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The purpose of this study is to ascertain the opinions of chief executive officers (CEOs) and school board chairs of Texas private schools in educational service center (ESC) Regions 10 and 11 toward board training and the potential benefits for the success of their respective roles. Literature regarding private school board training is limited. As a result, most private school boards face challenges regarding school board training expectations, which could affect their roles and the roles of CEOs.

The quantitative and qualitative cross-sectional research design examined Texas private school CEOs’ and school board chairs’ perceptions about school board training and the working relationships between Texas school CEOs and school boards. The researcher developed the survey and interview questions used in this study. Responses to a 4-point Likert-type scale instrument, short answer questions, and interviews were solicited from a population of private school CEO and school board chairs within ESC Regions 10 and 11 from schools with an enrollment of at least 100 students and that contained Grades 9 through 12. In-depth Interviews were conducted with 12 private school CEOs and 12 school board chairs with varying levels of school board training.

The research findings indicate that board training does make a significant difference in the working relationships between CEOs and private school boards. The findings of this study may assist private school boards in addressing school board training and the components of such training, which would benefit the working relationships between CEOs and school boards, as well as the success of private schools.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

School board training and ongoing professional development opportunities have been ignored in many aspects of governance in private schools. While many private school educators and independent school journals speak to the importance of training private school board members, inquiry on private school board training is limited. The reasons for the lack of research vary. For example, private schools are not required to report data to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Most importantly, the state of Texas does not require private schools in the state to receive state accreditation, follow state curriculum, participate in student assessment programs, employ certified teachers and administrators, or provide school board member training.

Among these factors, the TEA ceased accrediting private schools in 1989. Walsh, Kemerer, and Maniotis, (2000) stated, “[The] commissioner of education has endorsed the accreditation decisions of a consortium of private school accreditation associated called the Texas Private School Accreditation Commission (TEPSAC)” (p. 25). Because of a lack of state control, very little litigation has occurred concerning private schools over the years.

The roles of the chief executive officer (CEO) and school board chair as educational leaders are, without question, critical to the success of the students, families, and teachers in a private school. However, unlike public school districts, private schools do not require school board training. Some believe that school board training provided throughout the school year should be a perquisite to develop effective school boards. Therefore, private school board members should be encouraged to participate in training because poor board performance is a major cause for ineffective organizations (McClellan, 1978). Members of the school board who
may be inexperienced or uninformed in the many policy and decision-making areas could benefit from such training.

For the purposes of this study, the term CEO is used to replace the word superintendent, and refers to the person who leads the day-to-day operations of the school. Private schools typically refer to the head of the school as the president or CEO. The private school leader or CEO has additional responsibilities compared to public school superintendents; for example, raising funds for the operation and growth of the school.

In a 1972, the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) found that the average tenure of a CEO was 7.3 years. Since then, this average has decreased by 1 year to an average of 6.3 years (McClellan, 1978). According a NAIS (2013) governance study, board chairs identified major weaknesses relating to tenure, turnover, and the introduction and training of new members on the board. According to DeKuyper (2007), “Unplanned CEO departures can be disruptive to enrollment, faculty morale, community perceptions, and fund raising” (p. 132). Similarly, McClellan (1978) noted, “Emotional damage, financial loss, and diminished creative energies all follow from a change of CEO that takes place in the midst of a cacophony of dispute, disdain and defensiveness” (p. 2). McClellan also stated that some issues occur because of inner fears on the part of individual board members.

The working relationship between a board of directors and the CEO of any organization plays a significant role in the ability of that organization to achieve its established goals effectively. Thus, a successful partnership between the board and CEO lends itself to a successful governance process (Kilmister & Nahkies, 2004). This professional relationship begins with an engaged board that acts as a partner with the CEO.
Hart (2000) discussed the importance of a private school board that provides insight and support, and that encourages the CEO and administrative team. Hart also explained the importance of the private school board recognizing its primary role of hiring and overseeing the CEO, assuring the organization remains accountable to the mission and its stakeholders, and securing the funding needs of the organization. Therefore, it is imperative that school boards define the roles, behaviors, and responsibilities required by board members, as well as the boundaries of their CEOs. Private school board governance is a broad oversight and is not considered a function of management or administration.

Providing professional development for the CEO and board president based on respect and trust is essential for effective school governance and progress toward educational reform (Petersen & Short, 2001). Therefore, it is essential that the CEO develop a working relationship with the school board president, and the board chair should act as a coach to the CEO. Lewis (2010) stated the board chair has the key responsibility of ensuring that the CEO is well informed. To achieve this goal, a continual flow of information should exist between the board chair and CEO. Additionally, the school board chair should run interference on controversial issues between board members. The board chair also has the responsibility of informing new board members of their roles and responsibilities.

Lewis (2010) noted, “The CEO’s relationship with the board chair should be a partnership characterized by candor, continuous feedback and shared goals and aspirations” (p. 33). Steps should be taken to create a board culture that can sustain changes of membership (Richardson, 2005). Eadie (2029) suggested, “One of the most important investments that any organization can make is in building its board’s governing capacity, since high-impact boards make a huge difference in the affairs of the organization they govern” (p. 40). High-impact
governing boards make a real difference through their governing activities, which means the school board and the CEO must work together to achieve student success (Clay & Soldwedel, 2009).

Student achievement should be the priority of both school and community leaders. Waters and Marzano (2006) found schools with high levels of academic success have school boards that are supportive of academic goals. Sound leadership at a private school also adds value to the education system. Academic success only occurs through collaboration, not confrontation, between the CEO and school board members. Thus, school board members and CEOs need to measure their successes by that of their students (Education Writers Association [EWA], n.d.).

The purpose of the current study was to determine the current opinion of the CEO and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training and specific components of training that could influence private school boards. This study also sought to determine how training might influence the respective successes of CEOs and school board chairs. Finally, this study aimed to determine how school board training influences the professional working relationship between CEOs and school boards.

Statement of the Problem

An effective relationship must exist between the school governing board and its CEO for the school leadership to be successful (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2001). A growing number of private schools lack the collaboration and cooperation needed between school board members and CEOs. The loss of respect for the CEO is reflected in greater incidents of micromanagement by boards of education and inadequate compensation (Hoyle, 2002).
The relationship between CEOs and school board members can be antagonistic without guidance. The school board chair is the leader of the school governing board and is the key communication link between the board and the CEO (Glass, 2001). However, some school board members are inexperienced, uninformed, or under qualified in areas that the board needs to set policies. Tension between the CEO and school board can interfere with the success of private schools. Additionally, role confusion can develop on behalf of both CEOs and school board members. Thus, effective private school board training is important to develop positive relationships between these leaders of private schools.

This research is important to extend the knowledge base regarding school board training and its influence on leadership decisions. If private schools are to be successful, it is imperative that research identify leadership expectations of school boards and CEOs. This need warrants investigation into the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs on school board training, components of training, and on how such training might influence the professional working relationship between CEOs and school boards and their respective success.

Rationale for the Study

There is a clear need for this study to increase the future success of private schools and to extend the knowledge base regarding school board and CEO relationships and the effects of such relationships on the success of these schools. Success of schools depends largely on the leadership skills and working relationships between school board members and CEOs. Glass (2007) stated that many members of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) believe conflict between school board members and CEOs is more prevalent today than in past years. Results from the current study could offer the necessary information to improve
the relationships between private school board members and CEOs, which could increase the tenure of CEOs in these schools.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate whether any relationship exists between school board training and the professional relationships between board members and CEOs. I examined the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools on school board training, components of training, and on how such training might influence the professional working relationship between the CEO and school board and their respective success. The position of a school CEO is unique and plays a critical role in connecting schools and communities represented by school governing boards (Glass, 2007). However, few educators want to undertake this difficult position (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000). Examining the roles and responsibilities of private school boards and determining how board training can influence a school has the potential to strengthen the relationships between school boards and CEOs.

The collected data were used to analyze how school board training and the components of such training influence the professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards. It was the intention of this researcher to provide private school boards and CEOs with survey results on basic information to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of their school board training. This tool will provide participants with a framework for further discussion and analysis of effective school board training within private schools.

The findings from this study will also enable board members and CEOs to understand their unique roles and responsibilities better, which will allow them to evaluate their effectiveness in carrying out the missions of their organizations. The research questions were
examined through inductive data analysis of the results from a quantitative survey instrument and in-depth interviews of both private school CEOs and board chairs. This mixed-method approach combined triangulation and quantitative methods to answer the research questions.

Research Questions

I addressed the following research questions regarding private school board training:
1. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training?
2. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific components of private school board training that could potentially influence school boards?
3. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective successes?
4. How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationships with their school boards?

Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of private school board chairs and CEOs regarding school board training and its components and to determine how that training might influence their respective successes and working relationships. Cronin, Goodman, and Zimmerman (2004) believed that mandated school board training provides board members with up-to-date information and allows them to become more knowledgeable in their roles and responsibilities. According to Salpeter and Bray (2003), in-service training should be organized so that all participants find relevancy in the instruction. Additionally, “school board training in
school governance provides a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of board members” (Nutt, 2010, p. 8). The conceptual framework presented in Figure 1 illustrates how training of school board members affects their roles as educational leaders.

![Conceptual Framework for Private School Board Training](image)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework for private school board training.

**Definition of the Terms**

The following terms are defined as they were used in this study:

**Chief Executive Officer (CEO).** The CEO represents the position of superintendent, president, or head of a private school. The CEO is an individual employed by the school board in the private school systems to run the school. Carver (2002) stated a “CEO has personal authority over all these actions and people, but burdened with personal accountability for those same actions and people” (p. 340).
**Superintendent.** A superintendent is an individual in the public school who has executive oversight and administrative powers, usually within an educational entity or organization. The superintendent is responsible for the management and organization of the public school district.

**Educational region service center.** The educational region service center is a Texas Education Agency, which promotes the organizational and leadership development of districts and campuses by providing specialized training and technical support.

**Policy.** Policy refers to the principles, plans, or courses of action established, sought, and commanded by the governing body of a school system, and deals with values, aims, and desired ends, rather than means (Poston, 1994).

**Private schools.** Private schools are those founded, conducted, and maintained by a private group rather than by the government. These schools usually charge tuition and often follow a particular philosophy.

**Professional relationship.** Professional relationship refers to a good understanding between colleagues, clients, or any other important person for various reasons. These relationships involve work-related issues and businesses.

**School board members.** School board members are a group of people chosen to set the policies, vision, and goals for the school, and hold the school accountable for the results.

**School board president.** The school board president is an individual elected to the central leadership position of a school board by peer members of that board. In private schools, board presidents typically serve 2-year terms and are elected annually at mandated reorganization board meetings.
School board/CEO relations. School board/CEO relations refer to the working relationships between CEOs of private schools and the governing school boards; these relationships can effect the daily operations of a private school.

Limitations

The data analysis was based on questionnaires and interviews of private school board member chairs and CEOs of private schools located in the Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 in Texas. The following limitations were considered in relation to the study:

1. Participants included leaders in private schools who were members of Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 and represent private schools that have at least 100 students enrolled in Grades 9-12; therefore, findings may not translate to other private schools.

2. Private school board members are not required by the State Texas to participate in school board training.

3. The public does not elect private school board members; rather, current board members select private school board members and CEOs.

4. Responses were self-reported by private school CEOs and private school board chairs.

5. Participants may not have completed the survey or answered the interview questions honestly, and their biases, experiences, and knowledge may have influenced their responses.

6. A lack of time may have limited participants from completing the survey. Participants may have partially completed the survey and then forgot to do the rest. While the survey should have taken no more than 15 minutes to complete, if participants
became distracted or lost interest, they may have chosen not to finish. However, participants were given unlimited time within a 2-week period to complete the survey.

Assumptions

I made the following assumptions during this study:

1. Respondents understood the scope of the study and answered the questionnaire honestly and objectively.
2. School board and CEO characteristics were accurately reflected in the survey.
3. Private school board training varies between private schools.

Summary

Houston and Eadie (2007) noted, “Effective education is all about the relationships and the active collaboration and cooperation of partners—teachers and students, students and parents, teachers and parents, schools and communities, CEO/superintendents and school boards” (p. 73). A primary responsibility of CEOs is building strategically significant relationships with school board members. The need for adequate school board training could improve the professional working relationships between CEOs and school board members. Providing school board training with an emphasis on systems management, team building, and trust can give CEOs a greater sense of support and respect (Hoyle, 2002).

The aim of this research was to discover the perceptions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training and its components. The study also aimed to determine the opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools on how training might influence their respective success. Finally, this study aimed to discern how board training influences the CEOs’ professional working
relationships with their school board. As Reimer (2008) noted, “Board members must learn to govern” (p. 37). Thus, by understanding the training needs of board chairs and other school board members, more structured and relevant instructional activities can be designed to support the CEOs of private schools.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Private schools and private school boards hold a unique position in the education arena; therefore, it is imperative that private school board members participate in school board training. Specifically, training is important in developing the relationship between the school board and the chief executive officer (CEO) of private schools. Without board training, schools could suffer with high CEO turnover, which affects the success of schools (Grissom & Anderson, 2012).

Other causes of CEO turnover include micromanagement by board members (Hoyle, 2002), CEOs not receiving support from board members (Bredeson, Klar, & Johansson, 2008), and special agendas created by board members (Fossey, 2011a). Governance of schools, whether public or private, incorporates many of the same expectations and issues. Mountford (2004) suggested that the relationship between a CEO and school board members, whether positive or negative, influences the success of a school. Additionally, Land (2002) examined public school governance and found,

Negative board-superintendent working relationships are marked by an overload of information and work for the board, too much board involvement in administrative matters, lack of board independence for the superintendent, and haste on the part of the superintendent to resolve issues. (p. 253)

Therefore, training could be essential in developing a positive relationship between the school board and CEOs.

Chapter 2 examines the literature regarding the role of private schools in the American education system, with specific focus on the state accreditation guidelines and the rights of
private schools. This chapter includes a description of the roles and responsibilities of the CEO and superintendent, which provides a backdrop to discuss similarities of these roles in schools and present the need for a positive working relationship between these leaders and their school boards. The following sections include a discussion on the role of private and public school boards in establishing missions, setting polices, selecting and evaluating CEOs, and ensuring the integrity and financial management of the school. This discussion includes a breakdown of specific tasks considered essential for effective board leadership. Chapter 2 concludes with a discussion of current trends and expectations for school board training, which is expected to improve relationships between the school boards and CEOs of the private schools.

Private School Board Members

Schools with school boards that are constantly effective attain that level of performance because their leaders follow three enduring principles: engage directly and deeply in the substantive work of their organizations, hire and evaluate CEOs, and cultivate the right composition of professional backgrounds (Jonker & Meehan, 2014). When a school has a mediocre or inattentive board, it is easy for the entire organization to head down the wrong strategic path (Jonker & Meehan, 2014). Danzberger and Usdan (1994) identified the following 10 areas of common criticism of school boards, with a focus on training seen in several areas:

1. School boards fail to provide far-reaching or politically risky leadership for reform.

2. School boards have become another level of administration, often micromanaging the school.

3. School boards are so splinted by attempts to represent special interests or meet their individual political needs that boards cannot govern effectively.
4. School boards are not spending enough time educating themselves about issues or about education policy-making.

5. School boards have not provided the leadership required mobilizing other agencies and organizations to meet the health and social service needs of students and their families.

6. School boards do not exercise adequate policy oversight, lack adequate accountability measures, and fail to communicate progress to the public.

7. School boards rely on rhetoric rather than action in regarding decision making on the board.

8. School boards exhibit serious problems in their capacity to develop positive and productive lasting relationships with their CEO.

9. School boards pay little or no attention to their performance and to their needs for ongoing training.

10. School boards tend either to make decisions in response to the ‘issue of the day’ in changing communities or to govern to maintain the status quo in more stable communities. (p. 369)

Private schools need to provide school board members orientation and ongoing professional development opportunities throughout the school year (Morrison, 1996). Such training is necessary, as some board members are inexperienced or uninformed in policy related areas. Thus, school board members need opportunities to participate in board training to handle the issues of governance.
The Purpose of Private Schools

Today, private schools help fulfill the American ideal of educational pluralism. The Council of American Private Schools (CAPE, n.d.) stated,

As America’s first schools, private schools established our country’s foundation for education. Our nation is blessed by a rich diversity of schools—some rooted in religious tradition, some that provides intensive academic experiences and some that are specialized for specific populations. Whether public or private, these diverse schools constitute the American educational experience and share a worthy goal: the education of our country’s children. Together, public and private schools work to ensure an educated citizenry; together they strive to help students reach their potential and contribute to the common good. (p. 1)

Texas Private School Accreditation Commission (TEPSAC) ensures quality in private schools by monitoring and approving organizations that accredit the various non-public elementary and secondary educational institutions in the State of Texas. The state commissioner of education recognizes the TEPSAC and its affiliated non-public schools. According to the TEPSAC (n.d.),

The relationship of TEPSAC with the Commissioner allows for the following activities related to accredited non-public schools:

- Transferability of student credits earned in accredited nonpublic schools to Texas public schools as permitted by Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 74.26 (a) (2).
- Recognition of teacher service in accredited nonpublic schools for salary increment purposes in Texas public schools, as authorized in the Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 153.1021(h)(8).
• Acknowledgment of all accredited elementary and secondary nonpublic schools in the Texas.

• The listing of all accredited non-public schools in the Texas School Directory (http://www.tepsac.org). (para. 3)

The Bill of Rights, Fourteenth Amendment, and most provisions of the Texas Education Code (TEC) do not apply to private schools because they are not related to the state. However, private schools are not exempt from basic health and safety laws passed by local, state, and federal governments. Walsh et al. (2005) noted, “Private schools are subject to the Civil Rights Act, which outlaws discrimination in employment, though there are some exemptions for very small schools and for those that are religiously affiliated” (p. 26). Section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has specific wording that allows religious nonprofit employers to discriminate based on religion.

Employment contracts are important in the hiring of teachers for private schools. The rights an individual has in private schools depend to a large extent on the wishes of the private school (Walsh et al., 2010). Thus, the rights between employer and employee are determined by the “terms and conditions of the contract between the parties” (Walsh et al., 2010, p. 144). Many private schools use at-will contracts for faculty and staff. Generally, at-will employee may be discharged at any time without cause unless an agreement exits that limits the employer’s right to terminate employment (Center for Education & Employment [CEE], 2010). This type of contract allows private school employers more flexibility in hiring and dismissing teachers, as well as freedom to create specific details of individual contracts.
The Role of the Private School CEO

It is important to understand the roles and responsibilities of the CEO regarding working with private school boards. The CEO is a key member of the leadership team, and his or her performance is likely to be an important determinant of school effectiveness (McCormick, Barnett, Seyyed, & Newcombe, 2006). Therefore, it is crucial that CEOs of private schools aim to increase both recruitment and retention and oversee fundraising efforts. According to Portin, Alejano, Knapp, and Marzolf (2006), school leaders are “implicitly or explicitly charged with recruiting students and marketing their schools at the same time that they redouble efforts to improve student improvement” (p. 20).

McClellan (1978) and Carver (2002) advocated that CEOs spend time developing formal policies, procedures, and processes. Additionally, these leaders should have deep personal convictions and focus on the mission of their schools and the academic success of their students. Thus, CEOs need to acquire the ability to gather support through shared decision-making, board involvement, and instructional strategies.

The CEO has many responsibilities and duties to ensure student success. Bassett (2005) discussed the parallels between business and school leaders, and provided a list of seven factors that school leaders must be aware. First, he found that a CEO of a school cannot run the school. In other words, the CEO cannot monitor everything and will not know everything that happens in the school. Second, a CEO who gives orders can be very costly, as a “command and control” leadership does not work well in schools. Rather, a CEO should mentor, model, and develop middle management, and decisions should be made as a team.

Third, it is difficult for a CEO to know what is really going on in the school; therefore, a successful CEO should develop relationships with members of his or her staff to stay well
informed. Fourth, every move a CEO makes sends a message, thus, it is imperative that the CEO is clear in all communications. A wise leader clearly states issues to be decided collectively, and uses the input from administration and the school board to make the final decisions. Fifth, the CEO is not the boss; rather, he or she reports to the school board, which has the ultimate power; the CEO should consider the board chair as a mentor or coach. Bassett (2005) stated, “The skill in which the CEO ‘manage up’ determines not only the forward movement of their schools, but also their longevity in office” (p. 2).

Sixth, pleasing shareholders is not the CEO’s role; rather, the CEO must work with the board to develop long-term strategies and goals. While some shareholders might not agree with the developed goals, the CEO and school board must focus on student success. Seventh, the CEO is only human; therefore, he or she must be careful when setting priorities. A successful CEO needs to make professional and personal commitments, and it is imperative that the CEO manage within the context of goals and commitments, not daily operations. Thus, a CEO must be sensitive to the school culture and adapt his or her personal leadership style to that culture. A successful CEO will also “maintain a salubrious climate and build a culture that supports teachers and makes it possible for children to learn” (Bassett, 2005, p. 2).

Private school CEOs also must also be aware of the civil rights of their faculty and students. In Doe v. Episcopal School of Dallas the school was found guilty of fraud and negligent behavior for mishandling of a 2009 statutory rape accusation (Jennings & Goldstein, 2011, St. Amant, 2011). A teacher from the Episcopal School was accused of having sexual relations with a 16-year-old student. School administrators convinced the victim to withdraw. The student’s parents sued the school for civil charges against their daughter, and a jury awarded $9 million to the family for punitive and compensatory damages (Jennings & Goldstein, 2011).
Cases like the above play an important role in CEO tenure, student enrollment, and retention of private school students.

The Role of the Public School Superintendent

Although private school CEOs are responsible for tasks such as recruitment, retention and fundraising, some duties are the same or similar to those of public school superintendents. The public school superintendent is responsible for securing finances, evaluating student assessments, analyzing school and community data, and developing instructional innovations to increase student achievement (Byrd, Drews, & Johnson, 2006). The superintendent is also responsible for daily management and administrative tasks including personnel issues and student discipline (Education Writers Association [EWA], 2005). The superintendent must also provide the school board with good information to make decisions (EWA, 2005). The characteristics of expertise, trustworthiness, attractiveness, assertiveness, and emotiveness play important roles in the superintendent’s influence (Petersen & Short, 2001). According to the TEC (1995b), the duties of the public school superintendent include:

1. Administrative responsibility and leadership for the planning, operation, supervision, and evaluation of the education programs, services, and facilities of the district and for the annual performance appraisal of the district's staff;

2. Assuming administrative authority and responsibility for the assignment and evaluation of all personnel of the district other than the superintendent; making recommendations regarding the selection of personnel of the district other than the superintendent, as provided by Section 11.163;

3. Initiating the termination or suspension of an employee or the nonrenewal of an employee's term contract; managing the day-to-day operations of the district as its
administrative manager; preparing and submitting to the board of trustees a proposed budget as provided by Section 44.002;

(4) Preparing recommendations for policies to be adopted by the board of trustees and overseeing the implementation of adopted policies;

(5) Developing or causing to be developed appropriate administrative regulations to implement policies established by the board of trustees;

(6) Providing leadership for the attainment of student performance in the district based on the indicators adopted under Section 39.051 and other indicators adopted by the State Board of Education or the district's board of trustees;

(7) Organizing the district's central administration; and

(8) Performing any other duties assigned by action of the board of trustees. (§11.201)

Bredeson et al. (2008) noted that superintendents are responsible for managing the direction of the school, supporting the administrative team, fostering relationships among the various stakeholders, and managing resources. A positive and productive superintendent-school board relationship is essential for success in the school system (Geisick, 2006). Petersen and Short (2001) found that favorable board decision making with the superintendent was closely related to the trustworthiness, expertise, and social attractiveness of the superintendent.

The superintendent assumes primary responsible for helping the board develop itself as a governing body and dedicates 20% to 25% of his or her time working with the board directly (Eadie, 2003). The superintendent must keep the board informed, form leadership teams, act as a buffer, communicate frequently and directly with various constituencies, and develop personal and trusting relationships with board members (Bredeson et al., 2011). If a board member finds his or her governing work interesting, enjoyable, and ego satisfying, that member will feel
greater contentment and gratification. Consequently, the superintendent-school board member working relationship will be stronger (Houston & Eadie, 2002).

Moody (2008) surveyed 126 school board presidents and 214 public school superintendents on specific professional competencies. He wanted to identify which competencies were essential for a superintendent to be successful. The competencies examined included public relations, school finance, personnel management, curriculum development, policy formulation, school construction, accomplishment of goals set by the board, superintendent-board relations, and collective bargaining. Moody noted that superintendents are expected to be efficient managers and instructional leaders. While Moody (2008) found that all of these competencies were important, the most critical competency for the continued employment of the superintendent was the personal relationship between the superintendent and school board.

Glass (2001) reported findings from a survey of 175 superintendents judged nationally by their peers to be outstanding. He reported 35% of the superintendents would be more aggressive in pursuing school reform initiatives if given six-year contracts. Superintendent longevity is critical because frequent administrative turnover affects the ability a school to provide staff with a feeling of stability (Alsbury, 2003). Waters and Marzano (2006) found the length of a superintendent’s tenure correlates significantly to student achievement.

The EWA (n.d.) stated, “effective superintendents, according to Mike Kirst, have a vision of what good instruction is and know how to execute programs, which will improve teaching and learning” (p. 4). These superintendents can articulate a vision for the students and the district. Waters and Marzano (2006) stated, “The effective superintendents set specific achievement targets for schools and students and then ensure the consistent use of research-based instructional
strategies in all classrooms to reach those targets” (p. 4). Superintendents help the school board develop and maintain the strategic vision (Bredeson et al., 2008). Successful superintendents are flexible and collaborative, rather than authoritative. Glass (2001) found 37% of 175 superintendents identified as outstanding reported that insignificant, time-consuming demands limited their effectiveness.

Bredeson et al. (2011) examined the context in which superintendents operate in terms of district size, community demographics, organizational culture, history, geography, and local political realities. The findings revealed that the biggest difference between superintendents concerning their job responsibilities was determined by the district or school size. Superintendents from smaller districts had more opportunities to develop personal relationships and trust among their professional staff (Bredeson et al., 2008). Communication in the smaller districts is grounded in informal, direct, immediate, frequent, and consequential interactions (Bredeson et al., 2008). Communication specialists use local television or print media within large districts to communicate. The researchers also found that all superintendents interviewed agreed that student success was most important, and they focused all aspects of the job on keeping the process child-centered.

Comparison of the Private School CEOs and Public School Superintendents

The duties and responsibilities of private school CEOs and public school superintendent are very similar. Both the role of the CEO and superintendent are normally the only point in the entire education chain of decision-making where the flow of authority downward and accountability upward go through a single human being (Carver, 2002). Both CEOs and superintendents manage the direction of the school, support the administrative team, foster relationship among the various stakeholders, and manage the resources.
A major difference between these roles is that private school CEOs play a major role in fundraising for the school. Specifically, CEOs must secure funds to ensure their schools can meet school budgets and prepare for future projects; for example, CEOs are responsible for setting annual tuition costs for student enrollment and ensuring that the tuition will pay for the expense of running the school. A second difference is a CEO works with a board that is selected by the existing school board, while a superintendent works with board members who have been elected to the school board. Most importantly, a CEO works with school board members who are not required to participate in board training, unlike the public school board members. Finally, CEOs of private schools are involved in nearly all aspects of the school, whereas the larger public school superintendents are focused on leading others in a school district.

The Role of the Private School Board

Private school board members are not elected as they are in public schools. Everett and Sloan (1984) noted, “School board members are lay people, generally the least trained people in the school system regarding the learning and education of children, and typically hold the most power” (p. 2). The leadership in private schools seek individuals who are willing to serve on the school board and who have a skill sets that would benefit the school. The board members are also chosen to represent the collective values and interests of the school community.

Once the board has defined its strategic membership needs clearly, names of prospective board members who meet the selection criteria may come from several sources including current and former board members, the CEO, and staff. Quinby (2012) reported that the CEO should participate significantly in the selection of future board members. Typically, when individuals are recommended to serve on the board, current board members interview them to determine whether they will be a good fit to serve on the school board. Carver (2002) stated, “Most boards
would fire their CEOs for filling staff position as haphazardly as the board recruits for board position” (p. 165). Private schools need to seek board members that are committed to the mission, possess basic financial literacy, understand and respect nonprofits, have strong integrity and judgment, and have some prior board experience (Board Source, 2007b).

An exceptional school board can be identified through its work in a successful private school. Board Source (2007a) provided the following 12 principles of governance that power exceptional boards:

1. Exceptional boards govern in constructive partnership with the head, recognizing that the effectiveness of the board and head are interdependent.
2. Exceptional boards shape and uphold the mission, articulate a compelling vision, and ensure the congruence between decisions and core values.
3. Exceptional boards allocate time to what matters most and continuously engage in strategic thinking to hone the organization’s direction.
4. Exceptional boards institutionalize a culture of inquiry, mutual respect, and constructive debate that leads to sound and shared decision-making.
5. Exceptional boards are independent-minded. When making decisions board members put the interests of the organization above all else.
6. Exceptional boards promote an ethos of transparency by ensuring that donors, stakeholders, and the interested members of the public have access to information regarding finances, operations, and results.
7. Exceptional boards promote strong ethical values and disciplined compliance by establishing appropriate mechanisms for oversight.
8. Exceptional boards link bold visions and ambitious plans to financial support, expertise, and networks of influence.

9. Exceptional boards are results-oriented, measuring the organization’s advancement towards mission and evaluate the performance of major programs & services.

10. Exceptional boards intentionally structure themselves to fulfill essential governance duties and to support organizational priorities.

11. Exceptional boards embrace the qualities of a continuous learning organization, evaluating their own performance and assessing the value they add to the organization.

12. Exceptional boards energize themselves through planned turnover, thoughtful recruitment, and inclusiveness. (p. 2-3)

Keenan (2004) noted that many school board members become involved because of their strong commitments to the school; however, they bring little background in education or board governance. Private school boards are responsible for governance, policy and position development, visioning, and fiduciary responsibility. Therefore, it is important that school board members understand contract law because it defines not only the teacher-institution relationship but also the relationship of the student to the school (Walsh et al., 2010). School board members must also understand private school law and the implications in their roles as board members. Some board members lack understanding of the fundamental structure of school governance and underestimate that crucial role (Usdan, 2010). In the case of *Global Evangelism Education Ministries, Inc. v. Caddell* (2009), the Cornerstone Christian School Board fired an individual after just one semester of teaching. The one-year teaching contract had an arbitration clause specifying that disputes could not be settled by lawsuits. The teacher argued the Texas
Arbitration Act (TAA) did not apply to individuals unless both of parties had signed the contract. The school won the case because the contract was not between individuals, as the school was a corporation; therefore, the school board had the right to terminate the teacher (CEE, 2010).

Board members are also responsible for establishing the policies and funding structures that create better schools for the next generation (Bassett, 2005). The board governs the organization through the authority granted in the articles of the school board bylaws. Thus, the board reviews and develops policy and positions that guide the organization and its stakeholders. Additionally, the board sets the course for the organization well into the future. A visionary plan often includes a strategic plan with a clear mission and vision. Finally, the board is responsible for protecting the organization and its resources.

For most private schools, the school board exists primarily to formulate policy and give the school direction. Thus, the board is charged with furthering the mission of the school and ensuring its success (Guernsey, 2003). Independent School Management (ISM, 2002) is an organization that seeks to provide consulting and resources to independent schools. According to the ISM, “The board’s core activity is planning, and the board’s primary constituency is not today's students, but the students of the future” (p. 4). The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS, n.d.), another resource provider for independent schools, and the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) agree that school boards are critical to a healthy private school. All agencies agree that school boards play a critical role in long-term school operations.

According to Guernsey (2003), the ISM, NAIS, and NCEA believe that the minimal functions of most private school boards include the following:

1. Developing a strategic plan
2. Policy development and approval
3. Hiring the chief executive officer
4. Approving an annual budget
5. Setting salaries
6. Setting tuition
7. Overseeing financial accountability
8. Ensuring that in broad terms the school is fulfilling its mission. (p. 3)

Without a clear understanding of board expectations, it is difficult to ascertain the values of their contributions in leading the organization, which limits the ability to measure performance (Carver, 1997). Carver and Carver (2009) stated

[The] board should know who they work for; they should require their organizations to be effective and efficient; they should be in control of their organizations; the control they exercise should be of a type that empowers, not strangles; they should be fair in judging but unafraid to judge, rigorously holding delegates accountable; they should be disciplined as to the their role and their behavior; they should require discipline with regard to the role and behavior of their individual members; as the highest authority in enterprise, they should be predictable and trustworthy. (p. 2)

Table 1 offers a side-by-side comparison of school boards and CEOs.

DeKuyper (1998) emphasized that, “Individual board members should never be involved in specific management, personnel, or curricular issues” (p. 18). The critical distinction here is that school boards control the big picture and give the CEO direction who then implements policy with considerable discretion (Guernsey, 2003). According to Board Source (2007a) serving on a board “requires more than mere attendance at meetings. It requires of board members personal motivation and commitment, as well as intellectual curiosity and challenge.
They must share a passion for the organization’s cause” (p. xi). School boards also have the responsibility of raising money for the school, which could be one of the most difficult parts of their jobs. Additionally, they are responsible for donating resources and time to the school,

In turn, the chief executive must be ready, willing, and able to engage board members in making sense of situations, in determining what matters, and in solving dilemmas.

Neither the board nor the chief executive can simply go through the governance motions and expect great results. (Board Source, 2007a, p. xi)

Exceptional boards govern in constructive partnership with the CEO and recognize that the effectiveness of the board and CEO are interdependent.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Board</th>
<th>The Chief Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is corporate; acts as a group</td>
<td>Is individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is continuous</td>
<td>Is temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is part time</td>
<td>Is full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no staff or minimal staff</td>
<td>Has access to all staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has ultimate responsibility</td>
<td>Has limited, immediate responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is typical not an expert in the work of the organization</td>
<td>Is typically professional and an expert in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives volunteer time</td>
<td>Earns a salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees only parts of the whole</td>
<td>Is intimately involved in everything</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The school board is also responsible for performing yearly evaluations on the CEO.

Quinby (2012) suggested establishing routine practices such as setting goals for the CEO’s work,
evaluating and reporting progress, ensuring fiscal oversight, and monitoring compliance with the board policies. These practices will provide a level of transparency, accountability and effective supervision and support.

Governance structures should be laid out clearly and concisely in the school board constitution and bylaws. The board should ensure that its bylaws are consistent with applicable state law, especially regarding nonprofit corporate law. They should also include the goals and responsibilities of the board as they relate to leading the school into the future. These bylaws, which are a legal and foundational element of the school, should be carefully considered and consistently followed and implemented (Guernsey, 2003). The ISM (2002) stated:

The business of the school is in its classrooms, the Board should stay out of the classroom and do all it can to allow the classroom (i.e., the teachers, the students, the Head) to focus on the classroom alone by taking care of non-classroom issues such as strategic planning, finance, property and facilities issues, marketing, and fundraising. By taking care of issues related to stability and solvency, the Board allows the administration and faculty to “establish and maintain mission-specific excellence in classrooms, and curricula, and in the teaching ranks of the institution. (p. 46)

Developing school policies is an important task of private school board members. Board members need to keep in mind the following areas: nonprofit corporate law, educational licensing and regulations, charitable solicitation laws, labor and employment laws and health and safety codes. Shaughnessy (1988) emphasized that the school board takes the role of policy formation seriously because the members could be held personally liable if they knew or should have known that a certain policy or action violated an individual’s rights.
Board Source (2007a) discussed the importance of creating an evaluation system to access the different school programs, and noted that the evaluation system could be used to:

1. Assess the chief executive: Use program evaluation findings to hold the chief executive accountable for decreases or increases in client outcomes and program quality.

2. Fundraising: Use findings to inspire potential donors by telling and showing the mission story with facts and figures.

3. Recruit board members: Share the organization’s successes and challenges from a mission perspective in order to motivate individuals to bring their experience to bear in a way that is mission focused.

4. Strategic planning: Use evaluation findings to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the organization’s programs, identify opportunities and threats to the programs, and make resource acquisition and allocation decisions for mission success three to five years down the road.

5. Manage finances: Use findings about nonmonetary but essential resources (e.g., time, experience, expertise, facilities, equipment) to ensure that money is allocated for them.

6. Assess the organization: Use findings about program success as a yardstick for assessing how well key organizational functions (e.g., knowledge management, program staff assessment and development, volunteer management, joint programming efforts with other nonprofits) support program delivery.

7. Celebrate success: Use findings to provide praise and recognition to staff.

8. Business planning: Use findings to develop replicable programs/services that could generate a fee for service revenue stream.
9. Manage human resources: Use program quality findings as a tool for providing more
directed professional development and for conducting annual performance reviews.

10. Deciding to engage in a strategic alliance with other nonprofits: Use findings to
identify resource needs for improving service delivery that could be addressed by
collaborating or partnering with other nonprofit organizations” (p. 98).

Finally, private school board members need to participate in the fundraising process at the
school. Private school board members are typically expected for making financial commitments
to the school.

The Role of the Public School Board

According to Land (2002), “The most essential characteristic of the local education
policy boards is the focus on policy-making and oversight without involvement in daily
administration” (p. 239). School boards govern school districts. The challenge of governing a
school system becomes stressful when board members are uncertain of how to accomplish all of
the many expectations set for them, and when they do not know the roles and responsibilities of
their job (Hess, 2002). School board members represent the people of the district, ensure the
creation of the vision and goals for the district, and evaluate the success of the district; the school
board then communicates the vision and success to the community. School board members are
also responsible for adopting policies that inform district actions. These members hire the
superintendent to serve as the CEO of the district and evaluate his or her success. The school
board also approves the annual budget that is consistent with the vision of the district and that
supports academic achievement (Land, 2002). Therefore, school boards maintain fiscal
responsibility and fiscal autonomy with the authority to appropriate local funds to support the
board approved budget (EWA, n.d.).
The key characteristics of effective school boards are their ability to concentrate on academic achievement and policies as a group. McCormick et al. (2006) noted, “The critical leadership role of the board makes it imperative that board members learn to work together and reach consensus in order to exercise their authority” (p. 435). Eadie (2009) stated that the school board is responsible for setting strategic goals that relate to educational achievement. Additionally, Byrd et al. (2006) found 41% of school boards identified raising student achievement as a primary mission. Further, 21% of superintendents believe it is important to hold school boards accountable for raising student achievement (EWA, n.d.). According to Houston and Eadie (2002),

High-impact governing boards make a real difference though their governing activities, setting clear strategic directions to guide a district’s development, fashioning policies that provide boundaries for current operations, rigorously monitoring short-term educational, administrative, and financial performance, evaluating longer-term educational effectiveness, and building close, positive relationships with key stakeholders in the community. (para. 1)

It is important that school board members “do not fall into routine or old-fashioned expedient behavior that does not allow the time or the process needed to address long-range challenges or philosophical questions about how schools keep their vision in changing times” (Johns, 2006, p. 2). The challenge for school boards is developing the same high-level thinking and processes that schools want to elicit from their students. Chait, Ryan, and Taylor (2011) examined board practices, and found three types of thinking that are essential for good board functioning: generative, strategic, and fiduciary. A school board needs to consider the big picture when making decisions for a school. Johns (2006) emphasized the importance to
“govern a school through a big-picture window of mission and creativity, not a small porthole of preservation and habit” (p. 4).

Board members need to comprehend what conversations can occur in open- and closed-board meetings. For example, if a school board is searching for a new superintendent, board members may be pressured by the media and various community constituencies to break confidentiality about candidates (Fossey, 2011b). This breach of confidentiality would limit the number of superintendent candidates who would be willing to apply for the position if they knew the information could go public, which could jeopardize current employment. Therefore, a school board must understand how to keep the public informed properly of progress and challenges in the district.

Texas school boards must understand the Texas Open Meeting Act (TOMA). This policy provides the public access to public school board meetings. Specifically, the law entitles citizens to have notice of board meetings and allows individuals the opportunity to inspect and have a copy of the meeting minutes. A meeting is a gathering of a quorum of school board members in which they discuss public business or public policy within the supervision or control of the body, or which they consider or take any formal action (Walsh et al., 2010).

In the case of Aldridge v. School District of north Platte (1987), Gary Aldridge, a citizen, believed that school board members of North Platte violated the public meeting law when they met with the attorney for the school district after the superintendent of the school district was found guilty of third-degree sexual assault. He resigned from his position at a special scheduled board meeting, and the school board suspended the superintendent with pay until the resignation took effect.
Aldridge testified that a quorum of school board members met at the board attorney’s office before the special board meeting. School board members denied that the meeting took place. Therefore, Aldridge had the burden to prove this meeting occurred. In conclusion, he could not prove that four of the board members met at the same time with the attorney. It appeared the board members met two at a time with the school attorney, which did not violate the public meeting law.

In a later case, *Tovar v. State, Appellant, v. The State of Texas* (1997), a former school board president of the Somerset Independent School District (ISD) was found guilty of violating the TOMA. The first indictment alleged that the school board president knowingly participated in special closed meetings of the school board. The second indictment alleged that he aided in calling and organizing a special closed meeting of the school board. The board president claimed that he did not understand the TOMA; however, this lack of understanding did not excuse his actions or dismiss his charges. A jury found the school board president guilty as charged and assessed a punishment of six months in prison and a $500 fine for each offense. The sentence was probated.

The school board has to work as one body. According to Mountford (2004), “School board members who practice power in a dominating or oppressive manner can overtly and covertly disrupt a school district’s democratic foundation” (p. 704). Glass (2001) surveyed 2,096 school board presidents nationwide and found that 60% believed their school board worked well together “most” of the time. One-third of the school board presidents claimed their board works well together “all” the time. Bredeson et al. (2008) found strategies that effective superintendents used
Included working closely with school board members and keeping them informed, forming leadership teams, acting as a buffer, communicating frequently and directly to various constituencies, developing personal and trusting relationships with board members and key community members, helping make people feel they can participate in decisions and positioning the board to engage parents and community so there is a voice in state legislation and in the community. (p. 35)

There are times a school board needs to approve new policies and policy regulations. In the case of the Miami-Dade County Schools in Florida, a board member requested the school board to develop a policy that addressed the ethical behavior of her fellow board members (Manning, 2011). Specifically, board members had participated in a number of questionable activities. For example, some ensured family members were given jobs within the district, local politicians were paid for jobs in the district, and some board members did not live within the district. Additionally, members of the administrative team did not have advanced degrees from accredited institutes, suspicious land acquisition practices occurred, and criminal charges had been filed against one board member. The new ethical policy gave the school board an opportunity to repair the damage done within the district.

Lencioni (2002) argued that the dysfunctions of a school board could interfere with the roles of its board members. The first dysfunction is an absence of trust among team members. Board members who are not open with one another make it difficult to build a foundation of trust. This failure to build trust is damaging because it sets the tone for the second dysfunction: fear of conflict. Board members need to be able to debate ideas and come to a consensus of thought. A lack of healthy conflict is problematic because it ensures the third dysfunction of a
team: lack of commitment. Board members might not buy in or commit to decisions if they are not comfortable sharing their own thoughts.

In the face of a lack of real commitment and buy-in, team members develop an avoidance of accountability, the fourth dysfunction. Without committing to a clear plan of action, even the most focused and driven individuals will hesitate to call their peers on actions and behaviors that seem counterproductive to the good of the team. Failure to hold one another accountable creates an environment in which the fifth dysfunction thrives: inattention to results. Inattention to results occurs when team members put their individual needs or even the needs of their divisions above the collective goals of the team. Hart (2000) stated that the board has the duty of loyalty: “The board must act in good faith and must not allow their personal interests to prevail over the interests of the schools” (p. 18).

Some board members tend to have personal agendas when elected to a school board and can be demanding of the superintendent’s time. Eadie (2009) believed that most board members who meddle are just looking for something important to do as a member; this relationship can be challenging, divisive, and difficult. Additionally, some school boards avoid being transparent. Mountford (2004) stated, “School board members who practice power in a dominating or oppressive manner can overtly and covertly disrupt a school district’s democratic foundation” (p. 704). Superintendents who have supportive boards are more likely to take risks aimed to improve school reform (EWA, 2005).

Mountford (2004) noted that difficulties arise between superintendents and school board members because of questionable motivations of school board members. Fossey (2011a) stated that each board member typically brings a personal agenda to the school-district governing process, which means a superintendent has the difficult job maintaining the trust and confidence
of individual members. Superintendents typically operate under heavy constraints imposed by school board members, the community, and families of the school, which could lead to role confusion. However, role confusion could be eliminated if school board members and superintendents understood their responsibilities and duties.

Individuals who choose to become board members have different motivations for doing so. Some choose to become board members because they are interested in educational reform and feel a sense of duty, while others choose to join for personal gain. Waters and Marzano (2006) found when individual board members’ interests and expectations distract from the goals of the district and they are not contributing to the school. The position is accompanied with power and prestige, and this power should not be used to dominate, control, or oppress others (Mountford, 2004). Mountford (2004) strongly suggested a “person’s conception of power is likely connected to his or her motivation for school board membership” (p. 733). In other words, if a board member views power as power over others, then his or her intention as a board member is selfishness.

The Education Writers Association (2005) found that many school boards would rather hire a school administrator who can be controlled. Conversely, board members should use their positions to initiate and facilitate the collaborative decision-making process, instead of asserting power over this process. However, problems occur when members of the school board micromanage or interfere with the responsibilities of the superintendent (Byrd et al., 2006).

Some board members want to be elected because they have the desire to fix problems in the school district. Fossey (2011a) described a confrontational relationship between four trustees on the San Antonio School Board and the district’s superintendent, Diana Lam, a nationally recognized school reformer, who came to San Antonio in 1994. School board members were
elected with very few votes because of low voter turnout. The four board members were accused of wanting to be on the board just to get the school superintendent removed from her position (Fossey, 2011a). One San Antonio editorial noted that the career school board members were putting petty politics ahead of children and education (Fossey, 2011b). In line with this notion, Land (2002) suggested school boards serve their districts better by focusing on students’ academic success, instead of being concerned about the balance of power between the board and the superintendent. According to McAdams (2011), “No board can be effective at strategy, policy, and community engagement if it is dysfunctional, attempts to micromanage, or ignore its oversight responsibilities” (p. 2).

Clay and Soldwedel (2009) discussed signals that a school board is in trouble. The first signal is if the school board participates in partisan voting. The school board can be accused of “rubber stamping” a decision without giving it much thought. Second, board members who do not support a majority board decision could be in trouble. Productive debate needs to occur before a final decision has been made, not after the decision has been made, and, once a board decision has been declared, all board members need to support that decision.

The third sign that a board is in trouble is when board members respond to community discontent without gathering data or understanding the process. It is important that board members validate their decisions with data, rather than basing a decision on one’s feelings, intuition, or beliefs. Fourth, board members could be trouble if they decide to conduct their own research. School board members who conduct their own research jump from a strategic role into a tactical role, which can appear to be a distrust in the quality of the staff’s research. Fifth, board members who apply expert advice literally without consulting staff could be in danger.
The sixth sign that a board is in trouble is when they ignore the effect of the culture of change. It is imperative that the school board considers the culture of the school when making decisions. Seventh, school board members could be in trouble if they do not support district policies. All district personnel, including the board, must operate under the policies that have been established for the district. Eighth, a school board is in trouble when they hire a superintendent on a split vote. A superintendent is at an enormous disadvantage if he or she does not have full support from the board. The ninth sign is when board members fail to detach personally from board decisions, which can harm the success of the school board.

In a survey of 2,046 school board presidents, Glass (2001) reported an average turnover of three or more superintendents in school districts over the past 10 years. Hiring a new superintendent every couple of years can be unsuccessful. Glass et al. (2000) suggested that 88% of existing superintendents express serious concerns about the future of the superintendency and believe that a shortage of applicants will create a crisis in American education. The EWA (n.d.) reported, “A study commissioned by Education Commission of the States (ECS) found that 71% of superintendents surveyed believe the superintendency itself is in a state of crisis, characterized by poor school board/superintendent relations, long working hours and stressful working conditions” (p. 4).

Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, and Ellerson (2011) conducted a survey of nearly 2,000 school superintendents employed in school districts across the United States. The work examined historical and contemporary perspectives of the superintendency, the characteristics and demographics of superintendents and their districts, superintendents’ professional experiences, their relationships with their school boards, the nature of the superintendent role itself, and the social and political climate in which superintendents work. Approximately 51% of
the respondents surveyed said they still planned to be a superintendent in 2015. This finding suggests the probability of sustainable turnover for the next few years. Additionally, Hoyle (2002) reported, “One-half of 1149 public school Texas superintendents will retire in the next eight years, and over 200 change jobs each year” (p. 8).

Glass et al. (2000) found that school board members are generally qualified, but not well qualified. Thirty percent of reporting superintendents indicated that board members were under qualified for the job. Mountford (2004) stated the most common reason for difficult school board-superintendent relationships is role confusion between these positions.

A factious school board leadership can lead to a broken school system (Fossey & Jenkins, 2011). In the case in Duval County School District, the superintendent struggled with school board involvement in contracting school busing. The superintendent focused on student achievement, but financial needs and Florida law required gathering bid contracts for bus transportation. The decision to gather bids to contract transportation caused much tension for the board, the community, and the superintendent. The school board felt pressure from the community not to participate in competitive bidding for transportation, even though Florida law required it.

While the school board chair supported the superintendent, she received tremendous pressure from her fellow board members. The school district had the potential to save $3.85 million by changing from the 119 local bus contractors to a smaller group of national transportation firms. Legal counsel informed the board that they were obligated to follow Florida law to receive the competitive bids, as contract decisions cannot be made arbitrarily, capriciously, or based on sympathy or prejudice. Unfortunately, the school board did not represent themselves as a united group. The discord of the board caused great friction for the
school district and community. The mayor of Duval County suggested the school board members cease from meddling in the daily operations of the school and allow the superintendent to do his job (Fossey & Jenkins, 2011). In spite of the difficulties caused by personalities within the Duval County School Board toward the superintendent, the school board chair spent many hours working to develop a good relationship with the superintendent.

In conclusion, to be an excellent board member, one has to have a personal motivation, commitment, intellectual curiosity, and challenge. Eadie (2009) described the highest-impact boards are characterized by their use of well-defined processes for making governing judgments and decisions, working closely with their superintendents, and using standing committees that correspond to the major streams of governing decisions and judgments. Additionally, attention to planning, performance monitoring, and resource development are important for self-management.

Similarities of Private and Public School Boards

While a number of distinctions exist between the activities of public and private school boards, the roles and responsibilities for both reveal a number of similarities. Both types of school board must maintain effective governance, provide leadership and support for the CEO, ensure cost-effective operations, and follow legal regulations as defined by the structure of their organizations (McNamara, 2008). The responsibilities and roles of school boards, established by each group, define the focus of operations for the organizations they represent. Public and private school boards are also responsible for reviewing and creating school policies, visions, and goals. Additionally, both types of boards approve the annual budget and, most importantly, stay attune of the students academic success.

In the public school system, all 50 states are responsible for organizing the education of
school age students within their respective jurisdictions. In essence, each state maintains an autonomous school system, which is further decentralized as individual state departments of education delegate authority to local school districts. Funding for public education comes primarily from state and local agencies, with a small percentage from the federal government—approximately 7% based on 2000 Census figures (Jacobson, Johnson, Ylimaki, & Giles, 2005).

Private schools operate as independent school districts without benefit of public funding, neither state nor federal. Each private school has an oversight board tasked with the primary responsibility of establishing and providing sound policies to ensure the health and well being of the organization. Private school boards are primarily made up of volunteers who believe in the work of the school and who are willing to invest time and energy to support the organization. However, they often join the board with little knowledge about the commitment and expectations connected to their roles on the board. Therefore, it is essential that boards are proactive in their recruiting process to ensure a strong board.

Board members must be educated regarding the expectations for their roles. Members must also have a clear understanding of what is expected of them. A clearly defined job description and training on board policy can assist in this understanding. According to Selby (2011), “Failure to comprehend their responsibilities leads to confusion, poor decisions, and awkward situations that can limit the board’s effectiveness” (p. 40).

The Role of the Private School Board Chair

Private school board chairs must maintain effective governance, provide leadership and support of the CEO, and ensure cost-effective operations. Board chairs are also bound by legal regulations as defined by the structures of their organizations (McNamara, 2008). The school board chair leads the board, and the CEO leads the staff (Carver, 2002). Thus, a successful
private school needs both a powerful and strong CEO and board. The ISM (2002) recommended that the school view its board president as “Chair of the Board,” and the Head as the CEO.

The CEO of the organization provides the long-term implementation of the board-generated strategic plan through its adaptation into the daily affairs of the school. As long as the CEO acts in harmony with the school mission, legal employment practices, and school board expectations regarding budgets and staff professionalism, the board should stay out of specific personnel decisions (Guernsey, 2003). However, if the board chair takes over the role of the CEO, it is likely to confuse the school community, cause the CEO to resign, and create difficulties for the school (McCormick et al., 2006). The school board chair is responsible for organizing the board in the most effective way to conduct its business. Tortorice (1992) described the chair’s role as follows:

Significant authority is given to the chair, whose judgment should be respected by the meeting and who will conduct matters in the best interests of the organization. This is the case in the vast majority of meetings convened every day. Where it is not true, remedial action may be appropriate to restore effective leadership. The essential requirement for the procedural framework of any meeting is that the meeting be conducted with fairness and good faith toward all who are entitled to take part, and that those present be given an opportunity to consider and act on matters properly brought before the meeting. (p. 3)

The chair also provides particular oversight and direction to the school finances and resource management (DeKuyp, 2007). The board chair must oversee the board meetings, and the school board needs to keep the regulations to a minimum; therefore, the chair is responsible for communicating board decisions as one body. The chair encourages participation by all board members and handles difficult situations that might occur during board meetings (Petersen &
The chair also accepts the responsibility to be the disciplinarian of the board when necessary, and is willing to counsel unproductive, disruptive, and counterproductive board members (DeKuyper, 2007). According to Hart (2000), the school board chair holds the following responsibilities:

1. Determine and articulate the mission and purpose of the organization
2. Ensure adequate resources
3. Ensure effective organization planning (policies and procedures)
4. Select a chief executive officer
5. Support the Chief Executive and assess performance
6. Ensure effective resource management
7. Determine, monitor, and strengthen programs and services
8. Enhance the organization’s public image
9. Ensure legal and ethical integrity and maintain accountability
10. Recruit and orient new board members and assess board performance (pp. 2-10)

Relationship between School Board Chair and CEO

The working relationship between a school board chair and the CEO of any organization plays a significant role in the ability of that organization to achieve its established goals effectively. A successful partnership between the board and the CEO lends itself to a successful governance process (Kilmister & Nahkies, 2004). Moody (2008) stated a “positive working relationship between the school board and its superintendent of schools is vital to the successful operation of the school district” (p. 1). Widespread consensus exists that a good working relationship between the school board and the CEO is essential for effective school governance (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000). The NAIS encourages school leaders to regard the
relationship between the CEO and school board chair as a critical partnership that is characterized by mutual trust, reciprocity, honest feedback, and harmonious collaboration (Quinby, 2012).

In private schools, CEOs and board chairs manage enrollment and keep their schools affordable as top priorities (NAIS, 2013). According to DeKuyper (2007), several differences exist between the roles of the board, the board chair, and the CEO of a private school. The board can act only as a group as the chair cannot officially act alone, and the CEO is an individual.

The board exists continually even as its membership changes; the chair changes often in many schools and the CEO is temporary in the life of the school. The board and the board chair both hold ultimate responsibility, whereas the CEO holds limited, immediate responsibility. Typically, the school board and chair are not experts in education, whereas the CEO typically is an expert in education. Finally, the board sees only parts of the whole, while the chair needs to see the big picture, and the CEO is intimately involved in every aspect of the school.

The CEO is responsible for creating relationships with the board members that are built on trust and respect. Therefore, it is important that an exceptional CEO take several steps to support his or her school board. Moyers (2006) noted effective steps to support the school board. Specifically, the CEO needs to initiate and maintain a structure for board work; it is important that a CEO provide all written materials in advance of the meetings. The CEO must also show consideration and respect toward board members and facilitate interactions in board relationships. The CEO needs to spend time getting to know the school board, and he or she should provide the board with helpful and useful information. The CEO should also promote board accomplishments and productivity, as it is important to recognize and acknowledge good performance. Finally, the CEO should envision change and innovation with the board. The
CEO is responsible for keeping the board informed of changes in the field of education. The expertise of the CEO and his or her ability to communicate to the school board are vital to the success of a private school.

The school board chair works closely with the CEO on a daily basis, and the CEO is responsible for keeping the chair informed of the progress of the school. The school board chair works with the CEO in preparing for board meetings and takes the lead in areas of board leadership and management, while the CEO takes the lead in curriculum and school operations. Additionally, the board chair serves as a leader and manages the board; the chair and the rest of the board have the ultimate authority.

The chair leads the process for evaluating the CEO to ensure the annual board self-assessment has been completed. Additionally, the chair works closely with the CEO to anticipate and strategize issues, concerns, and priorities. Further, the chair is a ready and willing listener to the CEO’s concerns as they emerge; he or she serves as a major advisor, as the board chair is a private confidante and critic when necessary (DeKuyper, 2007).

In contrast, negative relationships may be characterized by an overload of information and work for the board, micromanagement by the board, lack of board independence from the CEO, and hasty decisions made by the CEO (McCormick et al., 2006). An ill-defined scope of authority has been the primary cause for disagreement between board members and school leaders (Thomas, 2001). However, research supporting this contention is limited and the roles of the board and CEO are interdependent, which makes complete separation difficult (McCormick et al., 2006).

Several factors can lead to dysfunctional CEO and school board relationships. The most commonly reported conflict between the school board and CEO is role ambiguity (McCormick et
al., 2006). Secondly, the questionable motivations for school board membership and the power struggles between school board members and CEO can cause problems. Third, some CEOs want to be the only source of information to their board. Fourth, some CEOs fear their school board. Fifth, some school boards do not understand the mission and vision of the school district.

Role conflict can also cause a CEO to move to another position. A dysfunctional board will waste time on unimportant, peripheral issues (EWA, n.d.). Richardson (2005) stated that the relationship between the CEO and school board cannot allow obstacles and individual egos to get in the way of student success. DeKuyper (2007) stated,

Because the head and chairs are partners, the premature resignation of a head is usually a sad reflection on the performance of the board chair. They succeed or fail together. If the chair and head differ too greatly in style to be able to work together, the chair should consider resigning. (p. 149)

Considering these factors, it is important that the CEO and board maintain a consistent pattern of shared leadership to avoid mixed signals. Additionally, CEOs who do not have supportive school boards will have difficulty being successful.

Relationship between School Board Chair and Superintendent

Eadie (2009) noted, “A close, positive working relationship between a strong board and a really board-savvy head of school is at the heart of high-impact governing” (p. 2). The relationship between the superintendent and school board allows effective leadership to occur within the school and organization (Petersen & Short, 2001). The superintendent is responsible for developing a positive working relationship with the board chair. Lamkin (2006) discussed the challenges of district politics and board relations with superintendents. He found that public battles between superintendents and boards presented a negative picture of the role of
superintendent that further eroded the pool of candidates for this position. Grissom and Anderson (2012) discussed relationships between a school board chair and a superintendent, and stated the following:

1. School board members may be inexperienced, uninformed, or under-qualified in areas relevant to school policies.
2. School boards may be divisive.
3. Superintendent and school board tension may interfere with the success of a school district.
4. Personality conflicts may exist.
5. Role confusion may exist.
6. Lack of trust can feed dissatisfaction on both sides and result in high turnover among superintendents. (p. 1154)

According to Cooper et al. (2000), 16.7% of all superintendents leave their jobs because of conflicts with school boards. Fossey (2011b) noted that most superintendents leave because of changes in school board politics, pressure from hostile community stakeholders, and personality conflicts with school board members. He stated, “Superintendents’ time in office has grown shorter in recent years, and a significant number of departing superintendents were forced from their jobs by dissatisfied school boards” (p. 23).

The first year with a new board chair requires extra work for a superintendent. Glass et al. (2000) examined 2,262 superintendents nationwide and found that school board members are generally qualified, but not well qualified. Quinby (2012) stated, “Significant time and energy must be devoted to learning how to work with the board chair. It takes time to establish trust and
effective communication routines” (p. 91). The superintendent needs to be firmly committed to playing a proactive role in maintaining and building relationships with all school board members.

The ability for a board to function coherently as one body in its governance responsibilities is not without challenges (McCormick et al., 2006). Several studies have examined the relationship between school board members and superintendents, and some have found evidence that competency, role confusion, power, trust, time constraints, and dissatisfaction can influence the success of a school district (Alsbury, 2003). Danzberger and Usdan (1994) suggested that many school boards have difficulty working as a single entity.

According to McAdams (2006), “All relationships are important, but no relationship is more important than the one between the school board and superintendent” (p. 16). Likewise, Eadie (2009) supported positive relationships as the key to a successful board and school. When such a relationship exists between the superintendent and school board, the school and organization is also positive (Petersen & Short, 2001). Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) argued that the clarification and separation of board and superintendent responsibilities is critical for effective governance.

A positive and productive superintendent-school board relationship is essential for success in the superintendency (Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1998). Productive relationships between school board members and superintendents are generally marked by trust, respect, open communication, and support (Land, 2002). Houston and Eadie (2002) indicated, “Communication is the glue that helps to cement a strong board-superintendent working relationship, provided that it is pertinent, honest, and that is formatted for ease of understanding” (p. 18). Additionally, Clay and Soldwedel (2009) stated that good communication and collaboration are as essential within the board as superintendents are between the board and other
roles. A school board never wants to be surprised by a major event that leaves it appearing to be uninformed.

There are times when a school board is dissatisfied or disappointed with the superintendent, which forces them to dismiss the individual. This is a costly action, as the school board typically must finish paying the salary of the current superintendent, while also paying the salary of a new superintendent. For example in San Antonio ISD, the school board had to buy out the superintendent’s contract, which cost $781,000 (Fossey, 2011a). This type of cost can cause public dissatisfaction toward the board.

Training school board members on negotiating contracts would eliminate problems that occur with superintendents who are dismissed. Fossey (2011b) stated, “Perhaps the chief reason a school board enters into an unfavorable contract with superintendents is because they reveal their choice of a superintendent before the contract terms are negotiated” (p. 18). Therefore, an opportunity exists for either party to walk away from the deal before it becomes public. Confidentiality is so critical.

Alsbury (2003) stated that dissatisfaction from within the community could lead to school board member and superintendent turnover, which is described as dissatisfaction theory. Vail (2001) suggested that the revolving door of leadership has not been reserved exclusively for the superintendent’s office, but it also extends to the boardroom: “Board member turnover is faster today, too, which affects how long superintendents stay on the job” (p. 23). DeKuyper (2007) stated,

Every time a new chair steps on board, a school faces a critical moment. Since the current trend is for chairs to remain in office a very few years (30% for one year and 28%
for two years), the chair often lacks sufficient time to get to know the job and all he or she needs to know about the school. (p. 148)

A lack of training among board members could result in high turnover. Changes in board members could lead to an involuntary turnover of superintendent, which could then lead to changes in school policy. Glass (2001) found that 30% of the 2,096 board presidents surveyed would not run for a board position again. Thus, the success of a school is effected if there is frequent turnover of school board members and the CEO.

Eadie (2003) presented eight key factors to create an extraordinary board-superintendent partnership. One factors emphasized was the superintendent needs to empower the board. A superintendent can help the school board be a governing board that makes decisions to obtain significant difference in the school. Board members who do not have the power to make governing decisions will become frustrated as they want to make a difference. A superintendent can also assist a school board in playing a resourceful, positive role in carrying out a high impact-governing proposal. This relationship requires intensive time, attention, strong leadership, and meticulous management.

Some school districts have chosen and retained good superintendents. Selecting a superintendent is probably the most important thing a school board will do for a district. Schools perform best when the school board has a stable and professional working relationship with its superintendent. These schools have strong community stakeholders and board members who support the superintendent. Bredeson et al. (2008) examined 12 superintendents from Sweden and Wisconsin. Ten superintendents indicated that developing and maintaining relationships with the stakeholders was critical in their role as leaders. Effective superintendents pay close
attention to the psychological and emotional facets of their working relationships with the board (Eadie, 2009).

Schools can be successful because of the positive relationship between strong school boards and effective superintendents. A satisfied board is one of the most important indicators of a board-savvy superintendent at work, and job security depends heavily on such satisfaction (Houston & Eadie, 2002). Specifically, a board-savvy superintendent (a) brings the right attitude to working with the board, (b) makes governance a top priority, (c) consciously focuses on the human dimension of the board-superintendent partnership, and (d) functions as a full-fledged, contemporary superintendent (Houston & Eadie, 2002). Thus, school board members should do everything they can to find the right superintendent for their districts and to keep that superintendent for a reasonable length of time.

It is also important that a school board communicate with the superintendent if the board changes their expectations. Eadie (2003) stated

One of the most important ways to make sure that the board-superintendent partnership starts off on the right foot and remains positive and productive is to negotiate—and periodically renegotiate—superintendent performance targets and to regularly assess superintendent performance against these targets. (p. 57)

A school board cannot assume that a superintendent is aware of a change if it has not been communicated. A lack of communication will lead to problems between the school board and superintendent.
Board Training is Important

Orem (2011) indicated,

In their rush to recruit, vet, and press new trustees into service—many educators view orientation as but a brief whistle stop in the rookie’s long tour of duty. Orientation, it seems is something that you can just check off the list before the ‘real’ work begins. (p. 3)

Eadie (2009) stated, “One of the most important investments that any school can make is in building its board’s governing capacity, since high-impact boards make a huge different in the affairs of the organization they govern” (p. 1). Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) believed that board effectiveness could be improved through appropriate development. Specifically, it is important that an individual understands the expectations of a board member before being nominated for the position. Orem (2011) also notes that each board member should have a detailed job description for the position; every board member should also have the opportunity to learn about the role as a board member.

Considering the importance of understanding the role of a board member, training should include an introduction to the organization, its mission and programs, clarification of future time and financial demands, time to get to know other board members, and time to form an educational foundation for the coming years (Board Source, 2007b). Training should also include potential conflicts of interest and examples or discussion on how board members should behave (Orem, 2011). Such training allows new board members to learn expectations quickly and get them engaged in board activities. If all board members go through the same training, it would allow them to function within the same framework and instructions.
CEOs believe they should initiate the first orientation for new board members to establish a good personal working relationship (Glass et al., 2001). Additionally, new board members should be given all written materials (board bylaws) and the school budget before the first orientation. These initial activities allow board members the opportunity to review the materials before their training begins. The board chair must also ensure that school board training occurs.

The NAIS (n.d.) recommended that the committee of trustees, in partnership with the board chair and CEO, should

- Plan a formal board orientation for new trustees each year. On an ongoing basis, it should also plan annual board education and training for all trustees, never forgetting to cover governance topics that would improve the board’s performance or correct any bad habits into which the board has fallen. Most often, the head facilitates ongoing educational and training activities, whether about trends in education, fund-raising techniques, or potential legislation that could threaten the school’s independence. It is also vital that the committee plan ongoing programs of professional development for all trustees on the topic of governance, including the shared roles of board and administration. (p. 1)

Of course, this is a recommendation made by NAIS and not a requirement, as private schools operate differently than do public schools. School board training is not optional for public school board members, whereas private schools do not have state required guidelines for training, thus, these schools have the flexibility to offer training, if desired.

**Public School Board Training**

Unlike private schools, public school board members are required by the Texas State Board of Education (TSBE) to participate in school board training. The Texas Association of School Boards (TASB, n.d.) believes in the importance of board service and the power of good
According to the TEC (1995a), the TSBE shall adopt a framework for governance leadership to be used in structuring continuing education for school board members. Public school board members follow the TEC, which states the following:

(a) The State Board of Education shall provide a training course for independent school district trustees to be offered by the regional education service centers. Registration for a course must be open to any interested person, including current and prospective board members.

(b) A trustee must complete any training required by the State Board of Education.

(c) A newly elected board member of an independent school district shall receive the orientation to the TEC within the first year of service. The orientation shall be delivered by an Education Service Center and shall be three hours in length.

(d) After each session of the Texas Legislature, including each regular session and called session related to education, each school board member shall receive an update from an Educational Service Center or any registered provider to the basic orientation to the TEC. The update session shall be of sufficient length to familiarize board members with major changes in the code and other relevant legal developments related to school governance. A board member who has attended an Educational Service Center basic orientation session that incorporates the most recent legislative changes is not required to attend an update. (§11.159)

The continuing education requirement consists of orientation sessions, annual team-building sessions with local boards and superintendents, and specified hours of continuing education based on identified needs. The TASB also provides every opportunity for board
members to receive their required training. Some trainings offered to new board members include quick tips, foundations of board policy, foundations of public school finance, foundations of the Texas accountability system, and introduction to parliamentary procedures. These training opportunities provide an overview of being an effective school board member. In these trainings, participants learn how to handle the personal and public demands of being a board member, the basic roles and responsibilities of their roles, and differences between their roles and those of the superintendent. The training also includes an overview of the role of the board in terms of the district vision and goal setting, the budget process, and basic school law. For example, the training consists of understanding basic employment contracts and employment issues. Finally, the training includes lessons in teamwork, which includes communication strategies and ethical behavior. The TASB provides all the resources for a school board to be exceptional. For new school board presidents, available training sessions include getting started as a new school board president, a board president’s guide to parliamentary procedures, a board president’s guide to meeting preparation, a president’s guide to facilitating superintendent evaluations, developing superintendent performance goals, and training on superintendent evaluation instruments and results.

Team-building training is an annual requirement for school board-superintendent teams. This training can increase effectiveness of the school board. The TASB also provides training for board members who are interested in non-required training. Most importantly, school boards are required to report their compliance with training requirements annually to the TSBE.

Private School Board Training Needs

Board training for private schools is not a state requirement; however, these boards would benefit from such training. Public school boards have many training requirements that would
also be beneficial to private school boards. Examples include tips for new board members, foundations of board policy, and personal and public demands of being a board member. Private school board chairs could also gain insight by participating in the training required for the public school board chair.

In addition to board training offered by TASB, private school boards need additional training that is applicable to the governance of their schools. Most importantly, board members need training on the roles and responsibilities of both the CEO and board members, which would help eliminate micromanagement issues by board members. Private school board members would also benefit from training in the fundamentals of fundraising, policy and position development, visionary planning, fiduciary responsibilities, private school board by-laws, budget training (including setting tuition and salaries), and basic contract law (including at-will contracts). Private school board members would also benefit from nonprofit corporate law, educational licensing and regulations, charitable solicitation laws, labor and employment laws and health and safety codes.

Orem (2011) stated that private school board training should include:

(a) What it means to serve on a nonprofit board (many new trustees are not that familiar with the nonprofit sector).

(b) What the attributes of an effective trustee are, covering such items as: principles of good practice for boards and trustees; why trustees are not representatives of constituent groups; attendance at, and participation in, board meetings; and the role of the board versus the role of school administrators.

(c) What the main roles of trustees are: setting policy; developing strategic direction; evaluating and compensating the head; etc.
(d) How this board operates: number of meetings per year; committee and task force structure; role of committees and task forces; and roles of officers.

(e) The school mission and goals, and an overview of operations: mission statement; current strategic plan; head's goals and objectives; current budget; etc. (p. 4)

Private school board training should also include dealing with fears in the school that can affect the relationship between school board members and the CEO. Board members may have inner fears about their role that are not openly discussed or they could have a fear of the future if they tend to be conservators. Thus, these members may want to concentrate on where they have been and not where they are going.

The fear of patrons can lead to issues within the working relationship between the board and CEO (McClellan, 1978). A patron with financial resources may bring a problem to the board, which could go against the CEO’s decisions, and money can play a major part in school decisions. These fears can cause difficulty between the CEO and the board when their missions diverge. The CEO can also become the scapegoat for the fears of the board members. McClellan (1978) stated “A board that feels cornered by its fear of some passing fashion, of what it sees in the future, or the young themselves can easily work itself into a position of sacrificing the head of the school” (p. 2). It is imperative that board members are trained to handle their fears.

Training of board members is a fragmented process left to chance in far too many private schools. Maritz (2006) states, “If school board members are to be effective, they must learn of the laws that dictate their responsibilities and the behaviors that lead to effective service” (p. 59). Organizations such as the ISM, Educational Regional Service Centers, and Board Source offer school board training for private schools. While the training of the private school board
members is left to the discretion of each of the school boards, it is essential for a school board to be successful. If TEPSAC ensures quality in private schools by monitoring and approving organizations, then maybe school board training requirements could be established and reported to TEPSAC. If private schools determine the need for school board training, then they have the responsibility to seek out these training opportunities.

Opportunities for School Board Training

Every school board member should have the right to learn what he or she is getting into before taking on the responsibility of making educational decisions. School board training can be obtained in many different forms besides the training required by Texas Education Agency (TEA). Board retreats and workshops are examples of extremely powerful activities for training. The strain on the CEO and school board relationship often results from the role ambiguity and a lack of clarity regarding the decision-making practices within the organization, which can be remedied partially through school board retreats (Newbrough, 2002). The CEO holds the most knowledge about the school and can share that knowledge with new school board members. This method allows both board members and the CEO to participate actively versus being passive learners. Houston and Eadie (2002) believed that retreats are successful when,

1) At least a full day is set aside for the retreat; 2) board members are involved in designing the retreat; 3) a professional facilitator is retained to assist in designing, facilitating and following up on the retreat; 4) a detailed retreat design is developed in advance, including the process for following through on the retreat; 5) the retreat is highly participatory and involves board members in leading deliberations; 6) the CEO and his or her executive team are full participants along with the board; and 7) no final decision are made in the retreat. (p. 32)
The full-day board retreat approach may be too demanding for some members who are spread thin with other responsibilities. This approach might also result in information overload. Thus, it is important that board chairs survey the members to determine the most beneficial approach.

Other opportunities for school board training activities include conducting book studies, attending conferences, and participating in educational blogs or webinars. Some CEOs and school boards have adopted a specific governance model, such as policy governance (Carver, 2002), or have focused on laying the foundation through vision setting, goal planning, and strategic plan development (Geisick, 2006). Houston and Eadie (2002) recommend that all work of the school board team must answer three overarching questions: (1) Where is our school headed?, (2) What is our school doing right now?, and (3) how well is our school performing? It is imperative that all new board members participate in professional development training to understand their roles and responsibilities. Board Source (2007) noted,

New board members need a detailed orientation program that includes meeting staff members, touring facilities, talking with committee and board chairs about how the board functions, and what is expected of members (including the possibility of making donations or attending various functions), reviewing the organization’s strategy, and a thorough briefing on any legal issues, such as director liability or how intermediate sanctions impact the work of the board. (p. 130)

Orem (2011) believes that the school board chair and CEO should incorporate education sessions regularly into scheduled board meetings. This method allows board members to be better informed before making educational decisions. In conclusion, school board training should be ongoing, and board members should engage in professional development as part of their enduring work.
Conclusion

Effective board training is important in the development of the professional relationships between the CEO and school board members. Jonker and Meehan (2014) stated, “Any board can improve its performance if its members are willing to confront the people, process, and behavioral challenges that drag competent people into an abyss of ineffectiveness” (p. 1). Houston and Eadie (2002) found that a solid board-CEO partnership yields benefits to a school when it (a) enables a board to effectively play a leadership role that transcends strategic decision making and policy formulation; (b) effectively deals with the most important issues facing a school; (c) ensures decisions are supported with a firm commitment of resources; and (d) sets a leadership tone that breeds confidence among students, faculty, parents, and the community. Exceptional boards deepen their members’ knowledge of organizational programs, constituents, and context through formal orientation and ongoing board education that draw on internal and external resources (Board Source, 2007a). These boards embed learning opportunities into routine work and activities outside of the boardroom.

Board training should include governance topics to improve the performance of the board. Mountford (2004) examined 20 board members who suggested the importance of training to allow board members and CEOs opportunities to examine their motivations for their current positions carefully. Petersen and Short (2001) found that the tenure of the board president and gender of the CEO had some influence on the perceptions of the board president. Trust, empathy, and clarity of the administrative roles are essential in developing and maintaining a cooperative relationship between the school board and superintendent. According to Byrd et al. (2006), “Improved relationships between school board presidents and CEOs could lead to longer tenures and possibly a better focus on the importance of what really matters in schools—student
academic achievement” (p. 17). However, additional research is necessary to determine whether board training improves relationships between school boards and superintendents.

In conclusion, the school board and the CEO must work together to achieve student success, and student achievement should be the priority of both school and community leaders. Waters and Marzano (2006) found that schools with high levels of academic success have school boards that are supportive of their academic goals. Sound leadership at a school level adds value to the education system. Thus, academic success only occurs through collaboration, not confrontation, between the CEO and school board members.

Land (2002) called for additional research to determine the key variables through which school boards affect student academic achievement. School board members and CEOs need to measure their successes by their students’ academic success (EWA, n.d.). To address this needs, the current study aimed to determine the current opinion of the CEO and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training and specific components of the private school board training that could influence the private school board. This study also sought to determine how training might influence the respective successes of the CEO and school board chairs. Finally, this study aimed to determine how school board training influences the professional working relationship between the CEO and school board.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the current opinions of the chief executive officers (CEO) and school board chairs of private schools on school board training, components of training, and how such training influences CEOs’ professional working relationships with school boards and their respective success. Private school board chairs and CEOs were chosen as the focus for this study because of the lack of board training requirements for private schools. I collected data related to the perceptions of Texas CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training and the influences of such training on private school boards and roles of CEOs and school boards. I addressed the following research questions regarding private school board training:

1. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training?
2. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific components of private school board training that could potentially influence school boards?
3. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective successes?
4. How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationships with their school boards?
Research Design

This study involved a quantitative and qualitative cross-sectional research design with a mixed-method approach. The focus of data collection was on the perceptions of Texas private school CEOs and school board chairs on board training and the working relationship between these leaders. Data were quantitatively captured at a single point in time. This mixed-method approach was chosen to combine both a qualitative and quantitative approach to answer the research questions. The cross-sectional research design allowed me to collect data from surveys and personal in-depth interviews from CEOs and school board chairs.

Quantitative Research Method

The first part of the study was conducted using the quantitative research method. The target population consisted of Texas CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. Potential participants were identified through National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Texas Private Schools Accreditation Commission (TEPSAC) and the Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 websites. The criteria for participation in the survey included private schools that served at least Grades 9 through 12 with enrollments of at least 100 students.

I administered the CEO (Head of School)/Governing Board Chair Leadership Survey. The survey was designed to gather the perceptions of CEOs and school board chairs on school board training, components of board training, potential influences of training on CEOs’ professional working relationship with their school boards and their respective success. The survey consisted of 25 items: an informal consent form, 20 questions pertaining to the research questions, and four demographic questions. This research method allowed for a larger sample of participants that represented the target population.
I used Survey Monkey and sent the survey link via e-mail to the CEOs of private school listed for Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. The CEOs were requested to send the survey link to their current school board chairs. This survey allowed me to ask questions about the school board training trends, components, attitudes, and opinions of the sample population of Texas private school CEOs and school board chairs.

To ensure confidentiality, I input the consent form and survey questions into Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey only tracked participant by their IP addresses. I received the IP address for each responder, but did not receive personal information on who had completed the survey.

I sent an email to all participants to remind them to complete the survey, if they had not completed it within one week of the initial email. A second reminder was sent out to all CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 after the second week of data collection. At the completion of data collection, the data from seven survey questions were exported from Survey Monkey and entered into Microsoft Excel format for analysis. Four survey questions were exported from Survey Monkey into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis, and nine open-ended questions were categorized and coded.

Qualitative Research Method

The second part of the research applied a qualitative research method. In-depth interviews were conducted with private school CEOs and school board chairs. Those who completed the survey were asked to participate in the interviews. Twelve CEOs and 12 school board chairs from private schools with expertise in their educational roles and who had the potential for varying levels of school board training were chosen.
I conducted all personal interviews so the process was consistent among participants. The interviews were transcribed into narrative pieces. The open-ended questions from the survey were also coded and placed in categories to help in the data analysis. I also transcribed all notes from the personal interviews and open-ended questions from the survey to answer each research question.

Participants

The population of interest in this study was current CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Texas located in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. The private schools selected included K-12, had enrollments of 100 or more students, and contained Grades 9 through 12. I obtained a master email list with the CEOs’ names from the NCES, TEPSAC, and Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 websites. There are 100 private schools in the population of Educational Service Center Regions 10 (56%) and 11 (44%) with enrollments of at least 100 students and contained Grades 9 through 12.

Of those schools selected for participation in this study, 46% were Christian, 18% were college preparatory, 25% were both Christian schools and college preparatory, and 11% offered specialized education programs. Additionally, 77% of the private schools chosen were Pre-K-12 or K-12, 8% were Grades 1-12, 7% were Grades 9-12, 4% were Grades 7-12, and 4% were Grades 5-12.

Fifty-three percent of CEOs and school board chairs who received the survey were considered leaders of small private schools (100 to 300 students), 26% were leaders of medium schools (301-700 students), and 21% were leaders of large schools (701 to 1,550 students) during 2013-2014 school year. The average tenure as CEO ($n = 37$) was 6.50 years and experience in education was 20 years (see Table 2 and Figure 2). The average time on school boards for chairs
(n = 28) was 6.85 years (see Table 3). The majority of participants indicated that their private schools had one to four new CEOs in the past 10 years.

Table 2

*Average Tenure as CEO of Current School and Years as Certified CEO*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Tenure as CEO at Current Campus</th>
<th>Years of Education Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (Years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School CEOs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*37 out of the 41 CEOs answered this survey question*

![Figure 2. Survey Question 16: Number of different CEOs.](image-url)
Table 3

*Average Tenure as Board Member of Current School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (Years)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private School Board Chairs (100 +)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>11.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 26 of the 28 school board chairs answered this survey question.

Participants who respond to the CEO (Head of School)/Governing Board Chair Leadership Survey were recruited for the quantitative study. Of the 100 Texas private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11, 41 (41%) CEOs and 28 (28%) school board chairs participated. Four individuals who received the email for the survey agreed on Question 1, which asked for their participation in the survey, but they did not complete the survey.

I randomly selected participants for the qualitative study from a convenient and purposive group of Texas private school board chairs and CEOs located in the Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. Twelve CEOs and 12 school board chairs were contacted by email or phone call to schedule the personal interviews. Five CEOs declined participation because of the time of the school year. Those individuals were replaced with CEOs who were available to meet. Interviews were set up with CEOs and school board chairs who were available to participate in the process.

Dependent Variable

Salkind (2012) stated, “The dependent variable is the outcome variable or the predicted variable in a regression equation” (p. 432). The dependent variable for this study was how school board training might influence CEOs’ and school boards’ professional working relationships and success (Survey Questions 9 and 10).
Independent Variable

Salkind (2012) stated, “The independent variable is the treatment variable that is manipulated or the predictor variable in a regression equation” (p. 433). The independent variables for this study were opinions on private school board training (Survey Questions 11, 12, and 13), opinions on components of private school board training (Survey Questions 3, 14, and 15), and opinions on participation in private school board training (Survey Questions 2, 4, 7, and 8).

Instrumentation

The instrument used for the quantitative part of this study was the CEO (Head of School)/Governing Board Chair Leadership Survey. To gather perceptions from Texas private school leaders, I created the survey for CEOs and school board chairs about school board training. The survey consists of 25 items: an informal consent form, 20 questions pertaining to the research questions, and four demographic questions. This survey was designed to learn the perceptions of CEOs and school board chairs regarding school board training and the components of board training. The survey also aimed to understand participants’ perceptions on how board training might influence their respective successes, and how such training might influence the professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards.

Eleven items were self-rated in which participants choose an answer to each question using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree). The first open-ended question gave participants the opportunity to describe orientation, training, and other preparation that board members receive, while the second open-ended question allowed participants to share information on the sources of orientation, training, and other preparation for the board members. The remaining seven open-ended questions gave
participants the opportunity to share their thoughts on board training and the effects of board training on the working relationships between CEOs and school boards.

The instrument used for the qualitative part of this study involved in-depth interviews with 12 CEOs and 12 school board chairs. The questions were open-ended and related to their positions in the private school system. I took notes as the interviewees answered the following questions:

1. What do CEOs or school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 report about school board training?
2. What components of school board training occur within the private school?
3. Which do you think is most important?
4. What are CEOs’ perceptions of their school boards’ trainings?
5. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of school boards and CEOs concerning board training? Explain.
6. How does the school board training influence a CEO’s effectiveness? Explain.

Research Procedures

Participant Selection

Once the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (IRB) granted permission for the study, I emailed CEOs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 requesting the names and email addresses of their school board chairs (Appendix A). Of emails sent, 13% of the CEOs responded and forwarded me the requested information. To increase response rate, I changed the approach by sending emails to the 100 private school CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 explaining the purpose of the research with a link to the survey (Appendix C).
I informed participants about the confidentiality of their responses and noted that their personal identification would be protected by using IP addresses. I felt it necessary to explain the confidentiality of the survey because of competition between private schools. I asked CEOs to complete the survey and send the link to their school board chairs. Participants consented to participate in the survey by clicking on the agree button on the informed consent form (Appendix B) located on the first page of the survey.

Because of the lack of participation by CEOs and school board chairs in responding to the survey, I contacted each CEO by telephone to encourage the completion of the survey. The analysis of the survey only provided an IP address so it was not possible to determine who had completed the survey; therefore, I had to contact each CEO.

To recruit participants for the interviews, the research called private school CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 to schedule appointments for the interviews. I performed the personal interviews with the CEOs and then requested the email addresses and phone numbers for their board chairs so interviews could be scheduled with them as well.

Survey Data Collection

According to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006), “email questionnaires produce fast results and are inexpensive to use and easy to score. Emailing the questionnaire also allows participants to remain confidential” (p. 165). Keeping participants’ identities confidential encourages more responses to sensitive materials (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). Therefore, I used Survey Monkey to email the survey to 100 private school CEOs. Many internet users do not like unsolicited email; therefore, I included an introductory message explaining the reason for the survey (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Depending on respondents’ abilities in using technology, the survey should have taken approximately 15 minutes to complete.
Survey Monkey is a web-based research tool used for research and project evaluation. I input the survey questions into the web page with one question per frame. After completion of the survey, participants saw a ‘thank you’ screen, and the data were sent back to me. After one week, I sent a follow-up email to all CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 requesting their participation if they had not completed the survey. The process was repeated two more times to complete data collection for the survey. The reminder emails also included the letter of consent and the 24-question survey. According to Hopkins, Stanley, and Hopkins (1990), it is important to send at least one or two follow ups to reduce the amount of nonresponsive subjects.

Data Sources

To determine the influence school board training has on relationships between private school boards and CEOs, many types of data were collected. Table 4 provides an overview of the data collected for each particular research question.

Data Analysis

The goal for data analysis in this study was to document the opinions of private school CEOs and school board chairs about school board training and components of training, and to determine whether school board training influences the working relationships between school boards and CEOs using multiple data resources. The data resources included the survey instrument and individual interviews. The inductive data analysis approach was used in this study. According to Creswell (2013), “Qualitative researchers build their patterns, categories and themes from the bottom up by organizing the data into increasingly more abstract units of information” (p. 188). Triangulation or multiple methods of data collection and analysis were used to strengthen reliability and internal validity (Merriam, 1998).
Table 4

Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training?</td>
<td>Qualitative Private School CEO/Board Chair Leadership Survey.</td>
<td>In-depth Informal/Semi-structured interviews - field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific components of private school board training that could potentially influence school boards?</td>
<td>Qualitative Private School CEO/Board Chair Leadership Survey</td>
<td>In-depth informal/semi-structured interviews - field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective successes?</td>
<td>In-depth informal/semi-structured interviews of CEO and school board chair - field notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationships with their school boards?</td>
<td>In-depth informal/semi-structured interviews of CEO and school board chair - field notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Thomas (2006), the first step in data analysis is to prepare documents. In this study, documentation was developed for a quantitative survey and qualitative in-depth interview protocol. The first part of this study aimed to collect data from a survey on the opinions of CEOs and school board chairs about school board training. The data analysis included specific statistical procedures for each research question. In this regard, the following survey questions applied:
1. How do you describe the orientation, training, and other preparations that your board members receive (Survey Question 11)?

2. If board members receive orientation, training, and other preparation, what is the source (Survey Question 12)?

3. Do board chairs receive orientation to support their roles as chairs? If so, what is the source (Survey Question 13)?

The components of school board training were examined to determine the most essential using the following survey questions:

1. School board training includes: (Survey Question 3). Respondents were asked to choose from a list of 10 items.

2. How would you generally describe the components of school board training or professional development that could influence private school boards (Survey Question 14)?

3. What board training or professional development do you believe might be missing that the school board would benefit from in their roles as board members (Survey Question 15)?

Opinions on how board training might influence CEOs’ and school boards’ respective success were examined through the following survey questions:

1. Training and other preparations are effective to be successful as board members (4-point Likert Survey Question 5).

2. How does or how could the professional development training of school board members influence the CEO or head of school’s effectiveness (Survey Question 18)?
The responses to the open-ended questions were categorized and coded to determine respondents’ opinions on school board training. School board training, CEOs, and board member chairs were the units used to prepare the coding, and low-inference codes were generated and transferred to label the units. Possible codes to be labeled in this study included training protocols, relationship, CEO responsibilities, and school board governance. Data sources were organized categorically and chronologically, and were reviewed frequently and coded recurrently after reviewing the transcripts of the survey and interviews. Finally, I identified the themes.

The second aim of the survey was to gather the opinions of private school CEOs and school board chairs about school board members participating in board training. A simple regression was conducted using SPSS statistical software to determine whether a positive significant effect existed between school board training participation and professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards. Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the internal consistency between participation in school board training and the effect it has on the working relationships between CEOs and school boards. The data from the following Likert survey questions were used to develop the independent variable:

1. The school board members regularly participate in professional development training (Survey Question 2).
2. All board members participate in school board orientation (Survey Question 4).
3. The school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed. (Survey Question 7)
4. The school board learns continuously by planning for training opportunities and responding to the training. (Survey Question 8)
The independent variable was used to determine whether the data gathered about participation in school board training yielded a strong correlation with the working relationships between school board chairs and CEOs. The survey questions used to determine the success of working relationships (dependent variable) were as follows:

1. The CEO or head of school has a good working relationship with the school board (Survey Question 9).
2. The school board-CEO working relationship includes the following: (Survey Question 10). Respondents were asked to choose from a list of 10 items.

The third part of the survey included conducting and analyzing the personal interviews of private school board chairs and CEOs. The interviews were transcribed and categorized into themes and patterns, and narratives were prepared from the interviews. The private schools that provided effective school board training were identified through the interviews.

According to Thomas (2006), a list of claims is developed to support the findings of the data. The following statements are possible findings that could be identified from the study about school board training, components or training, and the relationships between CEOs and school board chairs: (a) school board members may not be receiving training, which could cause them to be inexperienced, uninformed, or under qualified in areas relevant to school policies; (b) school boards may be missing necessary board training components; (c) CEO and school board tension may interfere with the success of a school; and (d) role confusion between the CEO and school board may exist.

**Anticipated Audience/Purpose/Format of Report of Findings**

The purpose of this study was to present the findings of this research to private school board groups. The findings will help them understand the importance of their roles in the
educational environment and offer information on how poor working relationships among school leaders could interfere with the education process. It is imperative that private schools have positive working relationships between school boards and CEOs to achieve success. This research could lead to developing school board training for private schools. The findings are presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the data analysis and findings from the surveys and interviews for each research question. Figures and tables are presented to represent the descriptive data and quantitative statistics for the study. I used the descriptive data to establish findings and construct meaning from the study. A qualitative and quantitative researcher is responsible for ensuring that this study was valid, reliable, and credible. The triangulation of the data helped ensure both validity and reliability. I achieved triangulation by collecting data from in-depth interviews, Likert scale questions, short-answer survey questions, and demographic data.

The major purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of school board chairs and CEOs of private schools on school board training, components of training, and potential benefits for the success of working relationships between CEOs and school board chairs. The following section presents the findings for the research questions. A presentation of descriptive statistics is provided for each research question. The four research questions were as follows:

1. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training?

2. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific components of private school board training that could potentially influence school boards?

3. What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective successes?
4. How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationships with their school boards?

Chief executive officers (CEOs) from 100 Texas private schools in educational service center regions 10 and 11 received a request to complete the CEO (Head of School)/Governing Board Chair Leadership Survey. The CEOs of each private school were also asked to forward the survey link to their school board chairs. The CEOs received a second and third request to complete the survey. Because the delivery of the survey coincided with the end of the school year, I contacted each CEO personally to encourage the completion of the survey. The result of the phone calls increased individual responses from 40 to 73 completed surveys.

Figure 3 illustrates how the CEO/Head of School Governing Board Chair Survey provides answers to the research questions. The figure shows the relationships between the independent and dependent variables, the survey questions, and the research questions.

![Figure 3. Research model.](image-url)
Findings

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 was as follows: What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training? I first analyzed the opinions of CEOs and school board chairs on board training practices and participation of their private schools. The survey questions related to Research Question 1 were as follows:

1. The school board members regularly participate in professional development training.
2. All new board members participate in school board orientation.
3. The school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed.
4. The school board learns continuously by planning for training opportunities and responding to the training.

Of respondents, 40.4% of CEOs \((n = 14)\) and school board chairs \((n = 11)\) agreed or strongly agreed that they regularly participated in school board training, whereas 59.7% of CEOs \((n = 22)\) and school board chairs \((n = 15)\) surveyed did not regularly participate in school board training (see Figure 4). Respondent 15 to Survey Question 14 stated, “I am not aware of any school board training that has taken place here for over the past 5 years.” Respondent 17 stated, “Our board does not participate in any type of training, they have a balanced business board.”
Concerning Survey Question 4, 69.4% of CEOs ($n = 24$) and school board chairs ($n = 19$) surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that the new board members participated in an orientation (see Figure 5). However, 30.7% of CEOs ($n = 13$) and school board chairs ($n = 6$) reported that they did not provide orientation for their new board members.
The next open-ended question analyzed was, “Do board chairs/presidents receive orientation to support their roles as board chairs? If so, what is the source?” In response to this question, 52% of CEOs ($n = 14$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) stated that new school board chairs did not receive any type of school board chair training. Further, 48% of CEOs ($n = 14$) and school board chairs ($n = 10$) replied that their school board chair training was either outsourced, conducted informally by the outgoing board chair, or conducted by the CEO or by past board members.

Concerning setting time aside to learn more about important issues facing schools, 60.7% of CEOs ($n = 19$) and school board chairs ($n = 18$) surveyed stated the school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed. Additionally, 39.4% of CEOs and school board chairs noted that they did not set time aside to learn more about important issues facing schools (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6.** Survey Question 7: School board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools.

Of CEOs and school board chairs, 40.4% agreed or strongly agreed that their school boards continuously learned by planning for school board training opportunities and responding to the training. However, 59.7% of CEOs ($n = 24$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) disagreed or
strongly disagreed that their school board continuously learned by planning for school board training opportunities and responding to the training (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7](image)

**Figure 7.** Survey Question 8: School board learns continuously by planning for training opportunities and responding to the training.

In conclusion, CEOs and school board chairs from the private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 who responded to the survey agreed that their schools provided more school board orientation training for new members compared to regular and ongoing school board training or school board chair training.

In response to the first research question, I began the descriptive data process by coding and indexing. From the onset, I defined “clear categories” for the data used to organize an “explicit structure” to manage the information (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 45). Responses were coded by their descriptions in response to the open-ended question, “How do you describe the orientation, training, and other preparations that your board members receive?”

Thirty-three percent \( (n = 18) \) of respondents reported a full orientation, 36% \( (n = 18) \) had a minimal training, 11% \( (n = 6) \) had no training, 7% \( (n = 4) \) had once a year board training, and 9% \( (n = 5) \) had continuous training. Interview Respondent 18 stated, “They have an orientation process and use Independent School Management (ISM) to assist them with board training.
needs.” Interview Respondent 8 reported that his board had participated in numerous book studies and contracted the services of outside “experts” to work with both the school board and the CEO. Respondent 47 stated,

I think we could improve on board training, we do an adequate job. I believe that we do, with all diligence, try to govern our school fairly, objectively, and lawfully. I think the reason that our board does this is because they are aware of state, federal laws, as well as the laws of God. The board trusts me as an administrator, but I do have restraints put on me by them. Our budget, staff, handbooks, policies, and procedures are all approved by the board.

The majority of CEOs and school board chairs (91%) interviewed believed that school board training was not only necessary, but also beneficial. Interview Respondent 3 stated that school board training is important and beneficial, and 70% of her school board chairs were parents. She also stated that board members need training and orientation that addresses confidentiality, expectations, and roles and responsibilities. Interview Respondent 5 stated that orientation should include having a good understanding of working within the chain of command for problem resolutions. He also believed that the training would lend to unity and cohesiveness within the school board. Of the 12 CEOs and 12 school board chairs interviewed, only one private school did not offer any type of school board training. This leader was the head of the school and school board chair of 32 years; he led a large (700-1550 students) private school. He believed it was not necessary for his board members to participate in any type of training.

Interview Respondent 6 believed that his school board had very informal school board trainings and had improved its processes over the past year. Interview Respondent 11 stated that
they are becoming better every year. This board chair conducted one-on-one meetings with the head of the school and individual board members. In conclusion, the majority of CEOs and school board chairs (91%) who participated in the interviews and surveys agreed on the importance of school board training.

Research Question 2

Research Questions 2 was as follows: What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific components of the private school board training that could potentially influence private school boards? Survey Question 3 asked respondents to indicate which components of school board training was included in their own trainings, which school board components could influence private school boards, and which components of school board training might be missing that the school board would benefit from as its role in the school system (see Figure 8). I categorized the responses to the open-ended questions and notes taken during the personal interviews. An analysis of the results revealed key words and concepts that recurred in several interviews.

The top three components of school board training that CEOs and school board chairs of the private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 selected from the survey included roles and responsibilities (87.8%), foundations of board policy (69.4%), and visionary planning (53.1%). Hess (2002) stated that the challenge of governance of a school system becomes stressful when board members are uncertain of how to accomplish all of the many expectations set for them, and when they do not know the roles and responsibilities of their jobs.
Interview Respondent 4 noted that board training should include strong descriptions concerning the distinction between those issues that are board decisions and those that are made by the school administration. The board hires the head of school, and it should trust that individual to run the school according to established policies and guidelines. Everyday decisions concerning school operations should be left to the school administration and not be micromanaged by the school board. The respondent also said that board decisions could only be made as a group, not by individual members outside of the board setting. All but one individual interviewed mentioned the importance of board training to include the roles and responsibilities of the position. Interview Respondent 3 stated that school board training should include roles and responsibilities, the mission of the school, the global picture of the school versus family, board members relationships, and then the nuts and bolts of the school. Interview Respondent 11 added confidentiality to the component of roles and responsibilities of school board members.

The CEOs and school board chairs were asked what components of school board training might be missing that would benefit their school board members. The top two components
identified were fundraising training (29%) and teaching leadership roles (25%). Other components mentioned included conflict resolution training, labor and employment law, school policies, vision development, understanding the ministry, non-profit organization training, and marketing.

Additionally, 43% of the CEOs and school board chairs surveyed believed that the lack of financial resources impeded them from achieving their goals for their schools. Interestingly, only 39% \((n = 24)\) of respondents surveyed had received training on fiduciary responsibilities, and 16% \((n = 8)\) of respondents received training on fundamentals of fundraising. Respondent 14 on Survey Question 14 stated there needed to be an “understanding of the role of the board—especially in regard to fundraising and development and winning friends for the school.”

On Survey Question 15, CEO respondents 28 and 30 stated, their school could do a better job in terms of making sure board members understand the importance of active participation in fundraising. Therefore, having someone with fundraising expertise or some board members trained in fundraising would be beneficial. Interview Respondent 7 asked his board members to assist his development officers with fundraising opportunities. The lack of training in fundraising and role and responsibility development are two components that potentially affect the success of the private schools in accomplishing their goals.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 was as follows: What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective success? I categorized and coded the responses to Survey Question 18 of the CEO/Board Chair Leadership Survey. Clear understanding of leadership roles, strategic planning, and effective communication were indicators that could influence a
CEO’s effectiveness. Of respondents \((n = 59)\), 95% believed they had good working relationships between their school boards and CEOs; however, they indicated some role confusion and personality conflicts.

Respondent 1 to this question stated that, by understanding the role of the board members and the role of the head of school (CEO), each entity would have a blueprint of the items that fall in their jurisdictions. Respondent 3 stated, “If board members do not fully understand the roles and responsibilities of both board members and the head of the school, then the effectiveness of the head of school will be greatly diminished.” Respondent 8 stated, “Untrained board members discourage CEOs and are often the result of CEO turnover.”

Respondent 19 stated, “If the board is better trained, the head of school (CEO) would not have to educate them on every issue or subject.” He also said that the board could stay focused on the big picture and not get caught in the minutiae. Respondent 21 stated,

Helping the school board understand its role/responsibility will help the school board provide clear guidance and direction to the CEO (head of school) which, in turn, will help the CEO (head of school) respond to and implement that direction and guidance. It would be difficult to collaborate without an appreciation for the roles of each party.

Interview Respondents 1 and 2 discussed the importance of having a relationship with the board. The board chair and CEO talk daily, and they spend time sharing ideas about the school. Interview Respondent 1 also noted that he has developed trust and social capital with his board.

In conclusion, 90.1% of CEOs \((n = 33)\) and school board chairs \((n = 22)\) believed that school board training and other preparations were necessary to be successful as board members (see Figure 9). Interestingly, 95% of CEOs \((n = 34, 57.6\%)\) and school board chairs \((n = 25,\)
42.3%) believe they already had good working relationships between their school boards and CEOs.

Figure 9. Survey Question 5: Training and other preparations for successful board members.

Figure 10 illustrates the top three factors for working relationships between school board chairs and CEOs, which include trust and effective communication (87.5%), positive attitude (87.5%) and working together to anticipate and strategize issues (87.5%). Most importantly, the two negative areas that the school board chairs and CEOs indicated as part of their working relationships included role confusion (23.2%) and personality conflicts (17.9%).

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 was as follows: How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationship with the school board? Research question four was examined using both descriptive data and quantitative statistics. I categorized and coded the responses to Survey Questions 6, 9, and 17 and developed narrative conversations from the 12 CEO and school board chair interviews. I also used the SPSS statistical software to determine whether a positive or negative significant effect existed between school board training participation and working relationships between CEOs and school boards.
Survey Question 6 asked whether board training was necessary to influence the working relationships positively between school boards and CEOs. Of the responses, 92% of CEOs ($n = 33$) and school board chairs ($n = 24$) agreed or strongly agreed that school board training can positively affect the working relationships between CEOs and school board chairs. Only 8.1% of
the CEOs \((n = 4)\) and school board chairs \((n = 1)\) disagreed with the survey question (see Figure 11).
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*Figure 11*: Survey Question 6: Board training is necessary in positively influence the working relationship between the school board and the CEO.

Survey Question 9 asked participants whether good working relationships currently existed between CEOs and school boards; 95.2\% of CEOs \((n = 34)\) and school board chairs \((n = 25)\) agree or strongly agree with this question (see Figure 12).
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*Figure 12*: Survey Question 9: CEOs have good working relationships with school boards.
Finally, I categorized and coded the responses to Survey Question 17, which addressed essential school board characteristics. Participants identified the following as the most important: position (37%), open communication (27%), clear governance (25%), and respect and trust (19%). Respondent 4 stated,

The head of school and school board should have a relationship of mutual respect and trust. The school board should be able to trust the head of school to operate the school effectively. The head of the school should be able to trust the board to support him and his decision in the daily operations. The board should also serve as a support system for the head of school. They should be willing to listen and offer support though difficult decisions or crisis situations.

Respondent 23 stated,

School board training is important. It is essential for both the CEO and the school board members to be trained to understand and respect the role that each of them holds and how each of them should appropriately interact. It is also essential to understand how to evaluate periodically with their respective roles.

Respondents (27%) frequently mentioned the importance of open communication through open discussions, dialogue, and engagement.

I found similar comments between CEOs and school board chairs who participated in the interviews. I asked participants how school board training influences a CEO’s effectiveness. Interview Respondent 5 stated, “If the school board training was done properly, it would help maintain a consistent operational model and communication model. It would also set proper
outcomes and behaviors for each leadership position. Trust value is important.” Interview Respondents 5, 6, and 3 also discussed the role of the continuity and longevity of the same CEO plays in the success of the school. Interview Respondent 7 emphasized trust among the leaders, while Interview Respondent 1 mentioned trust and added that the working relationship between the CEO and school board hinges on a healthy organization.

Interview Respondent 1 recommended a self-evaluation tool to be used as an accountability piece for all board members. Interview Respondent 9 noted that school board training is critical. School board training allows for effective board meetings because of the knowledge that board members have before entering a meeting. He also discussed the trust factor and the fact that no replacement for time exists on the job. Interview Respondent 9 also stated, “Putting the school and the Lord ahead of oneself with full disclosure, humanity, and willingness to be evaluated and critique is essential.”

Interview Respondent 2 stated, “If board training is not done right, it will be disastrous.” Successful school board training can affect the whole school. Interview Respondent 11 indicated that if board members are trained well, the administrative staff could focus on their responsibilities without interruptions from the board. In conclusion, 95% of the CEOs and school board chairs interviewed agreed with the findings in Survey Question 17, which emphasized training in defined roles, open communication, clear governance, respect, and trust.

Finally, a simple regression was conducted to examine whether a positive significant effect existed between school board training participation and the professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards. Cronbach’s alpha for this research question was .868, which is considered excellent internal consistency. Santos (1999) stated, “Cronbach's
alpha determines the internal consistency or average correlation of items in a survey instrument to gauge its reliability” (p. 1).

Cronbach’s alpha was determined by creating a new index using Survey Question 2 (The school board members regularly participate in professional development training), Survey Question 4 (All new board members participate in school board orientation), Survey Question 7 (The school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed), and Survey Question 8 (The school board learns continuously by planning for learning opportunities and responding to the training). The Cronbach’s alpha ($Y = \beta X$) was labeled “participation.” The b-weight and its $t$-test explained whether a significant, positive relationship existed between school board participation and the professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards.

The data were divided by position (CEO and school board chairs of private schools) before entering the data into the SPSS software. The data from the private school board CEOs was examined first. The results of the simple regression gathered on the private school board CEOs indicated that, for each one unit increase in good working relationship with the school board, participation in training increased, .312 (1-4) ($t = 2.40, p = .022$). The 95% CI indicated that the coefficient could be as low as .283 are as high as .373 in the general population (95% CI = .28, .37). The overall model was statistically significant [$F(1, 36) = 5.762, p = .022$] and explained approximately 14.1% ($R^2_{\text{Adj.}} = .117$) of the variance in good working relationship with the school board.

Then, the data gathered from the school board chairs were entered into the SPSS software. The results of the simple regression gathered on the private school board chairs indicated that, for each one unit increase in good working relationships with the school boards,
participation in training increased .336 (scale of 1-4) \((t = 2.37, p = .026)\). The 95% CI indicated that the coefficient could be as low as .28 or as high as .39 in the general population (95% CI = .28, .39). The overall model was statistically significant \([F(1, 24) = 5.63, p = .026]\) and explained approximately 19.7% (\(R^2\text{Adj.} = .162\)) of the variance in good working relationships with school boards.

The results of the quantitative data gathered from the both groups (private school board chairs and CEOs) were statistically significant. In examining and reviewing the in-depth interviews, the short answer questions, and the quantitative findings, I interpreted this finding to mean that school boards that participate in school board training tend to have positive working relationships with their CEOs.

Finally, Survey Question 16 asked, “What change in the school board do you think would make a significant improvement in your private school?” Of respondents, 47.5% of CEOs \((n = 18)\) and school board chairs \((n = 11)\) believed providing better or more professional development programs for board members would allow for improvement. Additionally, 22.9% believed that focusing on the board-CEO collaboration to provide better leadership and recruiting board candidates who are more qualified could make significant improvement for their schools. Finally, 29.5% believed that none of the above would make a significant improvement in their school (see Figure 13).

Exceptional boards deepen their members’ knowledge of organizational programs, constituents, and context through formal orientation and ongoing board education that draw on internal and external resources (Board Source, 2007a). This research study of Texas private schools from Educational Service Centers Regions 10 and 11 found, through quantitative and qualitative data and personal communications with school board chairs (\(R^2\text{Adj.} = .162\)) and
CEOs (R$_{2Adj.}$ = .117), that board training does make a significant difference in the working relationship between the CEOs and school boards of private schools.

A targeted review of the data revealed evidence to suggest that private school board training may influence the working relationships between CEOs and school board chairs. The findings for Research Question 1 demonstrated that the majority (69.4%) of private school CEOs and private school board chairs in Educational Service Centers Regions 10 and 11 who responded to the survey provided school board orientation. Additionally, the minority (40.4%) of CEOs and private school board chairs continually learn by planning for school board training opportunities and responding to the training. Respondents also tended to agree that their schools provided more school board orientation training for new members compared to regular and ongoing school board training or school board chair training.

Concerning Research Question 2, the highest percentage scores in Survey Question 3 indicated that private school CEOs and school board chairs believed roles and responsibilities (87.8%), foundations of school board policy (69.4%), and visionary planning (53.1%) were the

*Figure 13. Survey Question 16: Suggested changes in training.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Focus on the Board/CEO collaboration to provide better leadership.</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provide better or more professional development programs for board members.</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recruit board candidates who are better qualified.</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. None of the above</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

A targeted review of the data revealed evidence to suggest that private school board training may influence the working relationships between CEOs and school board chairs. The findings for Research Question 1 demonstrated that the majority (69.4%) of private school CEOs and private school board chairs in Educational Service Centers Regions 10 and 11 who responded to the survey provided school board orientation. Additionally, the minority (40.4%) of CEOs and private school board chairs continually learn by planning for school board training opportunities and responding to the training. Respondents also tended to agree that their schools provided more school board orientation training for new members compared to regular and ongoing school board training or school board chair training.

Concerning Research Question 2, the highest percentage scores in Survey Question 3 indicated that private school CEOs and school board chairs believed roles and responsibilities (87.8%), foundations of school board policy (69.4%), and visionary planning (53.1%) were the
most common areas for board training. Board training components that participants felt were missing included fundraising training and teaching leadership roles.

Concerning Research Question 3, the majority (95%) of CEOs and school board chairs who completed the survey believed they had good working relationships between their CEOs and school board chairs. However, the findings also indicated some role confusion and personality conflicts between CEOs and school board chairs.

Concerning Research Question 4, the majority of CEOs and school board chairs stated that board training could influence the working relationship between CEOs and school boards chairs positively. The majority of CEOs also agreed they had good working relationships with their school boards. In conclusion, the descriptive data and quantitative (simple regression model) findings demonstrate a significant, but small, positive relationship between participation in school board training and professional working relationships between CEOs and school boards.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings of the research questions, present interpretations, draw conclusions, and propose possible implications for future research related to private school board training and its influence on the working relationship between private school board chairs and chief executive officers (CEOs). This chapter presents a discussion of the data analysis offered in Chapter 4. In previous chapters, an introduction, review of relevant literature, research methods, and data collection findings were presented.

This study was designed to investigate the perceptions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools on the specific components of school board training, and the influence of training on school board effectiveness, school board success, and the working relationships between CEOs and their school boards. As indicated in previous chapters, the population used in this study was acting CEOs and school board chairs in Texas private schools in educational service center regions 10 and 11 with at least 100 students and containing Grades 9-12.

The CEOs and school board chairs in Texas private schools in educational service center regions 10 and 11 were asked to participate in the study by completing the CEO (Head of School)/Governing Board Chair Leadership Survey, which I created. The survey link (Survey Monkey) and explanation letter was electronically mailed to the selected private school CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. The CEOs were requested to send the survey link to their school board chairs.

The survey consisted of 25 items: an informal consent form, 20 questions pertaining to the research questions, and four demographic questions about the respondents. In addition, 12 CEOs and school board chairs were asked to engage in personal interviews with me. The Texas
private school board chairs and CEOs from Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 were chosen as the focus for this study because of the lack of board training requirements for private schools in Texas and the interest in what might impede private schools success.

I conducted a literature review to explore the roles of private school CEOs and public school superintendents, the role of the private and public school boards, the relationship between the CEO/superintendent and the private/public school boards, and the concept of private school board training and its components. Most importantly, the study sought to examine whether private school training played a role in the success of working relationships between CEOs and school boards. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the current opinions of the CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 about school board training?

2. What are the current opinions of the CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 about specific components of private school board training that could potentially influence school boards?

3. What is the current opinion of the CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective successes?

4. How does board training influence the CEOs professional working relationship with their school boards?
Conclusion

The analysis of the data leads to several conclusions regarding the perceptions of school board training and the potential benefits for the success of school board chairs and CEOs. Research Question 1 asked, “What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on school board training? The data indicated that CEOs and school board chairs believe school board training is important and beneficial, though fewer than half participated in training on a regular basis. Survey Questions 2, 4, 7, and 8 were examined to discover how much involvement private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 have in school board training. The following is a summary of these results:

1. Forty percent of CEOs ($n = 14$) and school board chairs ($n = 11$) surveyed stated their school board members regularly participate in school board training.

2. Sixty-nine percent of CEOs ($n = 24$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) surveyed stated new school board members participated in school board training.

3. Sixty-one percent of CEOs ($n = 19$) and school board chairs ($n = 18$) surveyed stated the school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed.

4. Forty percent of CEOs ($n = 13$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) surveyed stated their school boards learn continuously by planning for training opportunities and responding to the training.

The analysis of the data indicates that school board training is important (69.4%) for new school board members, which leaves 31% of the private schools surveyed that do not train their new board members. The majority of school boards members are not receiving continuous
training throughout their terms. Board training for private schools is not a state requirement; however, private schools could benefit from the training. The literature discusses that training of board members is a fragmented process left to chance in far too many private schools. Maritz (2006) emphasized, “If school board members are to be effective, they must learn of the laws that dictate their responsibilities and the behaviors that lead to effective service” (p. 59).

Survey Question 11, 12, and 13 were examined to discover the opinions on school board training. The following is a summary of these results.

1. Of the private schools that offered some sort of board training to their school board members, 49% of the CEOs \( (n = 16) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 11) \) surveyed described their school board training as minimal, where as 38% CEOs \( (n = 11) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 10) \) described their school board training as a full orientation.

2. Seventy-two percent of CEOs \( (n = 21) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 15) \) stated that school board training occurred in-house.

3. Fifty-two percent of CEOs \( (n = 16) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 12) \) stated that there is no training offered to new school board chairs.

The analysis of this data emphasize that, if board training occurs, it is minimal within the schools. The majority of the new school board chairs do not receive any training; rather, the knowledge to perform their jobs as board chairs comes from previous board chairs or CEOs. The school board chair has the responsibility to lead the board (Carver, 2002); therefore, it is important that he or she understands the role and responsibilities of this position.

Research Question 2 asked, “What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on specific
components of the private school board training that influence private school boards? The data indicated components of school board training that CEOs and school board chairs felt were important and beneficial. Survey Questions 3, 14, and 15 were examined to determine the components of school board training that were missing or essential to the success of the school board. Both CEOs and school board chairs ranked the following characteristics as the most important components to school board training:

1. Roles and responsibilities (84.2%): Board chairs \((n = 20)\), CEOs \((n = 23)\)
2. Foundations of board policies (71.1%): Board chairs \((n = 14)\), CEOs \((n = 20)\)
3. Visionary planning (55.3%): Board chairs \((n = 14)\), CEOs \((n = 12)\)

In the open-ended Survey Question 15, categories were developed from CEO \((n = 29)\) and school board chair \((n = 22)\) responses to indicate components of school board training that would be beneficial. Common themes included a lack of fundraising training, conflict resolution training, and understanding leadership roles. Other topics included non-profit organization training and labor and employment law.

Research Question 3 asked, “What are the current opinions of CEOs and school board chairs of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 on how training might influence their respective success?” The data indicated that school board training might influence their respective successes and is important. Survey Questions 5 and 18 were examined to determine how training correlates with the success of the CEO. The following presents a summary of those results:

1. Ninety percent of CEOs \((n = 33)\) and school board chairs \((n = 22)\) surveyed stated that training and other preparations are effective.
2. Seventy-four percent of CEOs (n = 12) and school board chairs (n = 12) surveyed stated that clear understanding of roles, collaboration, and shared purpose and vision could positively influence CEOs’ effectiveness.

3. Ninety-five percent of CEOs (n = 34) and school board chairs (n = 25) surveyed believed they had good working relationships between their school boards and CEOs.

4. Forty-one percent of CEOs and school board chairs surveyed indicated some role confusion (CEOs: n = 10; school board chairs: n = 3) and personality conflicts (CEOs: n = 6; school board chairs: n = 4).

The results indicate that private school boards would benefit from school board training, which could potentially decrease role confusion or personality conflicts. The data also indicate that, of the CEOs who responded to the survey, they identified role confusion and personality conflict to be a bigger problem comparison to school board chairs. Mountford (2004) stated the most common reason for difficult school board-CEO or superintendent relationship is role confusion. Eadie (2009) emphasized, “A close, positive working relationship between a strong board and a really board-savvy head of school is at the heart of high-impact governing” (p.2).

Research Question 4 asked, “How does board training influence CEOs’ professional working relationships with their school boards? The descriptive data suggest that school board training significantly influences the working relationship. Survey Question 6 and 17 were examined to determine the influences of school board training on the working relationship. The following presents a summary of those results:
1. Ninety-two percent of CEOs ($n = 33$) and school board chairs ($n = 24$) surveyed stated that school board training was necessary in positively influencing the working relationship between the school board and CEO.

2. Seventy-one percent of CEOs ($n = 19$) and school board chairs ($n = 15$) mentioned developing open communication, trust and respect, and defined roles as essential elements for CEOs and school boards to have strong working relationships.

3. The interviews with CEOs and school board chairs indicated that they all agreed effective school board training would be beneficial to the success of the working relationships between CEOs and school boards.

4. The simple regression revealed that the data from school board chairs ($p = .026$) and CEOs ($p = .022$) was statistically significant and showed a positive, but small, correlation.

The data gathered from the quantitative survey, in-depth interviews, and open-ended questions indicate that school board training has a positive influence on the working relationships between CEOs and school board chairs. While only 40% indicate that they currently use board training, these questions represent a strong belief that such training can make a difference. Providing board training that leads to open communication, trust and respect, and educating board members on their role and responsibilities will enhance the working relationship between CEOs and school board chairs. Land (2002) noted that productive relationships between school board members and CEOs or superintendents are generally marked by trust, respect, open communication, and support. A successful partnership between the board and CEO lends itself to a successful governance process (Kilmister & Nahkies, 2004). Therefore,
finding ways to develop relationships between the CEO and school board allows for effective leadership to occur within the school and organization (Petersen & Short, 2001).

In conclusion, the analysis of the data led to several conclusions regarding the effects of board training on the relationship between board members and CEOs. First, the CEOs and school board chairs of Texas private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 understand the importance of school board training. Private school CEOs ($n = 24$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) who participated in this study appear to be in agreement that school board orientation training is more common for new school board members. The CEOs ($n = 13$) and school board chairs ($n = 12$) also agree that many private school boards do not take the time to continuously plan for training opportunities and respond to the training. Additionally, most private school board meetings are limited in time, as there is typically a full agenda, and boards have limited time for training opportunities.

Participants also agreed that the most important characteristics to be emphasized during school board training are roles and responsibilities, foundation of board policies and visionary planning. Zimmerman (2004) discussed requiring mandated school board training to provide board members with up-to-date information, which would allow members to become more knowledgeable in their roles and responsibilities. Finally, the private school CEOs ($n = 29$) and school board chairs ($n = 22$) agree that (Survey Question 15) fundraising, conflict resolution, and developing a mission are all missing from school board training. Therefore, private school board members would also benefit from training in the fundamentals of fundraising, policy and position development, visionary planning, fiduciary responsibilities, private school board by-laws, budget training (including setting tuition and salaries), and basic contract law (including at-will contracts).
The CEOs \( (n = 33) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 22) \) agreed that school board training is effective to developing successful board members. The CEOs and school board chairs also agreed that a clear understanding of their roles, collaboration, and a shared purpose and vision would positively influence CEO effectiveness (Survey Question 18).

Data from a majority of interviews suggested that understanding the roles and responsibilities of board members is essential to having a successful working relationship between the CEO and school board. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) encourages school leaders to regard the relationship between the CEO and school board chair as a critical partnership that is characterized by mutual trust, reciprocity, honest feedback, and harmonious collaboration (Quinby, 2012). The findings from this study support previous research and suggest key characteristics of school board training that could potentially influence the CEOs effectiveness.

Further, CEOs \( (n = 12) \) and school board chairs \( (n = 12) \) agree that open communication, trust and respect, and defined roles are essential elements to have a strong relationship between the CEO and school board. Quinby (2012) noted, “Significant time and energy must be devoted to learning how to work with the board chair. It takes time to establish trust and effective communication routines” (p. 91). Most of the participant (91%) interviewed agreed that effective board training would be beneficial to the success of the working relationship between the CEO and the school board. The findings from this study suggest that a significant relationship and a small, but positive, correlation exist for school board training and the working relationship between the CEO and school board. These findings indicate that other factors are important to the relationship, but school board training will have a positive influence.
Recommendations

Recommendations for Application of Research

The conclusions of this study have prompted the following recommendations. It is hoped that these recommendations will contribute to the development of private school board training and articulate effective practices that assist CEOs and school boards in their governance of private schools.

First, Texas private school boards need to consider formulating a policy that would require effective school board training for all board members. Private schools need to investigate organizations such as the Independent Schools Management (ISM), NAIS, or the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) to see if they could meet the need of a school regarding school board training. School board members could also consider reading publications from websites such as Boardsource.org on school board training and, possibly, send board members to national conferences that include private school board training. Finally, in setting a policy on mandatory board training, private schools would need to consider the time constraints and expense of these trainings.

The private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 pay annual membership fees to participate in the services offered at the regional centers. Private school leaders could join and approach these Centers to inquire about specialized private school board and CEO training. The training could be based on the data included in this research study. It would be important for the training to be specialized to the needs of private schools.

In addition, private school CEOs could present the information in this study to their school boards. A steering committee could be formed of private school leaders to investigate options to encourage strong working relationships among private school leaders. This
committee would be responsible for the follow-up work to this study. The committee could
determine elements of school board training that would be beneficial to private schools to
improve the working relationship between the CEO and school board chair. The steering
committee could also develop an instructional design for board training that would be valuable to
private schools. Additionally, individual school boards could determine what components of
board training would be beneficial to their organizations to improve the success of the school
board and CEO relationship.

Board retreats and board workshops also could be a way to present training on
components that would improve these working relationships. Newbrough (2002) discussed that
the strain on the CEO and school board relationship often results from role ambiguity and a lack
of clarity regarding the decision-making practices within the organization, which may be
remedied partially through school board retreats.

The literature review provided information about public school boards and the training
requirements for all public school board members; however, little research focuses specifically
on private schools. An analysis of the resources used by successful private school boards for
board training could be incorporated into other private schools at a cost that makes the training
feasible.

Recommendations for Improvement of Current Research and Further Studies

Upon analysis of the data in this study, I offer the following recommendations:

1. Duplicating this study by examining the enrollment of each school would allow
additional data to be gathered to determine whether CEOs and school board chairs
from the same size private schools respond to the survey in the same way. For
example, a survey question could ask respondents to choose between enrollment size of 100 to 300 students, 301-700 students, or 701 and 1550 students.

2. This study could be repeated with an emphasis on longevity among CEOs. Respondents reported that 43% of their schools had more than three different CEOs in a 10-year time span. Additionally, Byrd et al. (2006) noted, “Improved relationships between school board presidents and CEOs could lead to longer tenures and possibly a better focus on the importance of what really matters in schools – student academic achievement” (p. 17). Unfortunately, there is a very limited data on private schools to determine whether the longevity of a CEO is related to the school board and CEO working relationship. It would be interesting to determine whether a correlation exists between school board training and CEO longevity. However, these data would only be accessible if the private schools were willing to share them.

Summary

In this study, I initially examined public school board training, the role of the public school superintendents, the relationship between the school board chairs and the superintendents to form a base to compare the information of private school boards and CEOs in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11. Public schools provide school board training regularly, while private schools are not required to provide their school boards with these opportunities. This study also allowed me to connect with other private schools in the area. Relationships were built among private school leaders, which will be beneficial in developing a common desire to provide practical private school board training.
The personal interviews and quantitative and qualitative data gathered affirmed that private school leaders are interested in private school board training and the influence it could play on the working relationships between CEOs and school boards. Private school boards consist of individuals who have a skill set that would be beneficial to the private school and who are willing to invest the necessary time and resources in supporting their schools. Even though the data concluded that school board training is essential, only 40% of the school board chairs and CEOs indicated that their school boards participated in regular training. Most individuals who participated in the personal interviews were concerned that they were not doing enough regarding school board training; however, time demands and a lack of funds often interfere with the desired board training. The data presented may provide private schools with the next step in defining their roles and responsibilities, foundations of board policies, and visionary planning required to strengthen the leadership within their schools.
APPENDIX A

REQUEST LETTER FOR EMAIL ADDRESSES OF SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRS
January 24, 2014

All CEOs of Private Schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11

Dear Private School CEO,

My name is Beth Riley and I am a doctoral student in the Education Administrative Leadership Program at the University of North Texas actively engaged in dissertation research. I am also the Chief Operating Officer at Fort Worth Christian School.

The purpose of this email is to get the name of your board chair and their email address. In the very near future I will be requesting your support by filling out a short survey for my dissertation study, which is a study of the perceptions of the private school board-CEO working relationship. The purpose of this study is to explore in-service school board training and the impact it plays on the working relationship of the board presidents and CEO. I am requesting your participation in this study to identify potential correlations between school board in-service training programs and the working relationship between board members and CEOs.

This research is of interest to me personally because I have served in different capacities in private education. I have moved from being a classroom teacher, to middle school principal, to the Chief Operating Officer. I have always been interested in observing the working relationship between school board members and CEOs.

I would appreciate your assistance in providing the requested information.

Blessings,
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Informed Consent

I freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent participating in the research project entitled “Effects of Board Training on the Relationship between Board Members and CEOs.”

This research is being conducted by Beth Riley, a Doctoral student, in the Educational Administration at the University North Texas. Beth is the student investigator for this study. Dr. Bill Camp is the supervising investigator and Dr. Michael Spector is the co-supervisor investigator for this study. I understand the purpose of this research is to further the research of school board-superintendent working relationship. I understand that if I participate in this project, I will be asked to complete a Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire as well as general information about myself. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

I understand that all responses and your school will remain confidential through the use of a coding system, that this consent form and completed questionnaire will be stored in the Investigator’s office on the UNT campus, and these documents will be destroyed six months after data entry.

I understand there are benefits for participating in this research project. First, the data from this research will contribute to the understanding of the school board-superintendent relationship by examining the perceptions held by school board presidents and superintendents on the subject of board training. Specifically, this research endeavors to examine the school board-superintendent working relationship in the areas of making decisions, functioning as a group, exercising authority, working toward board improvement, and acting strategically. Next, information from this study will provide schools of educational leadership valuable insight in the revision of programs and course offerings of educational leadership. Lastly, individuals who contemplate careers as private school CEOs or a school board member can utilize this data to develop their perceptions for the achievement of high performing schools.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

There are no foreseeable risks involved in this study. I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time. I also understand that I may withdraw from this study without loss or penalty.

I have read and understand this consent form.

School Board President Date

____________________________________

Person obtaining consent Date

____________________________________
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER
April 15, 2014

All CEOs of Private Schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11,

Dear Private School CEO (Head of School),

The purpose of this letter is to solicit your support in my dissertation study, which is a mixed-method study of the perceptions of the private school board-CEO working relationship. This study is to explore school board training and the impact it plays on the working relationship of the board presidents and CEO. I am requesting your participation in this study to identify potential correlations between school board training programs and the working relationship between board members and CEOs.

My name is Beth Riley and I am a Doctoral student in the Education Administrative Leadership Program at the University of North Texas actively engaged in dissertation research. Dr. Bill Camp, a UNT professor is directing my research.

This research is of interest to me personally because I have served in different capacities in private education. I have moved from being a classroom teacher, to middle school principal, to the Chief Operating Officer. I have always been interested in observing the working relationship between school board members and CEOs.

The enclosed link for the survey is being sent to all Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 private school CEOs and school board chairs. The survey focuses on school board training and how it affects the working relationship between school board chairs and CEOs.

I am requesting that you take approximately 15 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please complete your survey no later than April 30, 2014. Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this study. Again, your responses are very important relative to the completion of this research project.

Sincerely,

_____________________________  _____________________________
Beth Riley, M.Ed.   Dr. Bill Camp
Chief Operating Officer  Committee Chair
Fort Worth Christian School  University of North Texas
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT
April 22, 2014

Dear Study Participant,

If you have returned your survey regarding Effects of Board Training on the Relationship between Board Members and CEOs, I thank you.

If you have not returned your survey, please do so as soon as possible. If you need a replacement survey, please call me at [817] 808-3362.

Thank you,

[Redacted]

Doctorate Candidate

[Redacted]

Chair, Dissertation Committee
Department of Education Administration
University Of North Texas
P.O. Box 13018
Denton, TX

[Redacted]

Minor Professor, Dissertation Committee
Department of Secondary Education
and Educational Leadership
College of Education
University Of North Texas
P.O. Box 13018
Denton, TX
April 30, 2014

Dear Friend,

I need your help. Your survey participation is critical to the study of school board-superintendent relationships. In order for your information to be included in the study, I need you to return your questionnaire before May 15, 2014.

Fully realizing the endless demands placed on your time and energies, I appeal to you to return your survey. Included is a consent form and survey for your convenience.

Feel free to contact me at (817) 808-3362.

Thank you in advance for contributing to this valuable research.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
Doctoral Candidate

Department of Educational Administration Leadership
College Education
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 13018
Denton, TX

[Redacted]
Chair, Dissertation Committee
Department of Teacher Education and Educational Administration
College of Education
University of North Texas
P.O. Box 13018
Denton, TX
APPENDIX F

THE CEO (HEAD OF SCHOOL)/GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR LEADERSHIP SURVEY
Please take a few minutes to complete the following assessment of your school board. The statements describe a variety of possible actions by boards. Some of the statements may represent your own experience, while others may not. For each of the items, there are four possible choices. Please mark the choice that most accurately describes your experience as a school leader.

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers; your personal views are what are important. In order to ensure the anonymity of all respondents, please do not put your name anywhere on the form. Thank you for your participation.

This survey was created based on information seeking to answer the following research questions: What do chief executive officers of private schools in Educational Service Center Regions 10 and 11 report about school board training? What are the components of the private school board training that potentially influence private school boards? How does board training or professional development influence the chief executive officers professional working relationship with the school board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The school board members regularly participate in professional development training.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Multiple Answers:

3. Our school board training includes:
   - Foundations of board policy
   - Roles and responsibilities of board members
   - Fundamentals of fundraising
   - Visionary planning
   - Fiduciary responsibility
   - Budget training (ex. Setting tuition)
   - Basic contract law
   - Understanding of nonprofit boards
   - Evaluating and compensating the CEO
   - Labor and employment laws
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All new board members participate in school board orientation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Training and other preparations are effective to be successful as board members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Board training is necessary in positively impacting the working relationship between school board members and the CEO/Head of School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The school board periodically sets aside time to learn more about important issues facing schools like the one being governed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The school board learns continuously by planning for training opportunities and responding to the training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The CEO or Head of School has a good working relationship with the school board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Answers:

10. The school board and CEO’s working relationship includes the following:
  - Working together to prepare for board meetings
  - Personality conflicts
  - Working together to anticipate the strategize issues
  - Willing to listen to concerns
  - Role confusion
  - Trust and effective communication
  - Positive attitude
  - Working together to set goals for the school
  - Makes governance a top priority
  - Efforts to maintain a strong working relationship
Short answer questions:

11. How do you describe the orientation, training and other preparation that your board members’ receive?

12. If board members receive orientation, training and other preparation, what is the source?
13. Do board presidents receive orientation to support their role as president? If so, what is the source?

14. How would you generally describe the components of the school board training or professional development which could potentially influence private school board decisions?

15. What board training or professional development do you feel might be missing that the school board would benefit from in their role as a board member?

16. Which of the following changes in the school board do you think would make the most significant improvement for your school?
   a. Focus on the Board/CEO collaboration to provide better leadership.
   b. Provide better or more professional development programs for board members.
   c. Recruit board candidates who are better qualified.
   d. None of the above

17. Describe essential board training characteristics you believe to be necessary for the CEO and school board to have a strong working relationship.

18. How does or how could the professional development training of school board members influence the CEO’s effectiveness?

19. What impediments keep you from achieving the goals of the school?

Demographic Questions:

20. Are you male or female?
21. Are you a CEO (Head of School) or School Board Chair?

22. About how long in your current position? ______________

23. How many CEOs (Head of School, president) have you had in the past 10 years?
   - 0 – 2
   - 3 – 4
   - 5 – 6
   - 7 +

24. How many years in Education? ______________

25. Type of private school (for ex. Faith based, college prep, etc.) ________
APPENDIX G

PRIVATE SCHOOL IN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTER REGIONS 10 AND 11 (100+
STUDENTS AND GRADES 9-12)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>CEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aledo Christian School</td>
<td>400 Quebic, Aledo TX 76008</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kay Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda Christian School</td>
<td>4700 North Beach St, Ft. Worth, TX 76137</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vicki Vaughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Adventist Academy</td>
<td>4611 Kelly-Elliot Rd, Arlington, TX 76017</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Darlene White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Christian Academy</td>
<td>1401 Oakhurst Scenic Dr., Fort Worth, TX 761111</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sue Tidwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassata High School</td>
<td>1400 Hemphill St, Fort Worth, TX 76104</td>
<td>9th - 12</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Susan Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm Trail Academy</td>
<td>P O BOX 717, Keene, TX 76059</td>
<td>9th - 12</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tommy Simons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coram Deo Academy of Flower Mound</td>
<td>4900 Wichita Trail, Flower Mound, TX 75022</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bill Rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Christian Academy</td>
<td>901 Cheek Sparger, Colleyville, TX 76034</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Keith J. Castello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Christian Academy</td>
<td>6250 South Freeway, Fort Worth, TX 76134</td>
<td>K -12</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zachary Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton Calvary Academy</td>
<td>1910 E University Dr, Denton, TX 76209</td>
<td>1st -12</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stacey Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Christian School</td>
<td>730 East Worth Street, Grapevine, TX 76051</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Ed Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Christian School</td>
<td>6200 Holiday Lane, North Richland Hills, TX 76180</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kelly Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Country Day School</td>
<td>4200 Country Day Lane, Fort Worth, TX 76109</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Evan D. Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Academy</td>
<td>P O Box 73, Kennedale, TX 76060</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monica Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>3300 West I-20, Arlington, TX 76017</td>
<td>1st -12</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Marc Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Texas Academy</td>
<td>3846 N HWY 144, Granbury, TX 76048</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jennifer Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Christian School</td>
<td>7200 Denton Hwy, Fort Worth, TX 76148</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Terry Caywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill School</td>
<td>4817 Odessa Ave, Fort Worth, TX 76133</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Audrey Boda-Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key School</td>
<td>4113 Warnock, Fort Worth, TX 76109</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mary Ann Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Country Christian School</td>
<td>7050 Lake Country Dr. Fort Worth, TX 76179</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nancy Purtell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Christian School</td>
<td>1301 S. Highway 377, Argyle, TX 76226</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Rodney Haire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarene Christian Academy</td>
<td>2001 E Main Crowley, TX 76036</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kathie Starks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan Catholic School</td>
<td>4501 Bridge St Fort Worth, TX 76103</td>
<td>7th -12</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rev. Richard Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame Catholic School</td>
<td>2821 Lansing Wichita Falls, TX 76309</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>DOUGLAS E. JONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantego Christian School</td>
<td>2201 W Park Row Arlington, TX 76013</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jay Pritcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Christian School-Prep Campus</td>
<td>6901 Altamesa Blvd, Fort Worth TX 76123</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Penny Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart School Muenster</td>
<td>P O BOX 588 Muenster, TX 76252</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Donald Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Christian Academy</td>
<td>1010 Bellaire Blvd, Lewisville, TX 75067</td>
<td>1st -12</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Wallace, Sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Christian School</td>
<td>6824 Randol Mill RD, Fort Worth, TX 76120</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neil Childs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Clariden School</td>
<td>100 Clariden Ranch Rd, Roanoke TX 76262</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sallie Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oakridge School</td>
<td>5900 W Pioneer Pkwy, Arlington TX 76013</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jon Kellam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn College Preparatory</td>
<td>3333 University Drive W, Denton TX 76207</td>
<td>PreK - 12</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Karen Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory School</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Christian Academy</td>
<td>4954 EAST I-20 Service Road South, Willow Park TX 76087</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michael Skaggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Valley School</td>
<td>7500 Dutch Branch Rd, Fort Worth TX 76132</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr. Gary W. Krahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Christian Academy</td>
<td>603 Meander Road, Granbury TX 76049</td>
<td>K - 11</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marci Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Montessori Academy</td>
<td>3428 W. Arkansas Lane, Arlington TX 76016</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pamela Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>2500 E. Arbrook Blvd, Arlington TX 76014</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shawn King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Christian Academy</td>
<td>397 S Stemmons Freeway, Lewisville TX 75067</td>
<td>PreK-11</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Doug Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent's School</td>
<td>1300 Forest Ridge Dr, Bedford TX 76022</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jana Engelmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Christian School</td>
<td>2501 Garrett Morris Parkway, Mineral Wells TX 87067</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W. Doug Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Classical School</td>
<td>1701 Wind Star Way, Fort Worth TX 76108</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eric Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Christian Academy</td>
<td>508 N Broadway, Joshua TX 76058</td>
<td>Pre-K - 12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Archer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherford Christian School</td>
<td>111 East Columbia, Weatherford TX 76086</td>
<td>K -12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtney McKeown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Dunne Catholic High School</td>
<td>3900 Rugged Dr. Dallas TX 75224</td>
<td>7th - 12</td>
<td>608</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Dailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Lynch High School</td>
<td>9750 Ferguson Rd, Dallas TX 75228</td>
<td>9th - 12</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Leyden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighter Horizons Academy</td>
<td>3145 Medical Plaza Dr. Garland TX 75044</td>
<td>Pre - 12</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad Diwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Creek Christian Academy</td>
<td>2800 Custer Parkway, Richardson TX 75080</td>
<td>1st - 12</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Episcopal School</td>
<td>1708 N Westmoreland Road, DeSoto TX 75115</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Sandy Doerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercian Preparatory School</td>
<td>One Cistercian Rd, Irving TX 75039</td>
<td>5 - 12</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Peter Verhalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Academy</td>
<td>950 Tiffany Way, Dallas TX 75218</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimmy Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Christian Academy</td>
<td>4025 N Central Expwy, Dallas TX 75204</td>
<td>Pre K - 10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Christian School</td>
<td>P O BOX 570249, Dallas TX 75357</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Lutheran School Plano</td>
<td>1701 East Park Boulevard Plano, TX 75074</td>
<td>Pre K – 12</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Timothy Merritt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Academy Dallas</td>
<td>P.O. Box 868, Dallas TX 75221</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brian Littlefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland Christian Academy</td>
<td>1516 Lavon Dr. Garland TX 75040</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brian Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhill School</td>
<td>4141 Spring Valley, Addison TX 75001</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scott Griggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Christian School</td>
<td>8420 Jack Finney Blvd, Greenville TX 75402</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steve Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Christian Academy Rockwall</td>
<td>1408 S. Goliad, Rockwall, TX 75087</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Ron Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family of Nazareth School - Irving</td>
<td>2323 Cheyenne, Irving TX 75062</td>
<td>2nd -11</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ms. Janet Muelschen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit College Preparatory School</td>
<td>12345 Inwood Rd., Dallas TX 75244</td>
<td>9th -12</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Earsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul II High School Plano</td>
<td>900 Coit RD, Plano TX 75075</td>
<td>9th -12</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas W. Poore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakehill Preparatory School</td>
<td>2720 Hillside DR, Dallas TX 75214</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roger L. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Lutheran School</td>
<td>8494 Stults Rd, Dallas, TX 75243</td>
<td>7th -12</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. David Bangert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Christian Academy</td>
<td>3601 Bois D Arc Rd, McKinney TX 75071</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bob Lovelady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame of Dallas SP School and Vocational Center</td>
<td>2018 Allen St, Dallas, TX 75204</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Theresa Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovilla Christian School</td>
<td>3251 Ovilla Rd, Red Oak TX 75154</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Derward Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Community Christian Schools</td>
<td>18688 FM 986, Poetry TX 75160</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anne Horan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestonwood Christian Academy</td>
<td>6801 W Park Blvd, Plano TX 75093</td>
<td>Pre - 12</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Larry Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Peace Christian School</td>
<td>4000 N Midway Rd, Carrollton TX 75007</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chris Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dallas Adventist Academy</td>
<td>302 Centennial Blvd, Richardson TX 75081</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orton Varona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall Christian Academy</td>
<td>6005 South Dalrock Rd, Rowlett TX 75088</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jenny Zakem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Academy</td>
<td>6000 Custer Rd Bldg 5, Plano TX 75023</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Matthew Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark's School of Texas</td>
<td>10600 Preston Rd, Dallas TX 75230</td>
<td>1st - 12</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arnold E. Holtberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Christian School</td>
<td>3500 West Houston St, Sherman TX 75092</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jeff Burley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cambridge School of Dallas</td>
<td>3877 Walnut Hill Lane, Dallas TX 75229</td>
<td>5th - 12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B. Paul Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Covenant School</td>
<td>7300 Valley View Lane, Dallas TX 75240</td>
<td>7th - 12</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pat Gardon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Episcopal School of Dallas</td>
<td>4100 Merrell Rd, Dallas TX 75229</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Meredyth M. Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fairhill School</td>
<td>16150 Preston Rd, Dallas TX 75248</td>
<td>1st - 12</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carla Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highlands School</td>
<td>1451 E Northgate Dr, Irving TX 75062</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fr. Daniel Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hockaday School</td>
<td>11600 Welch Rd, Dallas TX 75229</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kim Wargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Episcopal School</td>
<td>4101 Sigma Rd, Dallas TX 75244</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>David W. Monaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Winston School Dallas</td>
<td>5707 Royal Lane, Dallas TX 75229</td>
<td>1st - 12</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Polly Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Christian Academy Addison</td>
<td>17001 Addison Rd, Addison TX 75001</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dave Delph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Street Christian Academy School</td>
<td>915 W 9TH ST, Dallas TX 75208</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Karen J. Egger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursuline Academy of Dallas</td>
<td>4900 Walnut Hill Lane, Dallas TX 75229</td>
<td>9th - 12</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gretchen Z. Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanguard Preparatory School</td>
<td>4240 Sigma Rd, Dallas TX 75244</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rosalind Funderburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Bend Academy Plano</td>
<td>2220 Coit Rd Suite 500, Plano TX 75075</td>
<td>5th - 12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter Berner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>GRADES</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavneh Academy</td>
<td>12324 Merit, Dallas TX 72751</td>
<td>9th - 12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>David Portnoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton Christian Academy</td>
<td>2205 East Hebron Parkway, Carrollton TX 75010</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>David Culpepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Christian Academy</td>
<td>5000 Academy Drive, Frisco TX 75034</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Chris Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton Christian Academy</td>
<td>2205 East Hebron Parkway, Carrollton TX 75010</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>David Culpepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Christian Academy</td>
<td>5000 Academy Drive, Frisco TX 75034</td>
<td>Pre K - 11</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Chris Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Westwood School</td>
<td>14340 Proton Rd, Dallas TX 75244</td>
<td>Pre K - 12</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pam Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxahachie Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>621 North Grand Ave., Waxahachie TX 75168</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>John C. Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercian Catholic Preparatory School</td>
<td>3660 Cistercian Road, Irving TX 75014</td>
<td>5th - 12</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fr. Paul McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie Preparatory School</td>
<td>4131 Skyview Ct, Wylie TX 75098</td>
<td>1st - 12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Calhoun, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Christian School</td>
<td>1231 East Pleasant Run Road, Cedar Hill TX 75104</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kathleen Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Academy of America</td>
<td>1920 Walden Blvd, Flower Mound TX 75022</td>
<td>K - 12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dave Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Lutheran School</td>
<td>8494 Stults Rd, Dallas, TX 75243</td>
<td>7th - 12</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dave Bangert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Academy</td>
<td>9407 Midway, Dallas, TX 75220</td>
<td>PreK- 12</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pamela Quarterman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

IRB APPROVAL
April 23, 2014

Dr. Bill Camp
Student Investigator: Beth Riley
Department of Educational Administration
University of North Texas

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB)
RE: Human Subject Application #14-054

Dear Dr. Camp:

The UNT IRB has received your request to modify your study titled “Effects of Board Training on the Working Relationship between Board Members and CEO.” As required by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects, the UNT IRB has examined the request to modify the data collection instrument for your study. These modifications to this study are hereby approved for use with human subjects.

Please contact Jordan Harmon Research Compliance Analyst, at (940) 565-4643, or Boyd Herndon, Director of Research Compliance, at (940) 565-3941, if you wish to make changes or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jordan Harmon
Patricia L. Kaminski, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Chair
Institutional Review Board

PK/ jh
REFERENCES


Texas Education Code. Member Training and Orientation. §11.159 (1995a)


