weakness seen in the process is that too often it is from the "top down" rather than from the "bottom up." Administrators and board members indicated a need to spend more time with the teachers and other staff members to get their concerns and input into the decision-making and goal-setting process.

As a result of the goal-setting experience District B is planning to schedule annual, day-long retreats to modify, redefine or reconsider goals for the district. Each board meeting also includes a section where a district program is defined and discussed. This allows both board members and the public to become better informed about activities underway in the district. A document developed by District B which describes the basic steps of its inservice program and a format for the training program are included in Appendix G.

District C completed a building program and administrative reorganization in 1983. The board of education believed that there were some things which could be done in the district because of the new facility and the new organization, but board members were not sure "where they were or where
they wanted to go." Goals had been set in the district during the 1979-1980 school year, and board members felt those goals should be updated or modified. In talking with board members in other districts, the board president and the superintendent were directed to an organization in the Houston area which contracted its services to boards for evaluation and goal-setting. A weekend retreat was scheduled for September of 1983.

Prior to the scheduled retreat, board members and administrators filled out a self-evaluation form and a questionnaire about their knowledge of district procedures and policies. They were also asked to list what they saw as district accomplishments in the past year, things done in the district which could have been improved, and priorities for the 1984-1985 school year.

The first day of the retreat was devoted to discussion of the board's role, communications, the board as a whole, the trustee as an individual and as a member of the board, and preparation for goal setting. During the second day, candid discussion preceded goal-setting for the board and for the district. The discussion "covered a multitude of sins" and benefited both the board members and the administrators. Administrators said they realized that the board was genuinely committed to having good schools, and board members admitted that they really were not sure what they should do and when they had the authority to act.
One month later a follow-up session was held at a local restaurant. Progress on board goals was discussed, as were district goals. District administrators were given the opportunity to discuss current concerns, and goals for 1984-1985 were identified.

Board members and administrators agreed that the workshop sessions had opened up the lines of communications between them, and all expressed a desire to continue the process on a regular basis. The board president observed that people generally assume that board members know what is going on all over the district and that administrators know what is going on in all programs in the district. Because this is generally a false assumption, this district has increased the number of board meetings from one to two each month and devotes a section of each board meeting to a discussion of district programs and activities. Board members and administrators alike stressed that both the board and the superintendent must be committed to a free and open exchange of ideas, or goal-setting will not work. The amount of time necessary for this process to be successful also requires that a spirit of cooperation exist. A format for the inservice session and materials used by each participant to prepare for the session are included in Appendix G.

Based on the above information, the common element present in formal inservice education programs for members
of the boards of trustees of selected Texas public school districts is goal-setting. Each of the three boards centered its inservice education efforts around the determination of where the district was, where it wanted to be, and how it would propose to get there. Following the setting of goals, board members turned their attention to increasing their knowledge about the district and its programs, including how those programs and activities addressed the stated goals. They accomplished this task through regular programs during board meetings, weekly workshops, campus visitation, and special seminars.

Present in all of the districts' activities was a spirit of cooperation and a commitment to openness and candor between the board and the administration. Board members and administrators in each of the three districts indicated that the goal-setting experiences had been valuable and worth the time they required.

It is clear from the interviews that board members feel that the goal-setting sessions have been successful. These sessions as described do not, however, concern themselves directly with the knowledge areas which have been identified as necessary for school board members. The information-gathering sessions which have been instituted as an outgrowth of the goal-setting activities do appear to address the skill areas indirectly.
Research Question Two

Research question two asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education affects the knowledge of members of the boards of trustees of local school districts. To answer this question, a t-test for independent groups was run on computed scores on the knowledge assessment objective test. Means were compared to test for differences between the experimental and control groups, and among members of the experimental groups. Table VIII gives the individual participant scores for both the experimental and control groups and Table IX shows the mean, standard deviation, degrees of freedom, and t-value for the experimental and control groups.

This analysis of differences in means between the two groups yielded a t-value of .011 with thirty-five degrees of freedom. According to the table of critical values by Roscoe (2), this is not significant at the .05 level. Thus, participation in a formal program of inservice education appears to have no significant effect on the knowledge of members of boards of trustees of local school districts. Worth noting is the fact that the range of scores in both the experimental and control groups was twenty points (Table VIII).

To compare knowledge between experimental groups, a t-test for independent samples was conducted. Means,
### TABLE VIII

**INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON THE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District D</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District E</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IX

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS FOR MEAN SCORES ON THE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.63</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

Standard deviations, degrees of freedom, and t-values are found in Table X.
TABLE X

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS FOR MEAN SCORES ON THE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05.

According to the distribution of t for given probability levels presented by Roscoe (2), the calculated t-values for comparisons of the three experimental groups do not exceed the tabled values for the .05 level of significance. In the comparison of District A to District B, the t-value of .408 with 11 degrees of freedom does not exceed the tabled value for the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no significant difference in knowledge between District A and District B.

In the comparison of District A to District C, a t-test for correlated rather than independent samples was utilized due to the fact that the sample sizes were the same for each
group. The $t$-value of 0 with 11 degrees of freedom does not exceed the tabled value for the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no significant difference in knowledge between District A and District C.

In the comparison of District B to District C, the $t$-value of .313 with 11 degrees of freedom does not exceed the tabled value for the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is no significant difference in knowledge between District B and District C. These data suggest that no one of the three programs has a greater effect on knowledge than another. It is interesting to observe that Districts A and C had identical mean scores, although the individual scores on the knowledge assessment instrument varied somewhat.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to compare the scores of the individual districts comprising the experimental group and the control group. Table XI gives the source of variation, the degrees of freedom, the sum of squares, the mean square and the $F$ value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1059.67</td>
<td>31.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1106.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = .503$. 
This analysis of differences of means between and within groups yielded an F value of .503 with 3/34 degrees of freedom, which is not significant at the .05 level, according to Roscoe (2). Therefore, there is no significant difference in knowledge between each district in the experimental group and the control group.

Research Question Three

Research question three asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education had an effect on the attitude of trustees of local school districts toward inservice education. The t-test for independent samples was used to compare the mean scores of the experimental group to the control group on the attitude assessment instrument. Table XII shows the mean, standard deviation, degrees of freedom, and t-value for the experimental and control groups.

TABLE XII

DIFFERENCE IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS FOR MEAN SCORES ON THE ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
According to the table of percentage points of the $t$ distribution presented by Owens (1), the calculated $t$ exceeds the tabled value for the .05 level of significance. Therefore, there is a significant difference, and board members who participate in formal programs of inservice education apparently have a more positive attitude toward inservice education than do those board members who have not participated.

It is important to acknowledge that although there was a significant difference in attitude between the experimental and control groups toward inservice education for board members, the mean scores of the control group were also on the positive side of the scale. The mean score of the control group was 7.39, indicating a generally positive attitude toward inservice education. This data suggests that board members feel that inservice education is an important and worthwhile activity even if they are not participants in a formal training program. The high scores on the attitude assessment instrument may have been a result of the involvement of the researcher in the data-gathering.

Attitudes toward inservice education for board members between experimental groups were compared with a $t$-test for independent samples. Means, standard deviations, degrees of freedom, and $t$-values are found in Table XIII.
TABLE XIII

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS FOR MEAN SCORES ON THE ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05.

The t-test for correlated samples was used in the comparison of groups A and C due to identical sample sizes. This analysis of differences in means between the three experimental groups showed a significant difference at the .05 level between groups A and C. According to the table of significant values by Owens (1), the calculated t of 1.87 with 11 degrees of freedom exceeds the tabled value. There is no significant difference in attitude between groups A and B and groups B and C. The t-value of 1.034 with 11 degrees of freedom in the comparison of groups A and B, and the t-value of .899 with 11 degrees of freedom in the comparison of groups B and C do not exceed the tabled value for the .05 level of significance.
While a significant difference was shown to exist between groups A and C, the mean scores for both groups were high, indicating a very positive attitude toward inservice education. Worth noting is the fact that District A has been involved in a formal program of inservice education for a decade. District C had begun a formal inservice program only recently.

Research Question Four

Research question four asked if the various components present in formal inservice education programs had an effect on the knowledge of participating board members. To answer this question, a comparison was made of incorrect responses on the knowledge assessment instrument. Although members of the control group did not participate in inservice education programs, their answers were included in this comparison.

Questions which were answered incorrectly by more than half of the members of either group (ten or more) were assumed to be areas of weakness in the knowledge of board members. Questions answered correctly by all or all but one of the members of the groups were assumed to be areas of strength. Table XIV shows the comparison of incorrect answers by members of both the experimental and control groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mal. Choice</th>
<th>True or False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>District D</th>
<th>District E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>District D</th>
<th>District E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>District D</th>
<th>District E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>District D</th>
<th>District E</th>
<th>District F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mul. Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
<th>District C</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>District D</th>
<th>District E</th>
<th>District F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions missed by more than half of the members of the experimental and control groups concerned the subjects of law, Texas Education Agency accreditation regulations, athlete insurance, taxation, comments to reporters, removal of board members, and federal funding. Questions which were answered correctly by all or all but one member were in the areas of bonding, audit regulations, discipline, personnel, role delineation between the school board and superintendent, policy availability, and citizen participation in board meetings.

A $t$-test for independent groups was run internally on the four areas covered by the knowledge assessment instrument to determine if the experimental group differed from the control group in knowledge in any of the four areas of law, school finance, policy, or public relations. Table XV gives the mean, standard deviation, degrees of freedom, and $t$-values for the experimental and control groups in each of the four areas.

The analysis of differences in means between the two groups showed no significant differences according to the table of critical values by Roscoe (2). Thus, participation in a formal program of inservice education appears to have no significant effect on the knowledge of board members in the individual areas of the knowledge assessment instrument.
TABLE XV
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS FOR MEAN SCORES ON THE INTERNAL SUBJECT AREAS OF THE KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

In summary, knowledge of board members does not appear to be affected by participation in a formal program of inservice education. The components of the inservice education programs, goal-setting and decision-making, appear to have no significant effect on knowledge of participants.
Board members in both the experimental group and the control group did perform well in areas which one would assume would be dealt with in the course of normal deliberations: policy, bonding, discipline, role delineation, and citizen participation.

The data suggest that board members who participate in formal inservice education programs have an attitude toward those programs which is significantly more positive than those who do not participate; however, those who do not participate also have a favorable attitude toward inservice education for board members.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The problem of this study was to describe inservice education programs for members of local boards of trustees, and to assess the knowledge and attitude toward inservice of participating and non-participating board members. The purposes of this study were to describe training programs carried on in selected Texas public school districts and their relationship to test scores of respective board members, and to assess the knowledge and attitudes toward inservice education of board members participating in those training programs (experimental) and of board members who do not participate in formal local inservice education programs (control). Additional purposes of the study were to compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group members among themselves, to compare the knowledge and attitudes of the experimental group with that of the control group, and finally to inform the public and other appropriate groups, organizations and agencies of the results of the study.
A review of the literature was divided into four sections: the need for inservice education programs, topics of study which should be included in the programs, pre-election programs, and orientation-inservice programs for elected board members. Literature on the need for inservice education programs indicates a well-established need for training programs by board members themselves (25), as well as by others, due to high turnover rates (11, 21), the changing roles of both the school and the board member (2, 19), and changes in state and federal statutes governing school districts (13). Numerous studies of board members also indicate that very little orientation or training is being conducted (6, 7, 14, 19, 20). Boardmanship (4, 7), the different roles of board members (9, 17), and school law (16, 18) are the major topic areas which should be included in training programs. Very few programs exist for prospective board members. Most consist of a discussion of the responsibilities of board members (1, 8), and an overview of district programs (22, 24). Mock board meetings are also set up to give the prospective candidate a chance to experience actual problems which are dealt with by school boards (12). There are a number of orientation and inservice education programs in operation across the nation, and while they may differ in format, the basic ingredients are the same: goal-setting, planning, problem-solving, decision-making, and board roles and responsibilities (2, 5, 7, 12, 22).
To accomplish this study, three school districts were identified which had a formal program of inservice education for board members, and three were identified with no program of board inservice education. The board members of districts with inservice education programs served as the experimental group, with the boards members with no training programs designated as the control group. To answer research question one, which asked what elements were present in inservice education programs for board members, information was gathered from members of the experimental group about each district's formal inservice education program.

A test and an attitude assessment instrument were developed to be administered to both the experimental and control groups. Copies of both instruments are in Appendix C.

The $t$-test for independent samples was used to determine if knowledge or attitude were affected by a formal program of inservice education. Research question two asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education affected the knowledge of board members in the skill areas covered by the assessment instrument. Research question three asked if participation in a formal program of inservice education affected board members' attitudes toward inservice. A comparison of incorrect answers by members of the experimental group on the knowledge assessment instrument was made.
to answer research question four, which asked if the various components present in the identified inservice education programs affected board members' knowledge.

Limitations

The following three limitations were indicated in Chapter I as being inherent in this study.

1. Knowledge and skills gained or learning which occurs outside of, but concurrent with, the formalized inservice education program could affect the aptitude test results of both the experimental and control groups.

2. Members of both the experimental and control groups had the opportunity to attend seminars, workshops, and training sessions conducted by the National School Boards Association and the Texas Association of School Boards. Whether or not they attended, and whatever knowledge may have been gained by their attendance, could not be controlled and may have affected the test results of members of both groups.

3. Because of the diversity of tasks engaged in by members of local boards of trustees, the knowledge areas which were tested were not all-inclusive on any subject. The assessment instrument was designed to measure generalized knowledge in a number of representative areas where decision-making is necessary by board members.
Findings

The information gathering, analysis of data, and comparison of incorrect answers on the knowledge assessment instrument resulted in several findings.

Concerning Elements Present in Inservice Education Programs

An analysis and interpretation of the data obtained reveals the following findings.

1. The inservice education programs described in this study were not designed with the purpose of increasing knowledge in any of the skill areas identified as necessary for board members. Some of those areas were, however, addressed indirectly during the course of the inservice activities.

2. Goal-setting was the primary objective of the inservice education sessions. A need for a sense of direction prompted each district to either re-evaluate existing goals or establish goals where none existed.

3. Board members felt uninformed about district programs and established routine activities to increase their knowledge. Board members felt that an understanding of the programs and how they were related to the goals set by the district increased their effectiveness as decision-makers.

4. According to those who participated in the formal inservice programs, a commitment to inservice education for
board members, both by the board members themselves as well as district administrators, is required. Not only do the sessions demand a great deal of time, but to benefit both the participants in general and the district as a whole, candor is essential.

**Concerning Effect of Inservice Education on Knowledge**

An analysis and interpretation of the data obtained reveals the following findings.

1. Participation in a formal program of inservice education appeared to have no significant effect on the knowledge of members of boards of trustees of local school districts.

2. The data imply that no one of the three programs in which the board members had participated had a greater effect on knowledge than another.

3. There does not appear to be an inservice program in operation in Texas which addresses the skill areas identified as necessary for board members.

**Concerning Effect of Inservice Education on Attitude**

An analysis and interpretation of the data obtained reveals the following findings.

1. Participation in a formal program of inservice education, regardless of its quality or organization, seemed
to result in a more positive attitude toward inservice education.

2. While the difference in attitude between the experimental and control groups was found to be significant, mean scores of the control group were also positive, leading to the inference that even if board members are not participants in a program of inservice education, they feel it is a valuable practice.

3. The length of time in which a district had been involved in an inservice training program for board members appeared to have a positive effect on the attitude of board members toward inservice.

Concerning Effect of Various Components of Inservice on Knowledge

A comparison of incorrect responses on the knowledge assessment instrument by members of the experimental group revealed the following findings.

1. Questions which were answered incorrectly by more than half of the members of the experimental group covered the subjects of law, Texas Education Agency accreditation regulations, insurance for athletes, taxation, and federal funding. Because the programs in operation in the districts comprising the experimental group have goal-setting as their main focus, these areas would not be included. It could also be presumed that information-gathering about district programs might not generate knowledge about those subjects.
2. Items which were answered correctly by all of the members of the experimental group, or which were answered incorrectly by only one person, were in areas which are likely to be dealt with by board members during their regular deliberations: discipline, audit regulations, bonding, personnel, policies, citizen participation in board meetings, and role delineation. It would be impractical to conclude that components in the inservice education programs had an effect on knowledge in these areas.

Conclusions

**Concerning Components of Inservice Programs**

The inservice education programs described in this study do not relate to the skill areas identified as necessary for board members. There do not appear to be programs which relate directly to the skill areas available to school board members in Texas.

**Concerning Analysis of Data**

Findings resulting from the analyses of data in this study lead to the conclusion that inservice education programs for board members which are currently in operation and which were described in this study have no significant effect on the knowledge of board members in skill areas which have been identified as necessary for board members. Because the program components do not relate directly to
those skill areas, the various components in the inservice programs have no significant effect on knowledge in these areas. Board members appeared to have adequate knowledge in skill areas which may be called upon during routine deliberations of the board of trustees. Board members showed a lack of knowledge in areas which would not surface as frequently. Had the study been limited to new board members, scores in all areas might have been lower due to their inexperience.

Participation in the inservice education program described in this study was found to make a significant difference in the board members' attitude toward inservice although members of the control group also had a positive attitude toward inservice. Comparison of the means of experimental group members leads to the conclusion that the longer a board has participated in inservice education, the more positive their attitude is toward inservice.

Discussion

The original purpose of this study was to develop and implement a training program for board members which incorporated the skill areas identified to be needed by board members. A training model was developed but never implemented due to a lack of interest on the part of superintendents and boards of education across the state. Experts in the fields of school law, finance, print and electronic media, and school policy development were engaged and a
handbook of resource materials was assembled. Numerous opportunities for participation were given to individual boards of education and groups of boards, at no cost for training materials or presenters. These opportunities included a weekend retreat sponsored by the Division of School Administration and Supervision, North Texas State University. Attempts were made for over a year to schedule a sufficient number of participants to implement the program. When it became apparent that there would be no cooperation with school districts, the original purpose was altered to a description of existing programs and their effectiveness as determined by the testing instrument.

The inservice education programs identified by the Texas Association of School Boards were considered to be exemplary or model programs. It was found, however, that the programs consisted mainly of goal-setting activities, which was cited as an essential component of training programs in only one research study reviewed in Chapter II. None were designed as training programs concerned with the skill areas identified to be needed by board members and none could therefore be in keeping with the intent of the training requirement specified in House Bill 72.

Board members in both the experimental and control groups performed well on the knowledge assessment instrument, leading one to ask if inservice education is even necessary.
to cover the skill areas identified. Inservice which does not relate to the skill areas is perceived as helpful, and appears to touch on some of the skill areas. From the data gathered regarding the knowledge of board members, it appears that the knowledge gained during the course of decision-making as a board member addresses the skill areas adequately. However, new board members should be provided orientation to help them become functioning board members more quickly. In addition, any program of inservice education should identify weak areas and focus on them, and leave other areas to be addressed by routine deliberations.

Recommendations

The question of whether or not board members in Texas should participate in inservice education or training activities has been answered by the passage of House Bill 72 during the summer of 1984. That legislation put into the law a requirement that local board members "participate in training activities consistent with statewide standards" (23, p. 164). In light of this legislation, the literature review, work of the professional panel members, and the results of this study, several recommendations can be made.

1. Training programs should be refined and extended to include all kinds of knowledge and skill areas needed by board members. Information-gathering sessions which have as their purpose to provide in-depth knowledge of district
programs and practices should include background information to ensure that board members have a solid foundation of knowledge.

2. Inservice education and training should become a routine and regular occurrence for boards of education. A policy covering board training should be adopted and funds should be budgeted to cover travel to conferences and seminars, consultant services for locally-tailored inservice, and a professional library of resources (3, 10, 15). Candidates should be informed of time requirements for study, meetings, and training before they are elected, and must be made cognizant of the importance of all three aspects of board service.

3. A major area of weakness in inservice education identified in the literature is orientation of new board members (6, 7, 19, 20, 21). During the first months of service, board members do not have the benefit of experience that other board members have. Orientation should be an integral part of inservice education for board members whether a district develops its orientation program locally or uses one of the many already-developed programs for new board members (9, 12, 14). Districts should also institute a pre-election program. Some of the literature reviewed in this study outlined programs currently in operation for candidates (1, 5, 8, 12).
4. A retreat setting should be employed for inservice education sessions. A major concern of board members who participated in inservice education programs described in this study was having everyone's full attention. Meeting in a "neutral" site, such as a restaurant, hotel, or nearby city or town, provides an environment more conducive to training.

5. Sessions which provide information about district programs should be a part of the regular board meeting. Discussion of recent training or inservice activities by board members should also be a part of the regular board meeting. Both of these practices will increase the knowledge of the citizenry while exhibiting the importance placed on continuing education by the board.

6. Regular campus visitation by board members should be an integral part of an on-going process of inservice education. Not only does it allow board members to observe practices in action, but it also allows district employees to develop a close and familiar relationship with board members.

7. Inservice education should be carefully developed so as not to duplicate what is learned through the routine job tasks and decision-making activities of the board members. Inservice education should augment learning with information of a specific nature to address weaknesses in areas such as law and finance.
Suggestions for Further Research

As a result of findings and limitations of this study, several recommendations are made for further research in the development and implementation of training programs. In addition, suggestions are made for further research to test the effectiveness of the training programs or inservice education activities.

1. A study in which there was control over the content of the training program would provide evidence as to the effectiveness of that program on the knowledge of the participants as compared with the knowledge of non-participants. A research design measuring two non-equivalent groups before and immediately after one group has received treatment would provide research data and training materials which could be adapted to a local community, to school board members in other areas of Texas, and the nation. This study could also be adapted to other local, state or national entities which have elected boards.

2. A longitudinal study to assess the retention of knowledge of the groups participating in inservice training programs would generate data to determine the long-range effectiveness of the training programs. A comparison of participant scores immediately following training and after a specified period of time, such as six months, should provide an impetus for refinement or extension of the training
program. An extension of this study would compare the retention of knowledge of participating groups after a specified period of time, such as six months, with the accumulated knowledge of non-participants. This should provide interesting data about the effectiveness of the training program as opposed to knowledge gained through the normal decision-making processes employed by local boards of trustees. Similar studies could also be done using other groups involved in the decision-making process, such as members of citizens' advisory groups or school district administrators.

3. Texas and Oklahoma are currently the only states which have legislation requiring board inservice education or training. A study which compares the attitudes toward inservice education between board members in Texas and board members in a state where inservice education is not mandated could provide interesting data concerning the effect of a legislative mandate on board members' attitudes. A similar study which determines universal knowledge areas necessary which are not state-specific and assesses those areas between states which do and do not require inservice education or training should make a valuable contribution to training programs for board members.

4. House Bill 72, passed by the Texas Legislature in 1984 and requiring board member participation in training activities (23), states that an advisory committee will be
appointed by the State Board of Education to develop state-
wide standards on the duties of school board members. A
study which compares these duties with the skill areas which
have been identified in this study as necessary for board
members could provide insight into perceptions of different
groups as to the roles and responsibilities of board members.
This information would make a significant contribution to
improving the inservice education programs offered for board
members.
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APPENDICES
### APPENDIX A

**Districts identified by the Texas Association of School Boards with Inservice Education Programs:**
(Listed alphabetically)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Wealth per Student</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>$3,190,748,000</td>
<td>$277,456</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34,171</td>
<td>5,261,246,000</td>
<td>153,857</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,010,732,000</td>
<td>777,486</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>408,170,000</td>
<td>111,217</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>1,055,347,000</td>
<td>422,138</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45,792</td>
<td>2,457,735,000</td>
<td>53,662</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Districts Similar to Experimental Districts from Which Control Group Chosen:**
(Listed alphabetically)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Wealth per Student</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>$670,174,000</td>
<td>140,722</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>4,272,820,000</td>
<td>321,264</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>460,725,000</td>
<td>131,260</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59,927</td>
<td>4,659,972,000</td>
<td>77,795</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,866</td>
<td>3,932,997,000</td>
<td>234,105</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,025</td>
<td>4,143,049,000</td>
<td>295,932</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36,607</td>
<td>4,873,273,000</td>
<td>133,149</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37,162</td>
<td>4,765,661,000</td>
<td>37,162</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>463,045,000</td>
<td>210,475</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 3, 1984

Dear,

I am conducting a research project for a doctoral dissertation through North Texas State University describing and assessing the effects of local training for school board members on knowledge and attitude. Paula Hardy, Texas Association of School Boards, has identified your school district as one which should be considered for participation in the project because of your local board inservice program.

The project involves the description of local inservice training programs for board members in three Texas districts, and the administration of two assessment instruments. One is an objective test of knowledge related to skill areas needed by board members, as identified by T.A.S.B., the National School Boards Association, and research literature. The second is a scale measuring board member’s attitudes toward inservice.

In addition to these three "experimental" districts, three other Texas districts without training programs will be given the knowledge and attitude scales. These districts will be "matched" to the three experimental districts in the areas of student enrollment, wealth per student, and geographical location.

The results of scores on the assessment instruments will be compared among and between groups. Data will be descriptive in nature.

Except for demographic data, districts participating in the project will remain anonymous. Participation in the study should require a minimum outlay of time. Administration of the two assessment instruments should take about thirty minutes. Data to be used for the description of the inservice program will be done in an interview session with the full board, and may take from thirty minutes to one hour. I would like to meet with your full board, and with you, to discuss the elements of your training/inservice program, why and how you got into local training, reactions to it, etc.

I hope you will give consideration to participation in this project. Currently, there are no reported studies in Texas or the United States which look at the effects of inservice for school board members on their knowledge or attitudes toward inservice. Results of this study have been requested by the T.A.S.B., the N.A.S.B., and the Texas Education Agency. The Chairperson of the Governor’s Select Committee on Public Education has also requested the results.

May I call you later in the week to discuss your district’s participation? Thank you!

Sincerely,

Nancy Ruff Meeker
August 31, 1984

Dear:

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in the study I am conducting. This will confirm that I will meet with your Board at 6:00 p.m. on September 11, 1984, in the Independent School District Administration Building. As a "control" group, members of your Board are asked to complete a scale measuring attitude toward inservice and an objective test of knowledge related to skill areas needed by Board members.

Enclosed please find a copy of both instruments for your information. You do not need to duplicate them; I will bring enough copies for your Board members with me.

Please assure your Board that, except for descriptive demographic data, districts participating in the project will remain anonymous. Board members will not be asked to put their names on the instruments. Results of the study will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

Thank you again. Should you have any questions regarding this, please feel free to call me immediately.

Sincerely,

Nancy Ruff Meeker
SKILL AREAS FOR BOARD MEMBERS

1. LEGAL
   a. due process [STUDENTS, PERSONNEL]
   b. negotiation [PERSONNEL]
   c. legislative process
   d. board agenda, meeting procedures [POLICY]
   e. attendance [STUDENTS]
   f. behavior, discipline [STUDENTS]
   g. Open Records/Open Meetings

2. FINANCIAL
   a. taxation, investment
   b. bonds
   c. budgeting
   d. real estate acquisition
   e. salary, benefits [PERSONNEL]
   f. support: transportation, food service, insurance
   g. risk management
   h. facility management, maintenance, construction

3. PERSONNEL
   a. evaluation
   b. recruitment, screening, interview
   c. contracts [LEGAL]
   d. due process [LEGAL]
   e. delegation, role delineation [POLICY]
   f. adoption of rules, regulations, by-laws (policy-making)
   g. understanding and evaluating policies
   h. organizational
   i. student dress, grading, promotion, extracurricular [STUDENTS]
   j. parental involvement
   k. research and development
   l. needs assessment, goal-setting, evaluation

4. POLICY
   a. adoption of rules, regulations, by-laws (policy-making)
   b. understanding and evaluating policies
   c. organization
   d. student dress, grading, promotion, extracurricular [STUDENTS]
   e. parental involvement
   f. research and development
   g. needs assessment, goal-setting, evaluation

5. PUBLIC RELATIONS/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
   a. media
   b. PTA, parent advisory groups, staff
   c. crisis management
   d. pressure groups

6. BOARDMANSHIP
   a. decision-making
   b. chain of command, role delineation [PERSONNEL]
   c. governance, management [POLICY]

7. STUDENTS/CURRICULUM
   a. course and time requirements [LEGAL]
   b. material selection [POLICY]
   c. student/teacher assignment; ratios [PERSONNEL]
   d. dress, grading, promotion, extracurricular [POLICY]
   e. safety

[ ] = Categories where skills overlap
SKILLS ASSESSMENT

1. Policies for a school district relate to which of the following (circle all which apply):
   a. statutory law
   b. established practice in the district
   c. established practice in the state
   d. case law
   e. constitutional law
   f. attorney general opinions
   g. TEA regulations

2. Sources of school law are (circle all which apply):
   a. constitutional law
   b. statutory law
   c. case law
   d. administrative law

3. An executive session may be called for the following reasons (circle all which apply):
   a. set teacher salaries
   b. discuss real estate sale, purchase, lease, or value
   c. discuss security personnel or devices
   d. discuss the district budget
   e. discuss or adopt assessment instruments

True-False

1. A school district may adopt a deficit budget if there is a sufficient fund balance to cover the deficit.

2. The legislature, having once granted the right to a school district to issue bonds, may not at any time remove or limit the power it originally granted.

3. The residents and taxpayers of a school district have a right to vote on the question of whether or not a school bond election should be held.

4. No textbook may be used in a school district unless previously adopted and approved by the State Board of Education.
5. Accounting documents and records must be audited annually by an independent auditor.

6. Educators are exempt from the copyright regulations when copies are to be used for instructional purposes.

7. A reporter must be given information about the amount of money spent by the school district for school board travel, meals and operations.

8. When contacted by a reporter, school employees must respond.

9. Students residing one and one-half miles from his or her campus of regular attendance, measured along the shortest route that may be traveled on public roads, and who are not classified as an eligible handicapped pupil, may receive free bus transportation.

10. An appraiser who is a classroom teacher may appraise the performance of a teacher who teaches at the same school campus at which the appraiser teaches.

11. A teacher may remove a pupil from class in order to maintain effective discipline in the classroom.

12. If you make an "off the record" comment, you should be prepared to give the reporter something on the record pertaining to the same subject.

13. Special education students may receive publicity—written, pictorial, or on television—only with written permission of their parents.

14. To manage and diffuse crisis situations, anticipate leaks of any and all confidential information and officially release as much information as possible.

15. No certified teacher may hold two jobs at the same time while under contract to a local district.

16. Local school boards may certify teachers to work within their district.

17. The Commissioner of Education may approve the operation of schools for less than 175 days of student instruction and 8 days of teacher inservice/preparation.

18. Students participating in athletic programs in local school districts may be required to purchase, or show proof of, insurance coverage.

19. Administrative regulations do not have to be approved by the Board.
20. The board sets policy, the superintendent administers it.

21. A schedule of facility maintenance on a regular basis will eliminate emergency repairs.

22. Board policies must be available to both district employees and the community.

23. A school district may set graduation requirements, teacher preparation requirements, and/or grade averages for participation in extracurricular activities over and above state requirements.

24. Overall student performance data will be compiled by campus and district and made available to the public at regularly scheduled Board meetings.

25. Actions for removal of Board members for incompetency, official misconduct, habitual drunkenness, or other causes defined by law, must be brought before the judge of the district court holding jurisdiction.

26. The 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in 1982 that there is a constitutional liberty interest in personal grooming and it may not be regulated as applied to teachers and administrators in the public school setting.

27. A principal can interview a prospective teacher, but only the superintendent has the authority to hire the teacher.

28. The concept of "lowest responsible bidder" grants boards of education discretion to reject bids from certain individuals or companies.

29. To be legally binding on a teacher, rules of the board of education must be adopted prior to issuance of his or her contract.

30. School districts are part of the state government and the present local governance could be changed to state control by the legislature.

31. To find a student guilty of incorrigible conduct, the Board or Board's designee, at a hearing that provides procedural due process, must find that all reasonable alternatives to the pupil's regular classroom program, including a variety of discipline management techniques, have been exhausted.

32. Parents of a child in special education have the right to demand that a local school district provide an "appropriate" education for their child, even if it means paying to send the child to a very expensive residential care facility.
Multiple Choice

1. State accreditation standards take into account the following (circle all which apply):
   a. goals and objectives of the district
   b. compliance with statutory regulations and requirements imposed by the SBOE under statutory authority
   c. fulfillment of curriculum requirements
   d. quality of teacher inservice training
   e. effectiveness of the district programs in special education and for special populations

2. According to state law, bids must be called for if a purchase exceeds:
   a. $2,000
   b. $3,000
   c. $4,000
   d. $5,000

3. Certified employees earn state sick leave at the rate of:
   a. Five days per year with unlimited accumulation
   b. Ten days per year to 120 days accumulation
   c. One day per month with unlimited accumulation
   d. One day per month to 150 days accumulation

4. The school tax rate per $100 valuation for maintenance and operation may not exceed:
   a. $2.50
   b. $1.25
   c. $2.00
   d. $1.50

5. The school board's primary function is to:
   a. hire teachers for the district
   b. interpret school board policy
   c. set school board policy
   d. see that the district pays its bills on time

6. If a person wants to address the board on any item, they must:
   a. call the board president 7 days before the meeting
   b. call the superintendent 48 hours before the meeting
   c. prior approval is not needed
   d. follow established procedures to be placed on the agenda
7. Any item which will appear in the official agenda and upon which the board will be requested to act must be submitted in writing to the superintendent:
   a. at least 7 days prior to the meeting
   b. at least 48 hours prior to the meeting
   c. noon the day of the meeting
   d. follow established procedures to place an item on the agenda

8. Student records:
   a. must be made available to parents within 30 days of their request
   b. can be seen only by parents or students over 18
   c. can be seen by only parents or students with parental permission
   d. may be challenged by parents

9. The U.S. Supreme Court standard of "excessive entanglement" between Church and State includes all but which of the following for a state statute:
   a. the statute must have a secular legislative purpose
   b. the statute must be based upon rational grounds which benefit the children
   c. the principal or primary effect of the statute must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion
   d. the statute must not foster excessive government entanglement with religion

10. In what area may ECIA-Chapter II funds be used?
    a. library materials
    b. adult education
    c. disruptive youth
    d. handicapped children
APPENDIX E

INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS--A

Instructions: Please read the following statements carefully.

Put a check mark (J) if you agree with the statement.
Put a cross (X) if you disagree with the statement.
If you cannot decide about a statement, you may place a question
mark (?) beside it.

There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. People differ in their opinions
on them. Please indicate your own opinion to each statement.

1. Inservice education for board members is of great value.
2. I really enjoy inservice education as a board member.
3. Inservice education for board members is profitable to everybody who takes it.
4. Inservice education for board members is very practical.
5. Any board member who participates in inservice education is bound to be benefited.
6. I am willing to spend my time in inservice education.
7. Inservice education or training for board members saves time.
8. I don't believe board training will do anybody any harm.
9. All lessons and methods used in board inservice are clear and definite.
10. I haven't any definite like or dislike for board inservice training.
11. I could do very well without inservice education as a board member.
12. I am not interested in receiving inservice training.
13. Board training is very dry.
14. I have no desire to participate in board training.
15. I have seen no value in inservice education as a board member.
16. I would not advise anyone to participate in board inservice education.
17. Inservice training for board members is a waste of time.
18. Inservice education gives board members the ability to interpret situations they
will meet in life.
19. Board training serves the needs of a large number of board members.
20. Board inservice has its merits and fills its purpose quite well.
21. Board training has its drawbacks, but I like it.
22. Board inservice is all right, but I would not take any more of it.
23. To me, board training is more or less boring.
24. No definite results are evident in board training.
25. Board training has numerous limitations and defects.
26. Board inservice education is dull.
27. Board inservice seems to be a necessary evil.
28. Board training does not hold my interest at all.
29. All of the material covered in board inservice is very uninteresting.
30. Board inservice education can't benefit me.
Instructions: Following is a list of statements about the practice of inservice education or training for members of local school boards. Please place a plus sign (+) before each statement with which you agree.

There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. People differ in their opinions on them. Please indicate your own opinion to each statement.

____ 1. Is very worthwhile.
____ 2. Is enjoyable.
____ 3. Is liked by almost everyone.
____ 4. Serves a good purpose.
____ 5. Develops cooperation.
____ 6. Should be appreciated by more people.
____ 7. Has advantages.
____ 8. Is all right in some cases.
____ 9. Isn't so bad, but is very boring.
____ 10. Has limitations and defects.
____ 11. Has several undesirable features.
____ 12. Is disliked by many people.
____ 13. Is a waste of time and money.
____ 14. Accomplishes nothing worthwhile for the individual or society.
____ 15. Is beneficial to almost everyone.
____ 16. Is endorsed by sensible people.
____ 17. Keeps us from being "one-sided".
____ 18. Has value.
____ 19. Should be liked.
____ 20. Is not boring.
____ 21. Is liked only fairly well.
____ 22. Benefits too few people.
____ 23. Serves no purpose.
____ 24. Is of no use to anyone.
____ 25. Has drawbacks.
1. Information about Board members
   a. ages
   b. length of service
   c. occupations
   d. participation in NASSBA, TASB, State and area meetings

2. Reason for having inservice (needs)

3. TASB participation in planning, designing, carrying out

4. Components of inservice program

5. Resources used: printed information, speakers, etc.

6. Reaction to as a group, individuals

7. Plans for more inservice? Regular basis?

8. How would you change it?

9. Do you think it
   a. improved attitude
   b. improved skills, knowledge
   c. improved decision-making
   d. stimulated interest
   e. was a waste of time

10. Biggest problems faced as a Board
    a. time to learn, plan
    b. everchanging rules, regs, directives
    c. money/discretion, financial (bonds, budgeting)
    d. administration of policies (role delineation)
    e. conduct of meetings, parliamentary procedure
    f. legal
    g. personnel
    h. pr (media, pressure groups, crisis mgmt)
    i. other

11. Do you set goals
    a. district
    b. Board
    c. curriculum
    d. management
    e. procedural

12. Evaluation
    a. self
    b. Bd as a whole

13. Opportunities when needed training (timely to solve a problem), but couldn't due to lack of time, expertise

14. Learn best from
    a. reading
    b. doing
    c. peer training and workshops
    d. visitation with administration, in classrooms

15. How good is your decision-making?

16. Do you have local orientation?

17. If so, what does it consist of?

18. Relationships with Board members in the area?

19. Member of area assoc?
    a. NE Tex, Region VI
    b. Brazoria County
    c. Big Bend Alliance, W Texas
I. WHY HAVE A RETREAT?

At regular board meetings it is difficult for board members to learn a lot of detailed information and do effective planning for the school district. This type of activity should take place in a different setting. At regular meetings, board members face pressure because they are called upon to vote on and consider issues affecting education of young people and taxing of community resources. Regular board meetings do not generally give board members the opportunity to deal with one another as human beings with the same objective in mind - meeting the needs of the students.

A retreat should be designed to facilitate open and honest discussion among board members and top level administrators. It should allow administrators and board members to get away from their offices and board meeting setting without the usual day-to-day interruptions. Both board members and administrators should be able to give intense concentration to the subjects at hand and, therefore, be able to make better quality decisions and/or plans. This is very difficult to do in a regular board meeting setting.

Another benefit of having a retreat is the development of positive working relationships among board members and between board members and top level administrators. By meeting for a long period of time, they simply get to know each other better as individuals.

II. POSSIBLE TOPICS FOR RETREATS

- Long-range Planning
- Goal Setting
- Intensive Study of Specific Subjects
- Evaluation of the Superintendent
- Board Self-Evaluation
III. WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED WITH THE BOARD AT RETREATS?

-- Top Level Administrators
  (superintendent, assistant superintendents )

-- Special Consultants

-- Others

[Comment: In a small school district, only the superintendent and one assistant, or the superintendent and the principals might meet with the board. In a large district this would be limited to the superintendent and a number of top level central office administrators. Again, it would depend upon the size of the system and the subject(s) at hand. An outside consultant may be called in to lead the discussion or make a presentation on a specific topic.]

IV. WHERE TO HAVE RETREATS?

The ideal location for a retreat is out-of-town and away from the city. In the city, the ideal place would be away from the board room or the usual meeting place. The place selected should allow board members to remove themselves from their daily responsibilities and avoid as many interruptions as possible. Hotels or retreat areas located in the district, or nearby, often provide the desired neutral ground and separation from daily regular activities/responsibilities for both board members and school district staff.

The setting should facilitate discussion among board members and should be a non-threatening environment.

V. PROBLEM AREAS

It should be noted that some criticism may be generated if a retreat is held out of town at a resort area. Usually that is the best setting because it really gets the board away from interruptions, but complaints from taxpayers should be expected. One way around this situation would be to get a foundation or private enterprise to donate money to cover the expense of the retreat rather than using school district funds.
If the retreat is held in town, there is still the expense of a meeting room to consider and there may be criticism for not using the board room. Again, it should be emphasized that the retreat should be held away from the regular meeting location. At the regular meeting location there is generally assigned seating and board members relate the board room with regular meeting behavior. It is important to allow them to make a distinction between the retreat and regular meetings.

VI. PLANNING THE MEETING

Pre-Meeting Planning - The board president and superintendent should plan the agenda, decide what topics are to be addressed, consider hiring a consultant or involving the school board association and do very detailed planning as regards what will actually occur at the meeting to accomplish the objectives which have been set.

The Meeting - At the meeting, details regarding the agenda should be worked out and the agenda followed religiously in order to accomplish the objectives.

Follow-up - There should be some type of evaluation following the meeting and also at a time some months after the meeting to determine whether or not any of the topics addressed at the meeting are actually being acted upon.

VII. LIVE EXPERIENCES

ISP had a board retreat on January 26-27, 1984, which was of a content nature. Attached is the agenda of that meeting, which indicates that the board met in a retreat situation and held various presentations regarding different content areas. This type of workshop would be similar to a conference or state convention, at which different presenters address different topics and then field questions.

ISP board of trustees met on January 28, 1984, in a "process" type workshop. In their workshop they went about goal setting for the 1984-85 school year. The board and top level administrative staff worked through a process and came up with the goals for the next school year. These goals were the product of their meeting. Attached is the agenda of that meeting.
DISTRICT B

FORMAT

First Work Session:

A. Information Session (Elementary Principals)
   1. Campus profile charts
   2. 1982-83 Test Report (district report, and principals bring own test data - TARS, IRT, SAT)
   3. District goals
   4. Superintendent's goals
   5. Goals/objectives submitted to Assistant Superintendents for Elementary and Secondary Education

B. Accreditation Projects for 1983-84 (Secondary Principals)
   1. TEA
   2. Southern Association
   3. Establishment of:
      a) accreditation goals/objectives
      b) Self-study
      c) Five Year Plan
   4. Relationship of accreditation project(s) to Campus Improvement Plan development

Second Work Session:

A. Information Session (Secondary Principals) Repeat Content

B. 1983-84 Accreditation Projects (Elementary Principals) Repeat Content

Third Work Session:

Principals will utilize information gained in previous sessions to start development of a Campus Improvement Plan. The plan will consist of an identification and listing of curriculum and instruction objectives which can be measured annually. Standard form will be provided for principals' usage.

Notation: Group 1 - Elementary principals
         Group 2 - Secondary principals

Fourth Work Session:

Utilize curriculum and instruction objectives established in third work session. Divide groups of principals into high school attendance zones (6 groups). Final review and development of objectives to be listed on Campus Improvement Plan. This session should solidify elementary objectives which are consistent with those developed by the secondary principals.
DISTRICT C
ORGANIZATION

PERSPECTIVE GOAL SETTING

I. Please answer the following as you believe they would be answered by the citizens of TSD in general:

A. What should be the district's focus for the 1984-85 school year and beyond?
   Basic Courses

B. What did the district accomplish this last year?
   Moved into a new facility.

C. What did the district do last year that could have been improved?

II. Please answer the following as you see them in your role as a school trustee or administrator:

A. List 3-5 things accomplished by the district last year:
   1. Completed skill continua for grades K through 2.
   2. Raised test scores on both TABS and CATS.
   3. The overall inservice was improved in several ways.
   5. 

B. List 3-5 things done last year in the district that could have been improved:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

C. List your priorities for the 1984-85 school year and beyond:
   1. Continue to work on objectives set forth in the Five Year Priorities.
   2. Improve teaching effectiveness through inservice program.
   3. Put administration on computers.
   4. 
   5. 

III. Circle your appropriate position:

   Trustee Central Office Administrator Principal
### ISD Board/Staff Workshop

**FIRST DAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session I</td>
<td>Understanding the Board's Role (utilization of overheads on Code of Ethics; Accreditation Requirements as related to the Board; Accountability; slide/tape on Board/Staff teamwork)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session II</td>
<td>Communications: The Two-Way Process (utilization of activities on identifying publics; completion of PR Report Card)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>LUNCH BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session III</td>
<td>The Board: A Self Evaluation (utilization of results from evaluation instruments completed by Board and selected administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45-4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-5:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session IV</td>
<td>The Trustee: A Self Evaluation (utilization of results from evaluation instruments completed by Board members only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>DINNER BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-9:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session V</td>
<td>Preparation for Goal Setting (utilization of slide/tape on goal setting; results from second evaluation instrument completed by Board and staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECOND DAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session VI</td>
<td>Goal Setting for the Board (free-flowing discussion resulting in action items for Board improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Session VII</td>
<td>Goal Setting for the District (discussion resulting in action items for improvement of ISD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00 noon</td>
<td>Workshop Session VIII</td>
<td>Questions, Comments and Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DISTRICT C EVALUATION

## THE BOARD AND THE TRUSTEE

### A PERCEPTUAL RELATIONS EVALUATION

#### INSTRUCTIONS:
Respond to each item on the questionnaire by circling the number which indicates the degree of conformity of your School Board or you, as an individual member of the Board, in meeting each statement.

### THE BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very High Degree of Compliance</th>
<th>Very Low Degree of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conducts its business in conformity with state laws and regulations of the Texas Education Agency.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Employs and consults as necessary with a competent attorney who specializes in school law.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Participates actively in area, state and national school boards associations.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Selects its president on the basis of ability to conduct a meeting rather than on seniority or rotation.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Calls only meetings or work sessions that are necessary.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Operates under approved parliamentary procedure.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Has developed an adequate planning mechanism for determining agendas and for having back-up information prepared for study before the meeting.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Makes the agenda of its meetings available to the public.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Has developed a clear understanding as to the kinds of matters which need not be brought to the Board's attention and which may be handled by administrative action.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Maintains a well defined and codified policy manual.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Periodically reviews and updates the policy manual.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Involves the input of administration, teachers, students and parents in development of policy.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Provides a good procedure for evaluating policy before it is adopted by the Board.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Establishes and maintains a systematic plan for feedback on policies to determine effectiveness and need for amendment, modification or deletion.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Makes policies available to all schools, teachers, students, parents and the public.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Provides for an annual recall of all copies of the policy manual to be checked for accuracy of contents.</td>
<td>S 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BOARD</td>
<td>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provides for long-range planning for acquisition of sites, additional facilities, maintenance, and energy conservation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Faces realistically the financial ability of the community to support a quality education program for its children.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Balances the interests of staff and taxpayers when making decisions about expenditures.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Weighs all decisions regarding the instructional program in terms of what is best for students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is familiar with the instructional program and the general qualifications imposed on it by the Texas Education Agency.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Establishes objectives for the educational program.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Receives periodic reports on the instructional program.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Provides the Superintendent with a clear statement of performance expectations and personal qualities against which s/he will be measured.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Provides the Superintendent with a climate of mutual respect and trust, offering commendations when earned and constructive criticism when necessary.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provides opportunity and encouragement for professional growth of the Superintendent.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Takes the initiative in maintaining a professional salary for the Superintendent comparable with salaries paid for similar responsibility in and out of the profession.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Provides the Superintendent opportunity to develop staff recommendations for action before deciding any matter, other than the Superintendent's contract.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Keeps the Superintendent informed of current issues so that no surprises occur at Board meetings.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Is kept informed by the Superintendent of current issues so that no surprises occur at Board meetings.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Immediately discusses matters tending to alienate either Board members or the Superintendent.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Provides for the complaints of employees to be heard, and if appropriate, be acted upon to correct the situation through administrative channels.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Encourages professional growth and increased competency through attendance by staff members at educational meetings.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VERY HIGH DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages the participation of the professional staff in development of curriculum and other matters that will affect them.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Makes the staff aware of the esteem in which it is held by the Board.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Provides for the issuance of periodic reports to the public.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Encourages public attendance at Board meetings.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Provides for regular communication with state legislators.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Takes leadership in developing a community-wide effort to find and persuade its most capable people to file for candidacy for the Board.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Takes every opportunity to tell the people about the good things happening in the school system.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Is receptive to suggestions for improvement of the school system.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Seeks input from administrators in the evaluation of Board performance.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Develops a well defined set of goals for improvements in Board practices.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Appoints its members to serve with citizens on advisory committees.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Adheres to an adopted Code of Ethics for Board members.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY HIGH DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE</td>
<td>VERY LOW DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do your homework before each Board meeting.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Have the ability to think independently, to grow in knowledge, and to rely on fact rather than prejudice.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Openly express your differences of opinion to other Board members and the Superintendent.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Weigh all decisions in terms of what is best for the students.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Have the willingness to hear, and consider, all sides of a controversial question.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Support the decision of the Board and/or the Superintendent if your point of view does not prevail.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Refer criticisms called to your attention to the Superintendent.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Deal with policy and allow the administration to operate the schools.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Devote the necessary time to become an effective Board member.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Know what the policy manual contains.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Avoid tying up your administrator with personal information requests that are not necessary for decision-making purposes.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Publicly support the Superintendent.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Take every opportunity to tell the people about the good things happening in your school system.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Understand that evaluation should lead to improvement rather than criticism.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Feel that you are a part of an important &quot;team&quot; effort.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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