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The purpose of the study was to determine, among Michigan certified school board members, the perceived effectiveness of the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program.

Four specific research questions were investigated:

1. What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA program?
2. How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses?
3. How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education?
4. How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe the CBA courses are to their effectiveness as members of the board of education?

The study utilized a descriptive research design. An 18-item survey questionnaire was developed from a modified Dillman procedure. The survey instrument was reviewed by a seven person expert review panel and pilot tested. The survey population included in the main study was a stratified random sample of 275 CBA certified school board members. The return rate was 80.3%.
Results indicated that school finance was ranked first in importance among the eight CBA courses and school law was rated first in quality. The leadership class was rated as the most useful and, overall, it was also ranked as the most effective. The legislation class was rated as the least effective class of the eight CBA courses.

The conclusions were (a) overall, respondents believed that the CBA program was effectively meeting their school board member training needs; (b) respondents rated the use of the CBA knowledge from all eight courses lower than they rated the importance of the CBA course topics; and (c) the high return rate (80.3%) indicated that respondents saw value in the subject of the study and in school board member training.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

I view education as the most important subject we as a people can be engaged in.

--Abraham Lincoln

American education is a uniquely democratic institution. In America, control of education is close to the people; in no other country of the world is there such a system of educational control (Tuttle, 1958). Shannon (1994), executive director of the National School Boards Association (NSBA), declared:

In the United States we cherish a historical ideal; ordinary people can decide what's best for themselves and their children. America's major social institutions--including our public schools--are founded on this precept. Its essence is that through free, democratic representative governance, the will of the people will be reflected in the public leadership of our schools. (p. 44)

Although the Constitution of the United States does not refer specifically to education, the 10th Amendment states "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people" (cited in Rebore, 1987, p. 1). Consequently, education has long been considered a function of the state.

In Facing the Challenge, the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force (1992) report on school governance noted that there are more than 15,000 school districts in the United States; most of them operate under the direction of a school board elected by the voters of the school district.
district. According to Danzberger et al. (1987), "approximately 95,000 school board members, more than 90% of whom are elected--make the local governance decisions that, taken together, create the American system of public education" (p. 54). Davies and Hosler (1949), in The Challenge of School Board Membership, said "if America is the arsenal of democracy, then local governments and local school boards are the seed-bed of democracy" (p. 6).

Rebore (1987) reinforced that idea when he stated:

School districts are perhaps the most democratically controlled agency of government. Citizens of a given community elect school members, who are charged with formulating policies for the organization and administration of local schools. State departments of education exercise some regulatory authority, assuring that a minimum educational program is provided in every school district, but the citizens of the local district maintain control of the schools through locally elected boards. (p. 5)

In Making Governance Work, Poston (1994) noted "board selection is primarily a democratic process, resulting in a body of government considered closer to the people than most other forms of government in a democracy" (p. xii).

School boards communicate local needs and goals to the professional educators in the schools, and also convey the competency of the school professionals to the community. Because school boards have been established by state government and have been given legal responsibility for establishing and maintaining the local public schools, these boards perform state functions on a local level. Their policies blend state intent and local control.

Tuttle (1958) pointed out:
We believe in our American plan for local and state control of public education by non-partisan, non-salaried, lay boards
of education, rather than in a centralized national professional control such as exists in most other countries of the world. (p. 13)

Who are these lay school board members who link state and local interests? The term lay school board members is understood to mean people who are not professional educators, as Everett and Sloan (1984) explained in *Are We Paving Lip Service to Training New School Board Members?* These authors characterized school board members as being the least trained people in the school system concerning the learning and education of the children. But they were quick to add that these people hold the most power. The authors concluded that if lay boards of education are to survive, they will have to improve their effectiveness. Other authors (Danzberger et al., 1987; Fricke, 1991; Shannon, 1991) concurred that school board improvement is critical to their future. Lewis (1994), in *Reinventing Local School Governance*, summarized "the overall message seems to be that local school governance is threatened by its own inability to keep up with change and provide strong leadership" (p. 357).

The first prerequisite of a good educational program in any community is a school board that understands what its functions are and performs well. School boards are expected to lead and to govern the education of the young on behalf of their communities and collectively on behalf of their states and the nation (The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, 1992). Thus, the ability of school boards to lead will in large measure determine the long range success or failure of efforts to improve schools.

Schlechty (1993) explained:
On the basis of my experience, I believe our schools must be restructured, redesigned and reinvented. Part of this redesign must include serious attention to the way schools are governed, including the way school boards interact and work with communities, legislatures, state education agencies, teachers, and school administrators. (p. 27)

Although the delegated powers of local school boards varies from state to state, most boards of education usually are responsible for formulating policy, setting programs, hiring personnel, providing educationally related services, and controlling the use of the physical facilities of the school district. In some states they are also empowered to levy taxes (Everett & Sloan, 1984).

Goldhammer (1964) observed:

The school board, then, is a creature of the legislature, established for the purpose of managing the affairs of the school district. By reason of its position as the immediate authority over the schools in the district, the board of education is responsible for the making of decisions, the formulation of policies, the development of programs, the employment of personnel, the levying of taxes, the provision of educationally related services, and the management of the use of the physical facilities of the school district. This delegated responsibility is defined by statute, interpreted by the courts, and, in some instances, expanded by custom. The amount of authority and the freedom of action exercised by any school board varies from state to state. (p. 4)

Michigan's first constitution was written in 1835 just before Michigan became a state. Its most recent constitution, adopted in 1964, is the fourth in Michigan's history. One of the interesting things about this constitution is that it devotes an entire article to education. Article VIII, Sec. 1, reaffirms the need to support a system of public education. Strum and Whitaker (1968) traced the historical background of this segment of the state constitution.

It even retains unchanged the historic language that originated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. "Religion, morality
and knowledge being necessary to good government and the
happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education
shall forever be encouraged." (p. 173)

Section 2 of Article VIII directs the legislature to "maintain and support a
system of free public elementary and secondary schools as defined by
law (Carr, 1969, p. 135). This constitutional recognition of public
education makes it a major state function. It requires Michigan to have
a system of free public education.

The 1964 constitution was written during a time when racial
discrimination was a national issue. The second sentence of Section 2,
Article VIII, was inserted to make clear Michigan's position on the matter
of school segregation. That sentence states "every school district shall
provide for the education of its pupils without discrimination as to
religion, creed, race, color or national origin" (cited in Carr, 1967, p.
135). From these two sections of Michigan's Constitution it is apparent
that the people of Michigan have long held education to be a prime
concern.

For decades, American school board members and school boards
collectively have been relatively free of criticism, but in recent years the
quality of elementary and secondary education has become the focus of
national concern.

Indeed, three major reports issued in 1983--the president's A
Nation at Risk, the Twentieth Century Fund's Making the
Grade, and the Carnegie Foundation's High School: A
Report on Secondary Education--added up to a ringing vote
of no confidence in the existing structure of public education
governance. (The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force,
1992, p. 5)

Leone (cited in The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, 1992), presi-
dent of the Twentieth Century Fund, articulated the problem in the
Foreword of *Facing the Challenge* as follows:

School boards have become the subject of increasingly heated debate—in some cases, of criticism that goes so far as to call for their abolition. Since schools are the place where a great investment in human capital is made, these complaints may simply be a reflection of the way the nation is struggling to achieve a better return on its investment. Indeed, many citizens are demanding better results in the face of persistent challenges at home and abroad. (p. vi)

In addition, Leone further suggested those challenges are understandable in the face of poor test scores and the lagging progress of minorities.

Steffy and Lindle (1994), in *Building Coalitions*, asserted:

The current public education system in the United States was never designed to be effective with 100% of our children. Shanker (1992), Hodgkinson (1993), Kozol (1991), Sarason (1990), Steffy (1993), and other researchers believe that unless the United States acts quickly to redesign, restructure, and reconceptualize public education, this country will lose its position as a world leader. (p. 65)

The emerging change in concepts of the role and the functions of schools has led more people to be involved in school governance. Parents, students, teachers, and administrators all want a voice in school affairs. School boards today operate under new and more intense pressures. Mandates and constraints imposed by the federal government and the legislative actions of the states, such as Michigan's 1990 Public Act 25 which called for development and implementation of a 3 to 5 year school improvement plan for school districts have affected school boards and the way they conduct business.

Ironically, even 20 years ago some critics recognized the emerging dilemma in which school boards find themselves. Foster (1975) reported:

caught between the demands of democracy, and of bureaucracy, the tasks of school boards are further complicated by the rapid change which characterizes every aspect of
modern life. Already in many places the single largest employer in terms of payroll and personnel, school boards are being asked to undertake many functions which were formerly regarded as being in the domain of family, churches, or other private institutions. But while new definitions of education multiply, the funds to provide these services are increasingly difficult to secure. Small wonder, then, that school boards like school superintendents are frequently at the center of storms of protest. (p. 9)

Kirst (1994) expanded on this point:

The school board must deal with shifting and ephemeral coalitions that might yield some temporary and marginal local advantage. But many of the policy items on the local agenda arise from external forces, such as state and federal governments, or from the pressures exerted by local interest groups, including the teachers and their unions. (p. 381)


Michigan has a long and honored tradition of providing quality, equitable educational services for all its people. This tradition is now in jeopardy. At the same time there is a growing disparity between the resources available to different school districts; there are greater demands on education in preparing students for a rapidly changing economic and technological society. Michigan has declined from its position as a national leader in providing quality education. There is clearly a need to re-examine both the financing and the quality of education in Michigan. (p. 114)

The Need for Training

School superintendents have considerable training which prepares them for their role as educational administrators. But what about school board members? Freeman (1990/1991) expressed it aptly when he said that "there are no professional school board members, only amateurs who hope to make the world a little better through their efforts to improve education" (p. 2).
Most school board members begin their service with only vague ideas of the scope of their duties; most have had little preparation for the difficult decision making that lies ahead; and most have no real grasp of the enormous amount of information that must be learned and constantly updated.

Where can school board members turn to learn how to respond to rapid change? What programs offer opportunities for them to acquire leadership skills? Who will provide the orientation and training necessary for them to become effective board members?

In 1991, Fricke, then president of the National School Boards Association, wrote:

More than ever before, society—from the top levels of government to our own communities, including parents—is looking to us not only to fulfill our traditional and legitimate role as the governors of our schools, but also to address and solve the myriad problems students face in their daily lives. After years of discussions about school reform, the buck has stopped with us. (p. 42)

Her solution was a stepped up training for school board members in the "expanding dimensions of their increasingly important governance role" (p.2).

Many educational analysts have agreed that this is a critical time for board member training (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Davies, 1989; Todras, 1994). For one thing, school board member turnover is at an all time high. The inevitable result of ever changing school board membership is a continuous group of inexperienced board members (Herman, 1980). Poston (1994) described school board members in this fashion:

They are relatively inexperienced in board service. The average board member is in his or her first term. This novice status could jeopardize the school system if there were no
ways for board members to effectively learn the ramifications and procedural preferences of their job quickly. Without training and without information issues, problems, and options, board members could easily be directing school systems from a position of ignorance and inexperience. (pp. 7-9)

Funk and Funk (1990) depicted the situation in these terms:

You wouldn't send a professional baseball team onto the diamond without spring training. And you wouldn't send a crew of astronauts on the space shuttle without some kind of shakedown "cruise." So why send a new school board member into the fray with little more than an hour's briefing from the superintendent and maybe a quick run-through of the school's mission statement? That kind of ad-hoc approach to board member training is a surefire description for discord and dismay—but all too often it's precisely what passes for board member training in many school districts today. (p. 16)

These authors cautioned that school board member training has to be an ongoing process. For school board members, learning never ends.

King (1990), executive director of the Michigan Association of School Boards and one of the leading exponents of school board training, reasoned:

Board members must keep abreast of changing times and circumstances. Their existing expertise should be augmented continually with new knowledge. School boards are, after all, in the business of education. Therefore, it is reasonable for them to give a high priority to their own education as board members. (p. 6)

In 1989, the National School Boards Association instituted a new program, the NSBA Leadership Training Center. Through this program, the NSBA hopes to train state school board members who will then train local school board members. According to former NSBA President Ogelsby (1989),

The new Leadership Training Center will help NSBA and our state associations to enhance the leadership skills of local school board members, thereby strengthening their efforts to
lead elementary and secondary education to new heights with vision, determination, and imagination, so that America can confidently meet those challenges" (p. 7).

Of course state school board training programs have become more urgent with the increased national interest in school board member qualifications. At least 10 state legislatures since 1985--Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia--have passed laws that mandate some form of training for school board members.

The Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) for many years has had as one of its major goals to assist school board members in learning, strengthening, and updating their skills in school boardsmanship (Michigan Association of School Boards [MASB] Bylaws, 1993, p. 1). The year 1994 marked the 45th anniversary for MASB which represents most of the 544 public school districts and the 57 intermediate districts in Michigan ("New School Board Members," 1994). In 1990, a new voluntary Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program was introduced (King, 1990b). This is a method to provide ongoing voluntary in-service education for Michigan school board members. In the 4 years since its inception, 1,056 school board members have attained certification under the program.

Statement of the Problem

Since 1990 the major responsibility for school board member training in Michigan has rested with MASB through the CBA program. If the Michigan Association of School Boards is to continue to provide suitable training for local school board members in Michigan, it will need data on
the effectiveness of the existing Certified Boardsmanship Award (CBA) program.

**Broad Research Questions**

The broad research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What are the perceptions of CBA certified school board members as to the quality and effectiveness of the CBA training program?
2. What impact, if any, has the CBA program had on CBA certified school board members?

Within the context of these broad questions, four specific research questions are presented in Chapter III.

**Significance of the Study**

This study is important because of the impact it may have on the training and development of school board members in Michigan. More specifically the study will:

1. Provide information for the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) for use in the planning and evaluation of the CBA program.
2. Assist Michigan school superintendents in planning necessary local district in-service training and orientation programs for new school board members. It will also provide information to veteran school board members regarding the value that the CBA training program may have for them as well.
3. Give state legislators useful data regarding the effect the CBA program has on Michigan school board members, and may in fact encourage them to provide financial support to local school districts for continued participation in school board member training programs.

4. Produce a data collection instrument for use by other state school board associations to evaluate their training programs.

5. Increase interest in the CBA program among Michigan superintendents and school board members.

The Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were:

1. The population from which the sample used in this study was drawn was that of Michigan certified school board members (school board members who have completed the CBA program), not the total population of Michigan school board members.

2. The validity of this study depended on the extent to which the sample responded to the questionnaire with accuracy and honesty.

3. A mailed questionnaire limited responses only to answers of the questions asked.

4. The information gleaned from this study may not be generalizable to other states with similar voluntary school board member training programs.

Definition of Terms

Board of education: The governing body of a school district (Lewis, 1988, p. 8).
**Certified school board member:** Michigan school board members who have completed the Certified Boardsmember Award (CBA) program (Michigan Association of School Boards [MASB], 1994, p. 1).

**Orientation:** Development activities for new school board members that imparts basic information about the duties and responsibilities of school board membership (Institute for Educational Leadership [IEL], 1986, p. 46).

**In-service training:** Development activities that involve all members of varying levels of board experience and tenure (Institute for Educational Leadership [IEL], 1986, p. 46).

**Boardsmanship:** The ability of a school board member to perform his or her duties skillfully (King, 1990b, p. 5).

**Effectiveness:** Serving the purpose, producing the desired response (Morris, 1968, p. 416).

**Intermediate school district:** A regional educational service agency whose purpose is to provide essential services to local constituent districts within the region so they may more effectively provide education to students based on educational needs (Blank, 1995).

**MASB’s school district enrollment groups:** A classification system used by the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) to place Michigan school districts in one of seven categories based on the district's pupil enrollment. The enrollment parameters for each of the seven groups is as follows: (1) Group 1--intermediate school district, (2) Group 2--0 to 1,500 students, (3) Group 3--1,500 to 3,000 students, (4) Group 4--3,001 to 7,500 students, (5) Group 5--7,501 to 15,000 students, (6) Group 6--15,001 to 100,000 students, and (7) Group
7--over 100,000 students (Michigan Association of School Boards [MASB], 1994).

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters.

Chapter I contains background material and the need for the study. In addition, the statement of the problem is presented; the broad research questions are identified; the significance is given; the limitations of the study are described; and the terms are defined.

Chapter II includes a review of the literature that is relevant to this study.

Chapter III identifies the research methodology to be followed in this study.

Chapter IV contains the statistical treatment and the findings of the study.

Chapter V reports the summary, conclusions, and recommendations resultant from this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The direction in which education starts a man, will determine his future life.

--Plato

The purpose of this study was to determine, among certified Michigan school board members, the perceived effectiveness of the Michigan Association of School Boards' Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a representative sample of the literature concerning school boards, the historical background of school boards, the roles and responsibilities of modern school boards, school board associations, the need for board evaluation, and relevant trends in school board member leadership programs.

The chapter is organized into the following six sections:

I. School Boards--Historical Foundations
   A. Public Control Over Education
   B. State Authority Over Public Schools
   C. Legal Origins of Michigan School Boards

II. Modern School Boards--Role and Responsibilities
   A. State Boards of Education
   B. Michigan State Board of Education

III. School Boards Associations
   A. National School Boards Association
B. Michigan Association of School Boards

IV. The Need for School Board Evaluation
   A. School Board Member Training
   B. Michigan's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program

V. National Trends in School Board Member Leadership Development
   A. State Legislative School Board Mandates
   B. State Associations' Board Member Training Programs

VI. Summary

School Boards--Historical Foundations

The American colonists followed the traditions of English schools as much as frontier life allowed. Education was generally considered a necessity because the colonists believed that a child should know how to read the Bible in order to become a good Christian. Greider and Romine (1965) wrote that “the most favorable seedbed for popular education was the New England colonies, because they happened to be settled by people with strong convictions on the importance of at least a little education for all” (p. 165).

The town of Boston in 1635 established the very first school in America--the Boston Grammar School--by vote of the town. The town also donated some land, from whose income, plus some private pledges, the school was to be supported (Greider & Romine, 1965). Sometime later, in 1642 and 1647, the Massachusetts Bay Colony enacted two important laws, the first two school laws in America.
The pioneer American school law in 1642 sought to compel parents and masters to see that their children had elementary instruction. Minimum essentials were set up: reading of English, knowledge of the capital laws, the catechism and apprenticeship in trade. Selectmen were given the authority to enforce this law by fines and compulsory apprenticeship. (Atkinson & Maleska, 1965, p. 94)

This first law held parents and masters of apprentices accountable to civil authorities "concerning the calling and employment of their children . . . and their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of this country" (Greider & Romine, 1965, p. 166).

Public Control Over Education

Tanner and Tanner (1987) observed that "the principle that government could control and supervise schools through management by public officials was enunciated in the famous Massachusetts law of 1647 requiring towns to establish schools" (p. 5). It was the 1647 law (sometimes referred to as the Old Deluder Act) which required towns of 50 families to provide an elementary school teacher, and towns of 100 families to establish a Latin grammar school for secondary education. Towns were granted authority to levy taxes to pay the teachers and to fine those who did not comply.

In the preamble to the law of 1647, the colonists made clear that concern for religious welfare motivated their interest in education. Hillway (1961) provided the original wording: "It being one chiefe project of ye ould deluder, Sathan, to keepe men from the knowledge of ye scriptures" (p. 11). But as Atkinson and Maleska (1965) noted, "regardless of the original motive, the important fact is that the government did establish its authority over education" (p. 95). Thus, the pattern of
control which eventually became dominant started in New England.

A 1650 Connecticut law established the responsibility for the schools in more detail. Two people from each town in the colony were to be appointed to insure that the family supported the schools and "to see that the gifts were brought to some central location each March" (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usdan, 1990, p. 207). The same authors, in explaining that these selectmen had the power to remove children from negligent parents or masters until girls were 18 and boys were 21, added "the justification for such arbitrary action were implied in the Act itself: an educated citizenry is imperative if representative government is to survive" (p. 207). And so the control of schools was held by selectmen for nearly 2 centuries.

Boston appointed the first permanent school visiting committee in 1721. This act established a separate school governing body apart from other governing bodies. The committee was to visit the schools and report back to the selectmen. Reeves (1965) reported that the school board in Massachusetts is still known as the School Committee though it acts independently of other city governing bodies.

In 1766 Connecticut legalized the establishment of local school districts and gave voters the right to elect their own school trustees, appoint teachers, and levy taxes (Greider & Romine, 1965).

State Authority Over Public Schools

Massachusetts followed Connecticut with a series of laws between 1789 and 1827. Schultz (1973), an historian, asserted that the 1789 law was "the first comprehensive state school law in the new
nation" (p. 11). Among the provisions of the law requiring towns to support an elementary school and larger towns to provide grammar schools was the authority to hire a special committee to oversee the schools. An 1827 amendment to the law mandated the employment of a school committee.

Reeves (1965) delineated the development of state authority as follows:

When the colonies became states and, later, when new states were admitted to the union (in the central, western, and southern parts of the United States), it was natural that state constitutions should provide for a state system of education and that their legislatures should create school districts and provide a method for the support and control of public schools. Thus, the school board is a creature of the state and subject to its laws. However, the board is also responsible, within the provisions of the law, to the people of the school district who, directly or indirectly, select its members. (p. 19)

It was the Land Ordinance of 1785 that provided for the surveying of public lands, established the six mile square township, one square mile the sale of which should be used for the support of common schools.

Two years later in 1787 the famous Northwest Ordinance set forth the plan for organizing and creating states (Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota). This act reaffirmed the land grant of 1785 and as noted in Chapter I, stated "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Greider and Romine (1965) called that act "the most vast endowment ever given anywhere for any purpose" (p. 177).
Atkinson and Maleska (1965) indicated that once again Massachusetts was the center for school board legislation. In 1837 James Carter and Horace Mann secured passage of a law creating a state board of education. Horace Mann became the first secretary of the new state board of education.

Horace Mann, a founder of the American school system, proclaimed "The common school was to be free, financed by local and state government, controlled by lay boards of education, and mixing all social groups under one roof." The school board was to be non-partisan and nonsectarian. (Kirst, 1990, P. A12)

Legal Origins of Michigan School Boards

Dain (1968), in Education in the Wilderness, traced the historical background of Michigan school boards.

The land ordinance of 1785, enacted for the orderly survey and sale of lands in the Northwest Territory, and the Ordinance of 1787, establishing a framework of government for the people who would live there, both contained provisions for the promotion and support of education. In March 1804, President Jefferson approved an act of Congress which specified that the funds derived from the eventual sale of lands in section 16 of each township should be reserved for educational purposes. The terms of the act were incorporated into the act of January, 1805, which created the Territory of Michigan. Official government surveys of the new territory did not begin however, until the fall of 1815, so no such bounties were available to the people of Michigan in the years immediately following the establishment of the territory. (pp. 40-41)

Bruin (1989) noted that it was not until 1827 when the Legislative Council of the Michigan Territory enacted legislation creating a system of common schools. Dain (1968) wrote that Governor Cass signed the act for the establishment of Common Schools on April 27, 1827, which laid
a foundation for true public education in Michigan. That law was sus-
pended soon after and replaced by other laws governing education. The
most important laws were passed in 1829 and 1833. Those two acts
were the foundation of today's Michigan school boards.

The 1829 and 1833 laws set the basic pattern for local
control of education. Each township was required to elect
"five discreet persons" who would serve as commissioners
of the common schools in the township and divide the
township into school districts. (Bruin, 1989, p. 9)

Taxable inhabitants were required to meet and elect three people to be
directors of the school district. The school directors, the commissioners,
and the people of the district all were responsible for providing a school
house, hiring a teacher, and maintaining an educational program.

Thus, both the act of 1827 and the act of 1829 asserted the
authority of the territory to legislate common schools into
existence, but they placed the control and administration of
the schools largely in the hands of local officials subject to
the will of the local electorate. (Dain, 1968, p. 139)

The act of 1829 established the office of Superintendent of Common
Schools. He was to watch over all school land in the territory. Dain
(1968) stated:

By this action of the legislative council in 1829, and because
of the good sense of those who later framed the Michigan
Constitution of 1835 and gave the office constitutional
status, Michigan today can be credited with having provided
for a department of public instruction for a longer period
than any other state. (p. 140)

In 1835, Michigan adopted its first constitution. In it the legisla-
ture was directed to provide for "a system common schools." Article X
of that constitution specified that any district that failed to keep school
at least 3 months of the year could not collect a share of the state funds
reserved for school support.

When Michigan was admitted to the Union on January 26, 1837, the state legislature had the power under Article X to create a statutory system of public school districts and provide for their governance. The Primary School law became effective April 1, 1837. Dain (1968) stated that this law remains today as the basic school law of Michigan.

This new state law followed the model of territorial laws in a two-step process to establish primary school districts and involving the township Board of School Inspectors, the voters of the community and a District School Board in the management of the schools. "First, the Board of School inspectors, comprised of three men elected at the annual township meeting, could divide the township into school districts. They determined the number of districts to be created and drew the school boundaries" (Bruin, 1989, p. 9). The next step was a meeting of the school electors. All white, male inhabitants who were 21 years of age or older and paid school taxes could vote at the school district meeting and elect a school board. The school board chosen at the annual township meeting was composed of three members: moderator, assessor, and director. Following their election, they held office for one year. In 1849, the law was amended to permit a larger school board to be chosen.

If a school district contained more than 100 scholars between the ages of four and 18, the voters at the annual meeting, by a two-thirds vote, could add four Trustees to assist the three officers, thus establishing the historical Michigan prototype for a seven member school board. (Bruin, 1989, p. 9)
Michigan's pioneer school boards come alive for the modern reader in the pages of The Michigan History Journal. They faced criticism and lack of funds just as school boards do today. An article about schools in Michigan's then remote Upper Peninsula entitled, "History of Schools of Portage Township in the Copper Country" recounts the following:

In the Portage Lake Mining Gazette for September 24, 1861, appeared a letter of inquiry from a nonresident concerning the schools of the district. The editor's reply said the schools had not received the attention they should have. There was one small building in Houghton and one in Hurontown. The teachers were not first class and their salaries were poor. An instance was given of one man's having moved to Lower Michigan because of lack of good schools for his children. An appeal was made for more interest from the people--less complaining and more money. (Paton, 1917, p. 558)

In addition, the article further revealed that early school trustees had to grapple with burgeoning legal problems resulting in an all too familiar 20th century solution.

The Gazette for October 21, 1869, states that the Supreme Court had decided against School District No. 1 of Portage Township requesting mandamus be issued against Adams Township obliging it to pay for the expenses of School District No. 1 of Portage Township. The court decided that a new township could legally form a new school district and that the old township could not collect taxes from the new. For two years Huron, Webster, and Adams townships had been using Portage Township schools, then Adams suddenly refused to give any support, and the law upheld it. This produced a state of confusion, which made it necessary for a change in the policy of the trustees of District No. 1 of Portage Township . . . with its revenues reduced and a considerable portion of the school building debt still unpaid, the Directors had but one course left to pursue--reduce expenses. (Paton, 1917, p. 561)
Modern School Boards--Roles and Responsibilities

The days of the one room school and the school board that hired and supervised the teacher, bought the school supplies, and could "enquire into their condition, examine the scholars, and give advice to both teachers and scholars as they deem proper" (Bruin, 1989, p. 10) gradually passed. Early school boards assumed not only executive and administrative roles, but also legislative ones. As schools grew larger, the principalship evolved out of necessity. Reeves (1954) showed "at first the boards relinquished to the principal teacher only minor executive and administrative functions, usually those requiring immediate attention" (p. 23).

Then as cities and school systems grew, the superintendency came into being in due course, with the first such office being created in 1837. Buffalo and Louisville share the honors for the first superintendency. School systems rapidly became too large and too complex for volunteer lay board members to handle. Gradually, a division of duties came about with the board making general policies and employing an administrative head, the superintendent, to administer the policies of the board (Ashby, 1968).

Cuban (1976), in his book *Urban School Chiefs Under Fire*, observed:

The office of the superintendent, then did not evolve from the classroom, although many of the early appointees were drawn from the ranks of teachers. Rather, as one former schoolman reminded his readers, the first superintendent's duties "originated in the delegation to him of powers every one of which belonged to the board and that the board still often exercises. Child of the school board, the superintendency would mature, struggle with its parent endlessly, and
never escape that fact of ancestry. (pp. 111-112)

In his book, *The School Board*, Goldhammer (1964) expanded on the historic perspective that the board of education has of the district's superintendent. He noted that the superintendent is "an alien expert" that the board of education is inclined to let make the decisions pertaining to educational policies (p. 38). Yet Goldhammer also pointed out that most boards feel their primary responsibility is "to determine policies" while the superintendent should be responsible for putting them into effect (p. 42). It is this view that may provide the basis for the policy versus implementation struggle that exists between the board of education and the superintendent of schools.

As traced earlier in this chapter, the local school board is an agency of the state and its authority comes from statutory law. These powers vary from state to state, but Goldhammer (1964) identified five levels of control over actions of local school boards. These levels of control are "(1) the state Constitution, (2) legislative enactments (statutory law), (3) the rules and regulations of the state board of education, (4) decisions of the courts, and (5) societal demands" (p. 4).

Today those five levels of control of local boards have undergone drastic changes with regard to their effect on school boards. As a result, school boards have had to assume an ever expanding array of functions. Frase (1994) commented:

> Every state in the U.S. assigns the responsibility for education . . . to school boards. Nearly every state also determines how much money can be spent on education; determines which courses must be taught; certifies teachers and administrators for hiring; provides tenure to teachers and, in some states, administrators; prescribes budgeting procedures and building requirements; and directs schools to
cure our social ills. Unfortunately, as the boards' duties have grown throughout the 20th century, the latitude to perform them has decreased. (pp. vii-ix)

State Boards of Education

Goldhammer (1964) observed that the powers of state boards of education are generally defined by the legislature in each state. Most state legislatures concern themselves with setting broad guidelines for the operation of public education. They leave specific details to either a state educational agency or to the local school board. In most states the chief authority administered by state boards of education deals with the rules and regulations of teacher certification, the rules and requirements for the revocation of teaching certificates, and the prescription of the courses of study for local schools. In other words, as Goldhammer noted, the state board of education establishes the policies for education in the state. Those policies are carried out by the chief educational officer of the state, the state superintendent of public instruction. He is selected by the state board of education and his term is set by the board. He is in charge of the state department of education and serves as its chairman.

Michigan State Board of Education

The current Michigan system of education was organized by the Constitution of 1964 and placed into operation by the state legislature (Strum & Whitaker, 1968). One of the most important changes in the new Article VIII, Section 3, was the enlargement of the state board of Education from four members to eight members, and the expansion of
its general planning and coordinating function (Strum & Whitaker, 1968). Carr (1967), in Government of Michigan, explained that the state board is responsible for planning and coordinating all public education in the state from kindergarten through college. The board has supervision over all public education except those colleges or universities which legally grant bachelor’s degrees. Those institutions have their own boards of control. The state board of education is required to advise the legislature regarding the amounts of money needed each year by the system of public education, including the 524 public K-12 school districts, the 37 non-K-12 school districts, and the 57 intermediate school districts.

As noted, there are eight members of the state board of education. Each serves an 8-year term, with each arranged so that no more than two end at the same time. Political conventions nominate candidates for the board every 2 years. Candidates for the board are elected by a vote of the people in the state in the November general election. Besides the eight elected board members, there are two other members of the board who are nonvoting members but who may participate in discussions of the board. One is the governor of the state, and the other is the state superintendent of public instruction (Carr, 1967).

The state superintendent of public instruction in Michigan heads the department of education and administers the policies of the state board of education (Carr, 1967). Those policies are contained in the 1982 State of Michigan General School Laws and Administrative Rules. Included in that document is "Board of Education Powers and Duties Generally" (pp. 111-134).
School Boards Associations

School boards associations have become a vital force in influencing American education. They have moved a long way since those early days in 1896 when the Pennsylvania State School Directors first joined together for mutual benefit (Reeves, 1954).

Over the years school boards associations were organized in most of the states. Several of those associations, led by California, Illinois, and New York, formed the National Council of State School Boards Associations in 1940. Later, in 1948, the name was changed to the National School Boards Association (NSBA). NSBA in 1950 voted to become a federation of state school boards associations (Tuttle, 1958).

National School Boards Association

The National School Boards Association now includes every state school boards association except West Virginia's. The federation also includes the school boards of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Shannon, 1994).

Gradually the National School Boards Association assumed a key role in shaping educational policies. In 1991 NSBA joined in a cooperative effort with other national associations that represent government agencies to improve services for children. It also urged the state associations to concentrate their leadership efforts at the state and local levels (Shannon, 1994).

Shannon's (1991) article "NSBA's Vision for the Year 2000" predicted how school boards would be affected by future changes in
society and its schools.

School boards associations still will represent public school governance in the capitals, courts, and public forums; still will serve as networks for peer exchange and providers of education; and still will offer pertinent information to constituents. . . . But our associations will evolve and change as well, in anticipation and in concert with the transformation of society and education. . . .

The implications already are discernible. NSBA and its federation of state associations will need to offer even more dynamic programming, with a new dimension of technology as an integral part. (p. 7)

The next year, 1992, NSBA addressed the topic of school board governance by issuing a statement on the "Revitalized Role of School Boards." In it the National School Boards Association called for a concentrated effort for leadership by school boards in four specific thrusts: vision, structure, accountability, and advocacy.

In 1993 NSBA formed a task force to develop a definition of the governance responsibilities of school boards. Campbell and Greene (1994) presented the task force's results this way:

School boards are truly the leaders of the local school systems. The four part definition of their responsibilities--setting the vision, establishing a supportive structure, ensuring accountability, and engaging in advocacy on behalf of children--assigns them a powerful role. (p. 369)

**Michigan Association of School Boards**

State school boards associations exist in all states except Hawaii which has only a single school board, and West Virginia's which is not affiliated with the NSBA. State school boards associations are one of the most helpful sources of support and information for local school boards. They provide a broad range of services including workshops,
seminars, advisory services, legal assistance publications, state conventions, and information about legislative activity affecting school boards.

As mentioned in Chapter I, the Michigan Association of School Boards recently celebrated its 45th anniversary. A review of its history revealed that throughout its 45 years, MASB has been dedicated to improving public education and helping school board members provide educational leadership in their own communities.

Braverman (1994a), editor of the Michigan School Board Journal, in her article on the history of MASB began: "Hatched in 1940 at a kitchen table in Allendale by rural school board members from Ottawa, Kent and Muskegon counties, the idea of an association of boards of education soon took flight (pp. 16-17). Two years later, the name was changed to the Michigan Association of School Boards. The author of the article stated: "Two factors contributed to this broadened appeal, according to state historians: 'the dwindling numbers of small rural schools' and 'the impact the association had on legislation and federal education laws. Urban school boards wanted to join'" (p. 17).

The Michigan Educational Journal for March 1949 supplies more details of the formal organization of the new association. On February 17, 1949, board of education representatives from 37 counties formed the Michigan Association of School Boards in Lansing, Michigan. The governor and state superintendent of public instruction addressed the meeting. At the business session, a constitution was adopted and a board of directors elected. The board was composed of three representatives chosen from each of four groups, classified by the size of the teaching staffs maintained by the school. The association voted to
incorporate as a nonprofit organization.

MASB soon assumed a prominent role in service for Michigan school boards. In 1965, four Michigan school executives formed a nonprofit insurance trust called School Employers Trust (SET) to provide low cost insurance for schools. SET and its subordinate insurance group, School Employers Group (SEG) became insurance affiliates of MASB in 1971. This innovative program for school boards was the first such in the nation (Bothwell, 1994).

Braverman (1994a) listed other MASB service initiatives. MASB was the first to establish a Legal Trust Fund to help school boards defray legal fees for school court cases with statewide implications. MASB instituted a Labor Relations Service which was the first one for boards of education in the United States. More recently, MASB also started a Superintendent Search Service to aid local school boards. Yet among the services provided to local boards of education by MASB, none has gained more attention than that of offering training to Michigan school board members.

In July 1994 the Michigan Association of School Boards incorporated modern technology as an integral part of its training program for new school board members. MASB participated in the first live interactive teleconference for newly elected Michigan school board members. The program was transmitted by satellite throughout the state. Among the topics explored in the orientation program were the role of a school trustee and board-superintendent relations. Call-in questions from new board members were fielded by a panel of experts including veteran board members and staff specialists (MASB, 1994a, p. 17).
The Michigan Association of School Boards also produced a video-tape which highlighted school board leadership in Michigan public schools. The tape entitled "Who Will Lead?" was sent free to all MASB member districts (MASB, 1994b, p. 1).

The Need for School Board Evaluation

As Shannon (1994) explained, most of today's school board members have assumed office since the 1983 publication of *A Nation at risk*, and may not be aware of what far reaching effects it has had on school boards. He stated that it "triggered the educational soul searching we are still doing" (p. 388).

The 1986 national study of school boards conducted by the Institute of Educational Leadership (IEL) also stressed a need for school board self-evaluation.

Increasingly, boards are engaging in formal evaluation processes for their superintendents (88%). Far fewer boards, however, conduct a formal appraisal of their own performance (33%), nor do they give their chief executive officer the opportunity to provide them with feedback on their own performance. (p. 49)

The report further observed: "The findings of this and other studies point to the need for a framework within which school boards and those concerned with their governance function can assess effectiveness and define areas of need for improved leadership performance" (p. 51). In the final chapter of the IEL study, 15 indicators of an effective school board are listed. These indicators address the basic roles and responsibilities of school boards and provide guidelines to help boards assess their own effectiveness.
Danzberger et al. (1987) followed up their work on the IEL study with an article entitled "School Boards: The Forgotten Players of the Education Team." The authors reiterated the need for school board evaluation:

A system for board members to assess their own effectiveness (perhaps with input from district staff members and from the community) is a necessary starting point for efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the board. The Institute for Educational Leadership, with foundation support, is developing a self-assessment package for school boards that is based on the Indicators of Effectiveness. (p. 59)

Todras (1994) recalled that in 1992 a task force of the Twentieth Century Fund released a report, Facing the Challenge, on the system of school governance. A few months later, the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) published another major report, Governing Public Schools: New Times, New Requirements. Both of these reports proposed comprehensive reforms of school governance.

King (1992), in "New Challenges in Governing Schools," began:

Diagnosing local school boards and their functions has become a favorite pastime for "think tanks" for the past several years. A new book about public school governance reform has just been published, titled Governing Public Schools: New Times, New Requirements. Authors are Michael D. Usdan and Jacqueline P. Danzberger of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) and professor Michael W. Kirst of Stanford University. Michigan board members will recall that MASB worked cooperatively with IEL in developing our Board Self-Assessment Program. (p. 8)

The MASB Self-Assessment Program helps school trustees examine what they do, how they do it, and how to work together. It also enables school board members to recognize the need for training.
School Board Member Training

In the Foreword to *Making Governance Work*, Frase (1990) wrote:

Yet the one responsibility the state lawmaking bodies forgot to assign to boards is training. Board members whether they are business people, homemakers, or postal workers, are simply elected and thrown into their jobs. It is not unreasonable that many newspapers and books demean the performance of school boards. They are given the toughest job of all without the training or freedom needed to succeed. (p. ix)

But even more than 20 years ago, the paucity of school board training was addressed by Francois (1970) in an article titled "Better--Lots Better--Training Is Needed for New Board Members. And How." Of the orientation training commonly provided to new school board members, Francois wrote of the results from his study, "Hand them the board policy manual, a copy of school regulations, maybe minutes from past board meetings--and be certain to include wishes for good luck in their new positions" (p. 9).

More than a decade later, Everett and Sloan (1984) conducted a similar study and found that only 17% of newly elected school board members had undergone an organized board member training program, while 80% said that they had not. Although both researchers conclude that school board member training programs are necessary, both found that such programs were not the norm. But the increasing complexity of educational issues seems to be causing even greater interest in school board member training programs today.

King noted in a 1990 article titled, "Board Member Certification: Wave of the Future," that "board members have a lack of specialized board member skills and knowledge required to deal with increasingly
complicated matters in education" (p. 2). The complexity of the issues that school board members must face, however, is being dramatically affected by the sheer size of the business of education. "Nationwide," King wrote, "school boards oversee the employment of more than four million people and expenditures of nearly 150 billion dollars" (p. 6).

The point that public schools have become big business was reinforced by Campbell and Greene (1994) when they quoted DiMarco, a former school board member, who described the complexity of a school board member's job in a Southern California school district:

Take a look at what a school district and school board are. My colleagues and I are the members of a five member board of directors of a $190 million annual corporation. . . . We're responsible for 4,500 employees at 67 different plants. We negotiate annually with four--count them--four different unions. . . . Incidentally, on the side, we operate the second largest transportation agency in the county. We serve 22,500 meals a day. We operate it, if we're lucky, on a 2 to 3 percent fiscal margin. We have more regulation than the worst nightmare of a corporate attorney, and we're required to provide supervision in over 89 languages. I dare you to try to operate California business in the manner in which we operate our public school system. (p. 392)

Yet, not only are the issues concerning education more complex and on a larger scale than they have ever been before, the quality of the decisions that school boards are being required to make with regards to those issues is viewed as perhaps the most important factor of all. The literature reviewed for this study overwhelmingly supported school board member training programs as the best way to address this aspect of school board membership.
Michigan's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program

A review of the literature showed that most state school boards associations conduct some sort of board development training.

The IEL (1986) study reported that "programs sponsored by state school board associations account for most of the development activities attended by school board members" (p. 47). However, the authors cautioned:

Leadership skills acquisition for board members apparently is not emphasized in most of the state associations' programs. While they are assuming leadership in board development, only a few state associations have full time directors of board development. Where such positions do exist, these staff persons are usually responsible for developing training materials, providing technical and development services directly to boards, holding individual consultations with boards, providing some assistance in crisis management situations--and upon invitation--going into a district for "trouble shooting." As more states have become involved in educational reform, some innovative practices have been devised, ranging from requirements that all newly elected and appointed school board members receive training at leadership academies with three year cycles of volunteer training. Strong incentives are built into some of these programs. (p. 47)

Kask (1990/1991) noted:

In 1986, the Ohio State University (Cunningham and Kask) conducted a survey to ascertain how and to what extent state school boards associations were providing training to school board members. Specific information was requested regarding school board training and development activities. The breath and depth of the development activities vary widely, as do specific materials submitted. However, programs submitted by state school boards associations account for most of the development activities attended by board members.

When asked what leadership role each state association has taken in local school board development, it was clearly evident that the state school boards associations have undertaken the leadership role in the local school board development. Furthermore, the state associations are
providing a broad range of services to school board members throughout their respective states. (pp. 56-57)

Roland (1990/1991) also stated that "the literature concerning training programs relevant to boardmanship emphasized professional association programs and publications" (p. 23).

The Michigan Association of School Boards recognized the importance of professional development for local boards. As early as 1982, MASS sponsored a Keys to Better Boardmanship Award Program to recognize Michigan school board members who give time and effort to improving public education in the state through professional development as well as service and leadership (Michigan Association of School Boards, CBA Brochure, 1993-1994). The first Keys Award program consisted of graduated levels of recognition determined by the number of credits school board members earned for in-service and development activities.

In June 1990, the Michigan Association of School Boards developed a new voluntary Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program (Michigan Association of School Boards, Headlines, 1990, p. 1). The new CBA program was designed as a systematic approach to basic member leadership education. It was to be the first level of recognition for board member achievement in the Keys program.

That same month, King (1990), writing in the Michigan School Board Journal, heralded the new CBA program as "perhaps the most important new step MASS has ever taken" (p. 5). King further explained:

The new program has three goals: Leadership skills, knowledge, and the ability to apply both the skills and the
knowledge appropriately in the boardroom to enhance education for Michigan's children. Board members completing the program will be more confident in their ability to conduct productive meetings, manage conflicts, and build consensus. (p. 5)

MASB worked with curriculum experts to devise an instructional program of appropriate knowledge and skills. Several tracks (hours of required instruction) were instituted to accommodate school board members' experience and current standing in the Keys program. Once a board member began the certification process on a certain track, he or she had 36 months to complete the certification requirements on that track.

Numerous training sessions were presented in several locations throughout the state. It was anticipated that certification could be achieved by new board members within 12-18 months of their enrollment in the program.

Eventually some tracks were phased out as board members attained certification. Also, some changes in the course offerings were made affording board members more flexibility in course selection.

The following information regarding MASB's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program requirements and curriculum were described in the Michigan Association of School Boards (1993-1994) CBA Brochure.

The Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program

What Is Required?

Newly elected and first term board members need 24 hours: CBA101, CBA 102, CBA 103. CBA 104, CBA 105, CBA 106, CBA 107,
and/or CBA 108. Veteran board members (second term or longer need 18 hours: CBA 102, CBA 103, CBA 104, CBA 105, CBA 106, CBA 107, and/or CBA 108.

**What Is the Curriculum?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101</td>
<td>Leadership Skills (6 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102</td>
<td>Policy, Administrative Procedures and Oversight (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103</td>
<td>School Finance, School Budgets (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104</td>
<td>School Law (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105</td>
<td>Curriculum/Instruction (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106</td>
<td>Community Relations Leadership (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107</td>
<td>Labor Relations (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108</td>
<td>Legislation (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fee per 3-hour course work is charged.

Full attendance and participation is required to obtain credit for attending certification courses.

"MASB is the coordinator and provider of the training of the CBA program leading to school board member certification" (Michigan Association of School Boards, 1993-1994, p. 2).

MASB also offers a voluntary continuing certification program. Under these guidelines, once a school board member has attained certification, he or she will be certified as long as they are a seated member of the board of education. Certified school board members are encouraged to continue their education by earning Continuing Certification Credits as offered or endorsed by MASB throughout the year.
It was the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program from its inception in 1990 to July 1, 1994, which was the focus of this research. The school board members surveyed in this study achieved certification during the 1990-July 1, 1994 period.

National Trends in School Board Member Leadership Development

State Legislative School Board Mandates

As noted in Chapter I, the new thrust of several state legislatures to mandate training of school board members has caused state school boards associations to implement leadership development programs.

The movement to mandate upgraded school board member qualifications began in 1985 when Kentucky became the first state to legislate yearly in-service training for school board members. Ficklin (1985) stated "slowly but determinedly, required in-service training for school board members is beginning to make its way onto state books" (p. 36). Ficklin continued to detail the mandate:

Under the new law, board members annually must take 15 clock hours (as opposed to semester hours) of specialized board member training. The state board of education directed K.S.B.A. to provide at least ten hours of the yearly training to local board members; the other five hours can be met by attending national, state, and regional school board meetings. (p. 35)

The author also discussed similar legislation in other states. Since 1987, Georgia has required that in-service training be made available to school board members who could take it voluntarily; but in 1986, legislation was passed requiring orientation training before or within one year after assuming office. Oklahoma, Texas, and Arkansas also have laws
that require school board member training. These laws vary from requiring that training be merely offered, to mandating documented school board member participation, to actually providing funds for board of education member training.

Huston (1989/1990), in "An Analysis of the Kentucky School Board Inservice Mandate After Four Years of Implementation" concluded "the findings of this study suggested that the in-service mandate is desirable" (p. iii).

Kask (1990/1991) summed up the new movement as follows:

It is apparent that whether or not the laws were enacted in response to the waves of educational reform, the fact that 10 percent of the states in the last three years have enacted such laws demonstrates the movement to require school board training. (p. 63)

Kirst (1994) reported that several states that contemplated education legislation in 1993--including Massachusetts, Washington, West Virginia, and Kentucky--have revised or are overhauling their status concerning the role of school boards.

West Virginia, although not a member of the National School Boards Association, adopted legislation in 1993 with

the avowed purpose of restructuring boards so that they become well-informed responsive policy-making bodies. The success of the legislation will depend to a great degree on the commitment of school board members to apply what they learn during the mandatory training. Campbell & Greene, 1994, p. 394)

State Associations' Board Member Training Programs

Current literature regarding specific training programs for school board members in each state was incomplete. To better inform this
study, an informal survey of states' board member training practices, including related articles, was conducted in August 1994. Specific information germane to school board member training was obtained from state associations of school boards. Many sent brochures and additional information concerning their programs.

The information showed that most state school board associations did offer some type of school board member development program. Furthermore, most of the executive directors who replied expressed support for school board member training programs, although they were split on whether such training should be mandatory or voluntary.

The information also indicated that since 1990 when Michigan instituted its CBA program, nine other states, (1) Iowa, (2) Washington, (3) Florida, (4) Arizona, (5) Ohio, (6) Utah, (7) Louisiana, (8) Rhode Island, and (9) Montana, have instituted voluntary school board member training programs.

Also since 1990, five other states, (1) Missouri, (2) Tennessee, (3) Mississippi, (4) North Dakota, and (5) West Virginia, have legislated mandatory school board member training programs.


The information indicated that the national trend was toward the adoption of statewide school board member training programs. It also
showed that implementation of the Michigan CBA program in 1990 placed it among the national leaders in providing an organized school board member training program. It further indicated that the Michigan CBA program was consistent with the trend nationally and, individually, well ahead of many other states.

Summary

This chapter presented an extensive review of literature relevant to boards of education. It began with an historical overview of the background of school boards including their origins, public control of American education, eventual state authority over public schools, and legal origins of Michigan schools in particular. The chapter also addressed the roles and responsibilities of modern school boards with emphasis on state boards of education, the Michigan State Board of Education, and local school boards. Then, the chapter discussed the literature concerned with the formation of school boards associations, including the National School Boards Association and the Michigan Association of School Boards. The next section of the chapter concentrated on literature relevant to school board evaluation. That segment included school board member training programs with special emphasis on the Michigan Association of School Boards' Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program. The concluding portion of the chapter dealt with national trends in school board member leadership development and state mandates. Included in this section was information gathered from an informal survey regarding state school boards associations' board member training programs.
The remaining chapters of this study included Chapter III, which identified methodology and procedures for the research. The presentation and analysis of the collected data were described in Chapter IV. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations to be drawn from this study were reported in Chapter V.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF PROCEDURES

Introduction and Background

Every man owes some of his time to the upbuilding of the profession to which he belongs.

--Theodore Roosevelt

The purpose of this study was to determine among certified school board members, the perceived effectiveness of Michigan's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program.

This chapter describes the methodology used in the study. It includes: (a) the research design, (b) restatement of the four specific research questions, (c) a description of the population and sample, (d) construction of the survey instrument, and (e) the procedures used for data collection and analysis.

Research Design

Descriptive survey research was used in the study. Isaac and Michael (1981) noted that the purpose of descriptive research is to describe systematically a situation or area of interest factually and accurately. Furthermore, Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1971) stated:

Descriptive research describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of view or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing. Its major purpose is to tell what is. (p. 26)
Babbie (1973) wrote that survey research is probably the best known and most widely used research method in the social sciences today. In particular, surveys are considered to be the most widely used technique in education and in the behavioral sciences for the collection of data (Isaac & Michael, 1981). This methodology is thought to be the most appropriate given the nature and purpose of the study.

Research Questions

In order to examine the broad research questions stated in Chapter I, the following four specific research questions were investigated:

1. What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA training program?

2. How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses?

3. How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education?

4. How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe CBA courses are to their overall effectiveness as members of the board of education?

The Population and Sample

The total population eligible for participation in the study was 1,056 Michigan school board members who had completed the Michigan Association of School Boards' Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program. The complete list of 1,056 MASB certified school board
members' names, addresses, and MASB school district pupil enrollment group was provided by the Michigan Association of School Boards. This study was conducted using a stratified random sample of 275 (26.8%) CBA certified school board members selected from the total 1,056 eligible population. The eligible population of 1,056 was reduced by 32 pilot study participants whose names were subsequently removed from the original list. This left a total eligible CBA population of 1,024 from which 275, or 26.8%, were randomly selected for use in the study from within each of the six MASB school district enrollment groups. There were no CBA certified school board members from enrollment Group 7. The size of the sample within each of the enrollment groups was proportional to its percentage of the total 275 participants. A stratified random sample was used because it lowers the sampling variance by containing the variance within the strata. Proportionate random sampling has a sampling variance that is less than or equal to the sampling variance from a nonstratified simple random sample (Frankel, 1983). It also insured that a sufficient subgroup representation was present in the overall sample. Although the 26.8% sample size for the study was actually larger than others reviewed in the literature (Freeman, 1990/1991; Huston, 1989/1990; Kask, 1990/1991), the size was consistent with that recommended by Isaac and Michael (1990) and was sufficient to insure a 95% level of confidence.

To select the participants, each of the names was assigned a number from 1 to 1,024. Corresponding numbers were then randomly generated by computer within each of the six enrollment groups with use of Microsoft Excel 4.0 software (see Appendix B). The numbers
were matched to the names of the school board members until all 275 participants had been selected. This procedure insured that "every element in the population had a none non-zero probability of selection" (Rossi, 1985, p. 23).

Construction of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in the study was of a type which Fink and Kosecoff (1985) described as "a method of collecting information from people about their ideas, feelings, plans, beliefs, and social, educational and financial background" (p. 13). The information collected in this study concerned school board member training in general, and Michigan's CBA school board member training program in particular. The survey was developed in September and October of 1994. In addition to the questions formulated by the researcher, the following primary sources were used to generate questions for the survey instrument: (a) literature reviews of other studies related to school boards and school board member training programs; (b) course and curriculum materials from the CBA program; (c) Michigan Association of School Boards personnel, including the organization's executive director and the director of policy services and education; (d) members of the researcher's dissertation committee; and (e) the executives directors from other state school board associations.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part 1 contained Questions 1 through 5, which were related to the subject of school board member training in general. Questions 6 through 10 examined the Michigan Association of School Boards' Certified Boardmember Award
(CBA) training program in particular. Four of the questions asked respondents to use a Likert-type scale to rate the importance, quality, value as related to school board member effectiveness, and the use of the knowledge gained from CBA courses. Questions 11 and 12 were open ended to provide respondents a narrative opportunity to suggest topics they would like to see added to the CBA curriculum, as well as to make comments on the CBA program overall. Part 2 of the survey instrument requested demographic information.

To establish the instrument’s reliability and validity, it was reviewed by a panel of seven recognized experts in the field of education and school board member training. The expert panel of reviewers included: (1) a member of the State Board of Education in Michigan; (2) a Kentucky school board training researcher who was the first to evaluate mandatory training in that state; (3) the executive director of the Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA), a statewide organization that represents Michigan superintendents; (4) the executive director of the Michigan Association of School Boards, who was the driving force in the creation of the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program; (5) the Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction; (6) the executive director of the Missouri School Boards Association; and (7) the executive director of the National School Boards Association, a recognized national expert on school board member training programs.

Reviewers were sent the survey instrument and asked to make comments regarding the content of the questions, clarity, and ease of reading the instructions, as well as suggesting items that should be added, deleted, or modified. The reviewers made only minor
suggestions for improvement.

The survey instrument was then pilot tested in December of 1994 with 32 randomly selected participants (or 3%) of the total list of 1,056 CBA certified school board members. A sample size of this number for a pilot test is consistent with that suggested by Isaac and Michael (1990). Of the 32 surveys mailed, 26 (81.2%) were completed and returned. An item analysis revealed that all 26 were appropriately completed and contained no further suggestions for revision.

The survey instrument was professionally prepared by a local printer in accordance with a modified Total Design Method (TDM) procedure (Dillman, 1983).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection followed a modified Total Design Method (TDM) as outlined by Dillman (1983). TDM has a demonstrated record of success in achieving above average response rates among survey participants.

A 1990 national study of school board members had a return rate of only 25.6%. Nationwide, the average return rates for studies that involved school board members range between 23% and 40% (Freeman, 1990/1991). Yet the TDM procedure has consistently resulted in participant return rates as high as 70% to 90%, with no study that used the complete TDM procedure yielding a response rate less than 60%.

The TDM procedure is divided into two parts: (1) questionnaire construction and (2) survey implementation.
Questionnaire Construction

The questionnaire construction used the following modified TDM procedures (Dillman, 1983):

1. The survey instrument was designed as a 6.5" x 8.5" booklet.
2. The booklet was printed on white paper to avoid a resemblance to advertising brochures.
3. Survey questions were not printed on the cover page. The cover page was instead used for an interest getting title and illustration.
4. Survey questions were not printed on the back cover page. It was used to restate where to return the completed survey and to thank respondents for their participation in the study.
5. Survey questions were ordered so that the most interesting topic related inquiries came first; the demographic information was last.
6. Survey questions included use of lower case letters for questions and upper case letters for answers.

Survey Implementation

The survey implementation adhered to the following modified TDM procedures.

1. A one-page cover letter was prepared. It explained (a) that a socially useful study was being conducted, (b) why each respondent was important, and (c) who should complete the questionnaire. It also promised confidentiality in conjunction with an identification system to facilitate follow-up mailings.
2. The exact mailing date was included on the letter which was printed on the researcher's letterhead stationery.

3. Individual names and addresses were typed onto the printed letters in matching type and the researcher's name was individually signed with a blue ink fountain pen.

4. Questionnaires were marked with an identification number, the presence of which was explained in the cover letter.

5. The mailout packet was sent to the 275 participants on December 24, 1994. It consisted of the cover letter, letter of support for the study from the executive director of MASB, the questionnaire, and a self-addressed and stamped business reply envelope. Each packet was mailed in a 10" by 13" manila envelope. The reply envelope was preprinted with the researcher's name and address.

6. Exactly one week after the first mailout, a postcard follow-up reminder was sent to all nonrespondents.

7. Three weeks after the first mailout, a second cover letter and questionnaire was sent to all nonrespondents.

Preliminary coding of data was completed prior to the mailing of the questionnaire packets. Each survey booklet was individually coded to identify each of the participants alphabetically so that follow-up reminders could be sent to nonrespondents. Each participant was identified by a number from 1 to 275. For example, the code Number 1 would identify the participant as being the first name listed alphabetically within enrollment Group 1. The number was printed on the outside back cover of the survey instrument to expedite sorting of the returned questionnaires. The cover letter advised participants of the significance of
the number code. Participants also were informed that only the researcher would know the identity of individual respondents and that complete confidentiality and anonymity would be insured.

A master notebook of survey participants for each of the six MASB enrollment groups was organized prior to mailing of the surveys. Participant names and addresses were listed alphabetically on each page within each of the MASB enrollment groups. The master notebook also had space after each participant name to record the return date of the questionnaire. This also served to identify participants who had not returned the survey and permitted a follow-up mailing.

The first completed survey was returned December 28, 1994, and the final survey was received January 25, 1995. Of the 275 surveys that were mailed, 221 were completed and returned for an overall 80.3% response rate. All of the surveys were used in the data analysis.

Survey questions were consecutively numbered Q-1 to Q-18. Each of the response options for the individual survey questions was precoded when appropriate from Number 1 to whatever total number of response options existed for each of the questions.

The first step in the analysis of data after return of the surveys was to examine each questionnaire for correctness and completeness. Incomplete or incorrect surveys were not to be included in the final data analysis.

The data were coded and entered into the NMV computer system for analysis using the Software Package for Social Science program (Norusis, 1990).
Results were reported in frequency distributions and percentages for each survey question and for each of the four research questions. Results were also reported for each of the eight CBA courses with regards to the (a) importance, (b) quality, (c) use, and (d) value as it relates to board member effectiveness. Tables and narrative summaries of the data were also utilized to report the study's findings.

Chapter Summary

This chapter included a restatement of the purpose and description of the methodology. It also explained (a) the research design, (b) a restatement of the four research questions, (c) a description of the population and sample, (d) construction of the survey instrument, and (e) the procedures for data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Education, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men.

--Horace Mann

The purpose of this study was to determine, among certified school board members, the perceived effectiveness of the Michigan Association of School Boards' (MASB's) Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) voluntary school board member training program.

From a review of the related literature and research, information was gathered which pertained to the historical foundations of boards of education, public governance of schools, the responsibilities of school board members, the need for school board member training, and Michigan's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) training program. A review of school board member training programs in all other states was completed in order to provide current information about national trends in the area of school board member training.

With use of information from the related literature, as well as that provided by school board training personnel in other states, a questionnaire was developed to study the Michigan voluntary school board member training program. The organizational layout of the questionnaire itself and the implementation procedures followed a modified Dillman...
(1985) methodology. To establish its reliability and validity, the survey instrument was reviewed by an expert panel of seven state and national educators recognized for their expertise in public education who made only minor suggestions for improvement to the instrument. In December 1994, the survey instrument was pilot tested using a randomly drawn sample of 32 (3%) CBA certified school board members selected from each of the six MASB enrollment groups from the total available 1,056 population as reported in Table 1. A sample size of this number for a pilot test is consistent with that suggested by Isaac and Michael (1990). Of the 32 surveys mailed, 26 (or 81.2%) were completed and returned. An item analysis revealed that the 26 returned questionnaires were appropriately completed and contained no further suggestions for revision.

Table 1
Stratified Sampling of Target Population for Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District enrollment group</th>
<th>Total certified board members</th>
<th>Percent of total population</th>
<th>Total board members in random sample</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research methodology for the study utilized descriptive survey research as outlined in Chapter III. The survey questionnaire itself was divided into two parts. The first contained Questions 1 through 5, which were related to the subject of school board member training in general. Questions 6 through 10 examined the Michigan Association of School Boards' Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) training program. Questions 11 and 12 were open ended to provide respondents the opportunity to suggest topics they would like to see added to the CBA curriculum, as well as to make any other comments about the CBA program in general. The second part contained Questions 14 through 18, which requested demographic information.

This chapter presents a description of the response data tabulated and reported in frequencies and percentages. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section provides a demographic description of the sample. The second section contains response data about school board training in general. The third section reports the response data for each research question. The fourth section contains a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Sample

The total population of Michigan CBA certified school board members who had completed MASB's voluntary school board member training program prior to August 1994 was 1,056. In order to determine the total number of CBA certified school board members eligible for the main study, the names of the 32 pilot study participants were removed from the list. From the 1,024 CBA certified school board members
whose names remained on the list, a stratified random sample of 275 (or 26.8%) was selected from each of the six MASB enrollment group categories as reported in Table 2. The survey questionnaire packets were mailed to all 275 participants on Saturday, December 24, 1994, and included therewith the researcher's introductory cover letter, a letter of support from the executive director of the Michigan Association of School Boards, the survey instrument, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. One week after the original mailing, a follow-up postcard was sent to all nonrespondents. Three weeks after the original mailing, a second survey was sent to all nonrespondents.

Table 2
Stratified Sampling of Target Population for Main Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District enrollment group</th>
<th>Total certified board members</th>
<th>Percent of total population</th>
<th>Total board members in random sample</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,024*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 1,024 reflects population available for sampling minus the pilot study population (N = 32).
The first completed survey was returned Wednesday, December 28, 1994, and the final survey was received on Wednesday, January 25, 1995. A total of 221 completed surveys were returned for an overall response rate of 80.3%. All of the completed surveys were used in the data analysis. The SPSS Statistical Data Analysis program (Norusis, 1990) was used to tabulate and report the responses in frequencies and percentages.

Demographic Response Data

This information presents a demographic profile of the respondent population utilizing data in which participants were asked to indicate their gender, age category, highest level of education, the category representative of the number of years they had served on the board of education, and the MASB region of the state in which their school district was located. Not all respondents replied to every question, so all data were not available.

Gender of Respondents

The number and percentage of respondents by gender is reported in Table 3. Of the 220 respondents, 114 (or 51.8%) were males and 106 (or 48.2%) were females.

Age of Respondents

Table 3 also reports the number and percentage of responses by age. One hundred and eleven (or 50.2%) of respondents reported that they were in the 41 to 50 age category. There were 22 respondents
Table 3

Distribution of Respondents by Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

10% in both the 31 to 40 age group and in the over 60 age category. Sixty-six respondents (or 29.9%) were in the 51 to 60 age group. There were no CBA certified school board members in the 30 or younger age category.
**Education Level of Respondents**

As shown in Table 4, 219 of the 220 respondents (or 99.5%) possess at least a high school diploma. The largest single category was the 70 respondents (or 31.8%) with college degrees. More than half of those who responded, 125 (or 56.8%) have a college degree or higher. One respondent (or 0.5%) indicated a less than high school degree.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post high school education</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree (junior college)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional degree</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

**Years of School Board Experience of Respondents**

Table 5 reveals that the largest single group of the 220 CBA respondents, 55 (or 25%), have between 7 and 9 years of experience on
the board of education, and that 46 respondents (or 20.9%) have more than 12 years of school board experience. More than half of the study's respondents, 122 (or 55.4%), have 7 years or more of experience on the board of education. One respondent (or 0.5%) indicated less than one year's experience.

Table 5
Distribution of Respondents by Years Served on the Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 years</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Michigan MASB School District Enrollment Group

Table 6 presents the number and percentage of survey responses within each of the six Michigan MASB enrollment groups. Of the 221
responses tabulated, Group 3, school districts with pupil enrollments of 1,500 to 3,000, had the greatest number of respondents with 70, or 31.7%, of the total. Group 6, however, which includes school board members from districts with enrollments of 15,001 to 100,000 students, recorded 5 surveys returned when only 3 surveys were initially mailed to Group 6 participants. The discrepancy most likely stems from the fact that some of Michigan's school board members serve on more than one board of education and, as such, these respondents may have selected enrollment Group 6.

Table 6
Distribution of Respondents by School District Enrollment Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District enrollment group</th>
<th>Enrollment size</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intermediate school district (0 enrollment)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-1,500</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,500-3,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,001-7,500</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,501-15,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,002-100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Michigan MASB Regions of Respondents

The data in Table 7 report the number and percentage of the 220 respondents in each of the eight statewide Michigan regions. The map of the eight MASB regions and the counties included in each is located in Appendix C. The Lower Peninsula, which includes Regions 2 through 8 accounted for 200 (or 91%) of the returns. Region 6 had the largest number of returns with 35 (or 15.9%) of the total. The Upper Peninsula was divided into Region 1E (east) and Region 1W (west). Twenty responses were returned from the Upper Peninsula regions which accounted for 9% of the total surveys returned statewide.

School Board Training Response Data

This section reports data to Questions 1 through 5 of the survey instrument. These questions were related to the subject of school board member in-service training in general. Not all board members responded to each question, so all data were not available. The responses are reported in frequencies and percentages.

Participation in New Board Member Orientation Programs by Respondents

Survey Question 1 asked respondents if, as new school board members, they had participated in any type of orientation program. Of the 220 responses received, 156 (or 70.9%) of respondents indicated that they had participated in some type of new school board member orientation program. Sixty-four of the respondents (or 29.1%) reported that they had not. Of the 219 orientation responses that were reported by gender, 73 (or 47.2%) were males and 82 (or 52.9%) were females.
Table 7

Distribution of Respondents by Michigan MASB Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan MASB region</th>
<th>Respondents (N = 221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1W</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1E</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

Of those school board member respondents who did not participate in an orientation program, 40 (or 62.5%) were males and 24 (or 37.5%) were females. Among survey respondents, more females participated in new school board member orientation programs than did their male counterparts.

In survey Question 2, respondents who had participated in an orientation program were asked to identify the provider of the training. Of the 149 respondents, 83 (or 55.7%) indicated that the local school
district's superintendent had most often provided the training. The second most common provider was the Intermediate School District, which was identified by 27 (or 18.1%) of the respondents, while 26 (or 17.4%) of the respondents listed the third most frequent provider as the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB).

In survey Question 3, when the 146 respondents who had participated in a new board member orientation program were asked to describe the nature of the training, more than one half (54.8%) reported that it had been a meeting with the superintendent of schools. Fifty of the respondents (or 34.2%) listed a program or conference sponsored by the Intermediate School District or MASB as the next most common type of orientation training. Eight respondents (or 5.5%) described their orientation training as a meeting with the president of the board of education. Eight of the school board respondents (or 5.5%) indicated some combination of the listed response choices.

Existence of School Board In-Service Training Policies by Respondents

School board members were asked in Question 4 to indicate whether their board of education had a written in-service training policy. Of the 217 responses, 139 (or 64.1%) of the respondents indicated that their school districts did not have a written school board member in-service training policy. Forty-three of the respondents (or 19.8%) reported that their districts did have a written in-service training policy for school board members. Thirty-five respondents (or 16.1%) indicated that they were unaware as to whether such a policy existed in their school district.
Table 8 reports responses relative to the existence of a written school board member in-service training policy by MASB school district enrollment group. Data revealed that 25 (or 34.9\%) of the respondents from Group 4 schools, those with pupil enrollments of 3,001 to 7,500, was the highest number with written school board member in-service training policies. Group 2 schools, pupil enrollments of 0 to 1,500 students, was the next highest group with 13 respondents (or 30.2\%). Of the 139 respondents with no school board member in-service training policy, Group 3, districts with enrollments of 1,501 to 3,000 students, was the biggest category with 47 respondents (or 33.8\%).

Survey Question 5, the last of those related to the general area of school board member training, asked participants if they thought in-service training for school board members should be mandatory or voluntary. Of 216 responses, 135 (or 62.5\%) said the training should be mandatory. Seventy-six (or 35.2\%) indicated that in-service training for school board members should be voluntary. Five respondents (or 2.3\%) registered no opinion. By gender, of the 215 responses that supported either mandatory or voluntary in-service training, more than one half of the respondents, 74 (or 55.2\%) were females, and 60 (or 44.8\%) were males. Among the 76 respondents who supported voluntary in-service training, the majority, 48 (or 63.2\%) were males and 28 (or 36.8\%) were females. Four of the male respondents and one female had no opinion. Overall, 71.8\% of female respondents support mandatory school board member in-service training, while 53.6\% of males do. Of those who support voluntary in-service training, 27.2\% are females while 42.9\% are males.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District enrollment group</th>
<th>Enrollment size</th>
<th>Written in-service training policy ((N = 217))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intermediate school districts (zero enrollment)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-1,500</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,501-3,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,001-7,500</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,501-15,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15,001-100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 presents results to Question 5 relative to mandatory or voluntary in-service training by MASB school district enrollment group. Of the 135 responses in favor of mandatory in-service training, Group 3, districts with pupil enrollments of 1,500 to 3,000, registered the highest respondent support with 43 (or 31.9%). Group 2, districts with pupil enrollments of 0 to 1,500, were the next most supportive group, with 38 (or 28.1%) of respondents favoring mandatory in-service training. Seventy-six of the 216 responses favored voluntary in-service training programs. Group 2, districts with pupil enrollments of 1,501 to 3,000 was the biggest group in favor of voluntary training with 25 respondents (or 32.9%).

Table 10 reports the results to Question 5 by region of the state. It shows that 134 of 215 responses, or 62.3 of respondents, supported mandatory in-service training. Of the 134 respondents, the largest number, 11 (or 16.4%) were from Region 7 in the southeast part of Michigan. Seventy-six (35.3%) of the 215 respondents supported voluntary in-service training. Of the 76 respondents, the largest number, 14 (or 18.4%) were from Region 6 in the southwest part of the state. Twenty of the 215 responses were from the Upper Peninsula. Of those respondents, 12 (or 60%) supported mandatory training, while 8 (or 40%) favored voluntary training.

Year of CBA Certification of Respondents

Survey Question 6 asked participants to identify the year in which they were CBA certified. The 218 survey responses are reported in Table 11. The results reveal that in 1990, the first year of the CBA
Table 9
Type of Support for School Board Member In-Service Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Support for training (N = 216)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District enrollment group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Intermediate school districts (zero enrollment)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0-1,500</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1,501-3,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 3,001-7,500</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 7,501-15,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 15,001-100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Region of Support for School Board Member In-Service Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michigan MASB Region</th>
<th>Support for training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed this question.

program, 20 school board members, or 9.2% of the respondents, were certified through the CBA program. In the second year, 1991, the number who was CBA certified rose to 53, or 24.3% of the respondents. In CBA's third year, 1992, the largest number of the respondents, 60 (or 27.5%) earned certification. In 1993, 52 respondents (23.9%) were
### Table 11
Year of Respondent's CBA Certification by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed this question.
Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program Response Data

This section reports the findings for each of the four research questions relative to the Michigan Association of School Boards' (MASB's) Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1: What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA training program?

Survey Question 7 asked school board member participants to rate the importance of each of the eight listed course topics included in the CBA program. Each topic was rated on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 indicated the topic was unimportant and 4 indicated the topic was very important).

Table 12 reports the respondent data by category for the importance of each of the eight listed course topics. Data revealed that seven of the eight course topics listed in the question were rated as very important by more than 50% of the school board members who responded to each CBA topic. Only the topic of legislation received a lower rating with 93 (or 43.3%) of the 215 respondents listing it as very important. Leadership was the highest ranked topic in the very important category among the 138 (or 63%) of the 219 school board member
Table 12
Importance of CBA Course Topics Reported by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course topic</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Total responses&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School finance (budgeting)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School law</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor relations</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Responses to the following survey question: "As a CBA certified school board member, how important do you feel it is that the following course topics be included in the CBA training program?"

<sup>b</sup>N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
respondents. School finance was the next highest listed topic, with 135 (or 61.6%) of the 219 respondents having ranked it very important. The topic of policy was ranked third in the very important category with 126 (or 56.4%) of the 219 respondents.

Table 13 ranks the importance of each of the eight course topics by mean score. Overall, school finance was ranked by respondents as the single most important topic among the eight topics listed with a mean score of 3.56 on a 4.0 scale. Leadership, with a mean score of 3.54, was ranked as the second most important topic overall, while policy, with a 3.52 mean score, was ranked third. Legislation was rated as the least important of the eight listed topics with a mean score of 3.22, while school law was the next lowest with a mean score of 3.35.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2: How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses?

Survey Question 8 asked school board members to rate the quality of the materials and the quality of the instruction for each of the CBA courses they had completed. To permit board members a greater range of response options on this item, each course was rated on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 indicated poor quality and 5 indicated high quality).

Table 14 reports the respondent data by category for the quality of the materials in each of the eight CBA courses.
Table 13
Importance of CBA Course Topics Ranked by Mean Score
(N = 221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course topic</th>
<th>Mean score (4.0 scale)</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Responsesa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance and Budgeting</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101/501 Leadership</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

Quality of Course Materials

Respondents ranked course materials for CBA 104 School Law, CBA 101/501, Leadership, and CBA 102 Policy in order as the top three in the high quality response category. Fifty-nine of 183 respondents (or 32.2%) ranked the course materials for CBA 104 School Law first in the high quality category. Second was CBA 101/501 Leadership with 57. of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA courses</th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Above average quality</th>
<th>Average quality</th>
<th>Below average quality</th>
<th>Poor quality</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aResponses to the following survey question: "Please rate the quality of the course material for each of the CBA courses you completed."

b\(N < 221\) indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
203 respondents (or 28.1%) rating its course materials as high quality, while 46 of 184 respondents (or 25%) ranked the CBA 102 Policy course materials at the high quality level.

Table 15 ranks the quality of the materials for each course by mean score. Overall, the course materials for CBA 104 School Law were rated the highest with a mean score of 4.02 on a 5.0 point scale. The course materials for the CBA 101 Leadership class were rated as the second highest with a 3.97 mean score and CBA 102 Policy course materials were rated third with a mean score of 3.89. The quality of the materials for CBA 105 Curriculum were rated lowest of the eight CBA courses with a 3.69 mean score and CBA 103 School Finance and CBA 106 Community Relations were the next lowest with mean scores of 3.81 each.

**Quality of Instruction**

Since different instructors may have taught the same CBA course in various locations around the state, respondent scores cannot and should not be used to evaluate or rate individual instructors in a given course. The data are presented with regards to the general quality of the instruction for the course and not with regards to individual instructors. Respondents did not need to complete all CBA courses in order to earn CBA certification, so the number of respondents varied with each course.

Table 16 reports respondent data by category for the general quality of instruction in each of the eight CBA courses. The instructional quality for CBA 104 School Law was again rated first at the high quality
Table 15
Quality of CBA Course Materials Ranked by Mean Score
(N = 221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course</th>
<th>Mean score (5.0 scale)</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Total responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101/501 Leadership</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

level by 68 of 174 respondents (or 39.1%). The instructional quality in the CBA 101/501 Leadership class was rated high quality by 70 of 198 school board respondents (or 35.4%), which was the next highest. The general quality of instruction for CBA 102 Policy was the third highest in the high quality category with 54 of 176 respondents (or 30.7%).

Table 17 ranks the general quality of instruction for each CBA course by mean score. Overall, CBA 104 School Law was rated highest with a mean score of 4.08 on a 5.0 scale, while CBA 101/501 Leadership was the next highest with a mean score rating of 4.04. CBA 102 Policy was third overall in instructional quality with a 3.97 mean score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA courses</th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Above average quality</th>
<th>Average quality</th>
<th>Below average quality</th>
<th>Poor quality</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aResponses to the following survey question: "Please rate the quality of the course instruction for each of the CBA courses you completed."

bN < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
CBA 105 Curriculum was rated the lowest of the eight courses with a 3.63 mean score, while the general quality of instruction for the CBA 106 Community Relations course was ranked seventh overall with a mean score of 3.78. In the consideration of both the quality of materials and the general quality of the instruction for all eight of the CBA courses, school board member respondents ranked the classes in the same identical order in each of the two areas. CBA 104 School Law was ranked first both in terms of materials and instruction. CBA 101/501 Leadership was ranked second in both areas, while CBA 102 Policy was ranked third. CBA 105 Curriculum was ranked the lowest by respondents both in terms of the quality of materials and the general quality of instruction.

Table 17
Quality of the CBA Course Instruction Ranked by Mean Score
(N = 221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course</th>
<th>Mean score (5.0 scale)</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Total responses(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101/501 Leadership</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
Research Question 3

Research Question 3: How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education?

Survey Question 10 asked school board members to rate how often they used their knowledge when making decisions as members of the board of education. Each course was rated on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 indicated very often and 4 indicated not at all). The numbers of school board member respondents varied with each course because not all board members needed to complete the same courses to become CBA certified.

Table 18 reports the respondent data by category of how often the knowledge from each of the CBA courses was used to making school board decisions. Sixty-one of 190 respondents (or 32.1%) ranked the knowledge used from CBA 106 Community Relations first in the very often category when making school board decisions. CBA 101/501 Leadership was rated next highest in the very often used category with 68 of 214 respondents (or 31.8%).

Table 19 ranks respondent use of CBA knowledge from each of the eight CBA courses by mean score. Overall, the use of knowledge gained from CBA 101/501 Leadership was ranked first with a mean score of 3.09 on a 4.0 scale. Knowledge used from CBA 102 Policy was ranked second with a mean score of 2.99, while the knowledge used from CBA 106 Community Relations was ranked third with a 2.98 mean score. The knowledge gained from CBA 108 Legislation was
Table 18
Use of Knowledge From CBA Courses in School Board Decision Making by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA courses</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aResponses to the following survey question: "Overall, how often do you use the knowledge you received from the CBA courses you completed when making decisions as a member of the board of education?"

*bN < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
ranked least used of the eight courses when making school board decisions with a mean score of 2.71. CBA 107 Labor Relations and CBA 105 Curriculum were ranked as the next lowest with mean scores of 2.79 each.

Table 19
Use of Knowledge From CBA Courses in School Board Decision Making Ranked by Mean Score (N = 221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course</th>
<th>Mean score (5.0 scale)</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Total responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101/501 Leadership</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4: How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe CBA courses are to their effectiveness as members of the board of education?
Survey Question 9 asked school board members to rate the value of each CBA course they had completed as it related to their overall effectiveness as school board members. Each course was rated on a scale from 1 to 4 (1 indicated not valuable and 4 indicated highly valuable). The number of respondents varied with each course, so not all data were available.

Table 20 reports the respondent data by category for the value that each of the eight CBA courses had related to the school board member's overall effectiveness. Seventy-one of 194 respondents (or 36.6%) rated the CBA 106 Community Relations course first in the highly valuable category. CBA 101/501 Leadership was the next highest ranked in the highly valuable category with 76 of 217 respondents (or 35%). Both CBA 102 Policy with 65 of 200 respondents (or 32.5%) and CBA 103 School Finance with 64 of 197 respondents (or 32.5%) were ranked third by respondents. All eight of the CBA classes were ranked as valuable or highly valuable by more than 60% of the respondents.

Table 21 ranks by mean score the value that each CBA course had related to the board member's overall effectiveness. Overall, CBA 101/501 Leadership was ranked by respondents as the most valuable and effective course of the eight with mean score of 3.14 on a 4.0 scale. CBA 102 Policy was ranked second by respondents with a mean score of 3.12, while CBA 106 Community Relations was ranked as the third most valuable and effective by respondents with a 3.08 mean score. CBA 108 Legislation, with a mean score of 2.93, was ranked as
Table 20
Value of CBA Courses as Related to School Board Member Effectiveness by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA courses</th>
<th>Highly valuable</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Somewhat valuable</th>
<th>Not valuable</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Law</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses to the following survey question: Please rate the value of each CBA course you have completed as it relates to your overall effectiveness as a school board member.

*N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.
the least valuable and effective of the eight courses, and CBA 105 Curriculum was ranked next lowest with a mean score of 3.00.

Table 21

Value of CBA Courses Related to School Board Member Effectiveness Ranked by Mean Score
(N = 221)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBA course</th>
<th>Mean score (5.0 scale)</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101/501 Leadership</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N < 221 indicates that not all respondents completed the question.

Board Member Suggestions for Additional Training Topics

Survey Questions 11 and 12 gave school board member participants the opportunity to narratively respond to each of two open-ended questions regarding school board member training. All responses were recorded to identify those that were most often cited by the respondents. The first grouping of responses that appeared most frequently in each of the two questions was then reported. The grouping involved...
reporting five responses from Question 11 and four responses from Question 12.

Question 11 asked respondents if there were any other topics they would like to see included in a school board member training program. One hundred and seventy-one (or 77.3%) of the 221 surveys that were returned answered yes to the question. Of those who answered yes, the following five subjects were most often suggested as topics that should be included in a school board member training program: Twenty-four of the 171 respondents (or 14%) suggested that school board member training should include a course on team building within the local school board. The second most frequently cited suggestion offered by 20 respondents (or 11.6%) was to provide a class on board/superintendent relations. Third, 15 respondents (or 8.5%) requested that a course be offered on the duties and responsibilities of new school board members. The fourth topic suggested by 11 respondents (or 6.4%) was to offer a class in technology. The fifth topic, suggested by seven respondents (or 4.1%) was a class in superintendent evaluation.

Narrative question 12 asked respondents if there were anything else they would like to say regarding the CBA school board member training program. One hundred and forty-eight of 221 (or 66.9%) of the surveys that were returned answered yes to the question. Of those, 20 (or 13.5%) of the respondents wanted the CBA program to provide ongoing and advanced training to school board members. Second, 17 (or 11.4%) of respondents referred to CBA as a "great program." Third, 16 (or 10.8%) of the respondents said that the travel distance to CBA courses and the time involved to get there was too great. Fourth, 14
respondents (or 9.5%) expressed strong written support for mandatory school board member training.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the responses from a survey administered to Michigan school board members who had completed the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program. The chapter is divided into four parts.

The first section provides a demographic description of the sample that includes gender, age, education level, region of the state, and years of school board experience. It revealed that CBA respondents were fairly evenly divided by gender with a slight majority being males. Most respondents were 41 to 50 years of age, college graduates, with 7 to 9 years of school board experience.

The second section contains general school board training response data including participation in new school board member orientation programs, existence of written school board in-service training policies, and support for voluntary or mandatory school board in-service training. It showed that the majority of respondents participated in an orientation program as new school board members, the nature of which most described as a meeting with the superintendent. Most represented school districts with no written school board member in-service training policy, yet the majority indicated support of mandatory school board member training.

The third section reports respondent data for each of the four research questions which are:
1. What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA training program?

2. How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses?

3. How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education?

4. How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe CBA courses are to their effectiveness as members of the board of education?

Respondent data listed school finance as the most important CBA topic, while school law was identified as the class with the highest quality. Respondents indicated that knowledge from the leadership class was the most often used and that leadership was, overall, the most effective class.

The fourth section summarizes the contents of Chapter IV.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research is a high hat word that scares a lot of people. It needn’t. It is nothing but a state of mind. It is the problem solving mind instead of the let-well-enough-alone mind.

--Charles Kettering

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section provides a summary of the entire study. The next section includes a discussion of the findings. The third section presents the conclusions, while the fourth and fifth sections provide the recommendations and recommendations for future study. The closing is given in the sixth section.

Summary

America’s national emphasis on the improvement of its public schools through the quality of their governance has moved several state legislatures to mandate school board member training programs. In other states, the state school boards associations have implemented voluntary in-service training programs for their school board members. In 1990 Michigan became one of the first to inaugurate statewide voluntary school board member training through the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program. Since then, 14 other states have followed suit by offering voluntary or mandatory school board member training programs. Over the 5 years that the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) has conducted the CBA program, 1,056 Michigan school board
members have completed the requirements for CBA certification. What had not been done, however, was to determine how effective those who had completed the program perceived the training to be. It was the central purpose of this study to determine, among certified school board members, the perceived effectiveness of Michigan's Certified Board-member Award (CBA) program.

To accomplish this, the study investigated four specific research questions:

1. What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA training program?
2. How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses?
3. How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from the CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education?
4. How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe CBA courses are to their effectiveness as members of the board of education?

Research Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive research design and survey questionnaire as outlined in Chapter III to gather data from a stratified random sample of 275 CBA certified Michigan school board members. The sample population was proportionately selected from each of the six MASB school district enrollment groups. The names and addresses of the 1,056 certified school board members from which the sample was
drawn were provided by the Michigan Association of School Boards. A sample of 275 certified school board members was selected and sent surveys, of which 221 were completed and returned for an overall response rate of 80.3%.

The survey instrument used in the study was developed by the researcher, reviewed by a seven person expert review panel of recognized school board authorities, and then pilot tested. The survey instrument itself was divided into two parts. Part 1 requested information about school board member training in general and Michigan’s Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program in particular. The second part requested demographic information about the respondents. The results were analyzed using the SPSS Statistical Data Analysis (Norusis, 1990) program and the data were reported in frequencies and percentages.

Discussion of Findings

Respondents were described by gender, age, education level, enrollment of the school district, region of the state, and years of school board member experience. Respondents also indicated if they had participated in an orientation program as new school board members, whether their school district had a written school board member in-service training policy, and if they support voluntary or mandatory school board member training programs, as well as the year in which they were CBA certified.
A Profile of Respondent Population

Data indicated that the gender of CBA certified school board members was fairly evenly divided among respondents, with a slight majority (51.8%) being males and 48.2% females. Slightly more than half of CBA certified school board members are 41-50 years of age, most have a college or graduate/professional degree, and they average 7-9 years of experience on the board of education. The clear majority (70.9%) did participate in an orientation program as new school board members, of which more than half (54.8%) described the orientation training as a meeting with the superintendent of schools. Most of the CBA certified school board members (64.1%) represented school districts with no written school board member in-service training policy, and a majority (62.5%) supported mandatory in-service training for Michigan school board members. Results from the current CBA study supported findings from a recent Michigan study which found that a majority of superintendents and school board members favored mandatory school board member training (Adamkiewicz, 1994).

Findings of the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program

In June of 1990, the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) offered a voluntary school board member training program called the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program. Its goal was to offer Michigan school board members the basics of leadership education for use in their role as members of the board of education. The following
are the findings of this study regarding the Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) program.

**CBA 103 School Finance and Budgeting**

Underwood, Fortune, and Cameron (1985) reported that money, or the lack of it, is consistently a school board's biggest worry. The importance that school boards place on finance was further supported in the Adamkiewicz (1994) study in which school finance was identified by school board members as their top training need. Yet Freeman (1990/1991) found that school board members ranked the need to understand how to build the budget and their knowledge of finance as a low priority. Results from the current CBA study supported the literature and found that school finance was rated first in importance among the eight listed CBA topics. It was rated sixth of the eight CBA classes in terms of quality of materials and instruction. It was ranked fourth in the use of CBA knowledge and fifth in the overall effectiveness of the class, which seemed consistent with related literature in this regard.

**CBA 101/501 Leadership**

In a background paper titled *School Boards: A Troubled American Institution*, Danzberger (1992) noted that school boards that regularly paid attention to honing their leadership skills were those with the fewest problems. Respondents in the current CBA study ranked leadership as the second most important CBA topic of the eight that were listed and also rated it second in the quality of the course materials and instruction. Furthermore, respondents reported that they used the
leadership class knowledge more than any other CBA class when making school board decisions, and they rated the leadership class first in overall effectiveness.

CBA 102 Policy

The establishment of school district policy has long been considered one of the main responsibilities of school boards. That belief was given further credence by the Twentieth Century Fund's 1992 report on school governance titled *Facing the Challenge*, which concluded that "school boards must become policy boards . . . responsible for setting broad policy guidelines" (p. 5). Yet the report also noted that only 3% of a school board's meeting time was spent on policy development. Respondents from the current CBA study ranked policy third in importance of the eight listed CBA topics and third in the quality of the course materials and instruction. Yet it was ranked second highest both in terms of its use in making school board decisions and in the overall effectiveness of the class, results which are not consistent with some of the related literature in this area.

CBA 106 Community Relations

Freeman (1990/1991) found that school board members tended to use their community relations knowledge more often because they felt comfortable with their information base. Results from the current CBA study would tend to support this aspect of the related literature. Although respondents ranked community relations fourth in the importance of the topic and low in the quality of the course materials and
instruction (it was tied for sixth of the eight CBA classes), board members placed it third in terms of its use in making board decisions and third in the overall effectiveness of the class.

**CBA 107 Labor Relations**

A recent National School Board Association California task force that defined the major responsibilities of local school boards identified collective bargaining as one of the seven core decision-making functions that can be performed only by the local board of education (Campbell & Greene, 1994). Respondent results from the current CBA study did not support the literature. Labor relations was ranked fifth in terms of its importance of the eight listed CBA topics. The quality of the course materials and instruction were rated fourth, while it was ranked near the bottom (sixth) in use and fourth in the overall effectiveness of the class.

**CBA 105 Curriculum**

Curtis (1990/1991) reported that curriculum was ranked as the second most important in-service training topic of 17 listed by new school board members in North Carolina. Curriculum was also identified by Campbell and Greene (1994) as one of the seven essential core areas of responsibility for California school boards. An Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL, 1986) study put it most powerfully when it noted that since teaching and learning are the ultimate reasons for the existence of school boards, curriculum must remain a major focus. Yet Carver (1991) noted in a study of the West Virginia school boards, that only 2% of their decisions were related to textbooks and curriculum.
the current CBA study, curriculum was rated as one of the least important CBA topics with respondents ranking it sixth, while it was rated the lowest among all eight CBA classes in terms of the quality of the course materials and instruction. It was rated seventh of eight both in terms of use of knowledge in making decisions and in overall effectiveness and was, therefore, consistent with the Freeman (1990/1991) study which reported similar results. It was not, however, in step with literature cited above that placed curriculum at the forefront of school board importance.

**CBA 104 School Law**

Freeman, Underwood, and Fortune (1991) reported that in a national study of 17 characteristics of effective school board members that knowledge of school law was ranked dead last. Respondents in the current CBA study seemed to support the related literature when they rated school law seventh of the eight listed CBA courses in terms of importance. It was, however, rated first in quality of the course materials and instruction. It was ranked fifth both in its use in decision and in its overall effectiveness.

**CBA 108 Legislation**

Legislation was rated the least important among the eight listed CBA topics. The course was rated fifth in the quality of the materials and instruction; it was also ranked last in use of the knowledge and last in overall effectiveness.
Findings of Narrative Suggestions for Additional CBA Courses

All responses for this item were recorded to identify those that were most often cited by the respondents. The first grouping involved five suggestions for additional CBA courses. The California School Boards Association (CSBA) recently identified several tenets of effective boardsmanship, among which was listed the importance of teamwork on the school board. When asked in the current CBA study what other topics school board members would like to see added to the CBA curriculum, the highest number of respondents (14%) suggested that, like the California study, a course on school board member team building be added to the CBA curriculum. The second most frequently suggested topic was to offer a course in board/superintendent relations. Both of these topic areas are related to forging stronger and more productive relationships involving school board members and the personnel with whom they work. Third, respondents cited the need to offer a course related to the duties and responsibilities of being a new school board member. Fourth, respondents requested a technology course. Fifth, respondents suggested that instruction be provided in the area of superintendent evaluation. Overall, respondents supported the need for additional CBA course offerings.

Findings of Narrative Comments About the CBA Program

All responses for this item were recorded to identify those that were most often cited by the respondents. The first grouping involved four general observations about the CBA program. As previously noted
in the review of literature chapter, there is a national movement to provide school board member training programs. In this current CBA study, which seems to support the national trend, 13.5% of the respondents requested that in addition to the current CBA program, MASB should also provide advanced school board member training courses. The second most frequent comment listed by 11.4% of respondents, expressed direct satisfaction with CBA by classifying it as a great program. Third, 10.8% of school board member respondents noted that travel distance to CBA course training sites was too great. Respondents expressed additional narrative support for mandatory training as the fourth most frequent observation. Overall, respondents indicated support for school board member training, coupled with thoughts for its improvement.

Restatement of the Four Research Questions

The following four research questions were investigated and answered:

**Research Question 1**: What topics do CBA certified school board members believe to be the most important within the CBA training program? CBA 103 School Finance and Budgeting was ranked first. CBA 101/501 Leadership was rated second, and CBA 108 Legislation was ranked last among the eight CBA topics.

**Research Question 2**: How do CBA certified school board members rate the quality of the CBA courses? Respondents gave identical rankings to both the quality of the materials and the quality of instruction. CBA 104 School Law was rated first. CBA 101/501 Leadership
was ranked second, and CBA 105 Curriculum was rated last among the eight CBA courses.

**Research Question 3:** How often do CBA certified school board members use the knowledge gained from CBA courses in making decisions as members of the board of education? CBA 101/501 Leadership was rated first. CBA 102 Policy was ranked second, and CBA 108 Legislation was rated last among the eight CBA courses.

**Research Question 4:** How valuable do CBA certified school board members believe CBA courses are to their effectiveness as members of the board of education? CBA 101/501 Leadership was ranked first. CBA 102 Policy was ranked second, and CBA 108 Legislation was ranked last among the eight CBA courses.

**Conclusions**

The following conclusions are presented based on the findings of this study:

1. Nearly 60% of the respondents rated all eight CBA courses/topics in the highest two response categories in terms of the importance of the topic, quality of the course, use of the knowledge, and overall effectiveness of the course. This finding would indicate that overall, school board member respondents believed that the Certified Board-member Award (CBA) program was effectively meeting their school board member training needs.

2. Among all eight CBA courses, respondents rated the leadership class highest overall. This finding would indicate that the school board member respondents believed the leadership class to be the most
effective of the eight CBA courses.

3. Among all eight CBA courses, respondents rated the legislation class lowest overall. This finding would indicate that the school board member respondents believed the legislation class to be the least effective of the eight CBA courses.

4. Respondents rated their use of CBA knowledge from all eight courses lower than they rated the importance of the CBA topics. This finding would indicate that board members used their CBA knowledge less in making decisions as members of the board of education than the degree of importance they placed on the topic.

5. More than 60% of the respondents supported mandatory school board member training. This finding would indicate that the school board member respondents believed that in-service training is necessary for all school board members.

6. The study's high return rate (80.3%) indicated that the respondents saw value in the subject of the study and in school board member training.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are presented to assist planners of school board member training programs and those who work with boards of education:

1. MASB should continue to provide CBA training to Michigan school board members, but may need to consider modifications in program content, structure, and delivery and to provide participants with
practical application strategies.

2. The results of this study should be made available to various educational organizations within Michigan that are involved in working with or training Michigan school board members.

3. MASB should evaluate current curriculum offerings and modify or drop courses that do not meet the needs of school board members and add courses that will equip school board members to address changing educational issues of the future.

4. In order to address some of the concern over travel distances to CBA course sites, MASB may wish to consider offering some CBA courses via telecommunications. This would also permit school board members to attend CBA classes as a school board team.

Recommendations for Future Study

The following recommendations are offered for future study:

1. A research study should be conducted into the discrepancy between the importance and value placed by school board members on the CBA course program information and the actual use of the CBA course knowledge.

2. A study should be conducted to determine the perceptions of school superintendents regarding the effectiveness of the CBA program.

Closing

For two centuries, public schools have been the educational cornerstone of American democracy. As the 21st century approaches, education still holds the greatest hope for our nation's success. The
challenge facing school boards today is to provide leadership necessary to insure every child a quality education. Ruskin's (cited in Fields, 1993) words continue to point the way, "quality is never an accident; it is always the result of intelligent action. It is the will to support a superior thing" (p. 13).
Appendix A

Pilot Study Cover Letter
Dear

You are one of 32 Michigan school board members being asked to participate in a doctoral study of Michigan’s voluntary school board member training program. It is the first study of its kind ever done in the state.

More specifically, this project will examine the perceived effectiveness of the Michigan Association of School Board’s “Certified Boardmember Award” (CBA) training program. The study has been endorsed by Justin Kir%, Executive Director of the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB).

As a Michigan school board member who has completed training through the CBA program, your responses will be of particular importance. The survey results are intended to provide MASB and Michigan’s educational leaders with valuable information regarding the CBA school board member training program.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed survey and return it prior to December 17, 1994 in the self-addressed stamped envelope. Your survey responses will be entirely confidential; and your identity, known only to the researcher by the number on the back of the questionnaire, will be completely anonymous.

Once again, thank you for your interest in this survey, and for your commitment to Michigan’s children.

Yours truly,

Henry Bothwell

P.S. As sincere appreciation for your participation, please open and enjoy the enclosed handmade holiday snowflake.
Appendix B

Main Study Cover Letter, Letter of Endorsement From Michigan Association of School Boards, and Computer Generated Random Numbers for Selection of Main Study Participants
Dear

You are one of 275 Michigan school board members being asked to participate in a doctoral study of Michigan's voluntary school board member training program. It is the first study of its kind ever done in the state.

More specifically, this project will examine the perceived effectiveness of the Michigan Association of School Board's "Certified Boardmember Award" (CBA) training program. Please find enclosed a letter from Justin King, Executive Director of the Michigan Association of School Boards which endorses the study.

As a Michigan school board member who has completed training through the CBA program, your responses will be of particular importance. The survey results are intended to provide MASB and Michigan's educational leaders with valuable information regarding the CBA school board member training program.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed survey and return it prior to January 4, 1995 in the self-addressed stamped envelope. Your survey responses will be entirely confidential; and your identity, known only to the researcher by the number on the back of the questionnaire, will be completely anonymous.

Once again, thank you for your interest in this survey, and for your commitment to Michigan's children.

Yours truly,

Henry Bothwell
December 12, 1994

Dear MASB Certified Boardmember:

Enclosed is a letter and a research study questionnaire from Henry Bothwell III, who is doing a study of the impact and value of the MASB Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program as his doctoral dissertation.

Since the CBA Program is now beginning its fifth year, we are most interested in determining its effectiveness on improving the leadership skills of those who have become certified. We believe that a good deal can be learned from the information gathered in Mr. Bothwell’s study to help MASB continue to improve the CBA Program. Therefore, I urge you to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire to Mr. Bothwell as soon as possible.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Justin King
Executive Director

JK/dm

Enclosures
**Microsoft Excel 4.0**

**Mac IIIi; Mac operating system 7.1**

*Insert command* =RANDBETWEEN(bottom,top) *and copy command downward*

**Sample data selection: 275 population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample b/w:** 1 - 113 114 - 446 447 - 747 748 - 956 957 - 1012 1013 - 1024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>462</th>
<th>918</th>
<th>1007</th>
<th>1019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>723</th>
<th>897</th>
<th>971</th>
<th>1024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Survey Instrument Sent to CBA School Board Member Participants
A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARD'S CERTIFIED BOARDMEMBER AWARD (CBA) PROGRAM

As a Michigan school board member who has been certified under the CBA Training Program, we are asking for your help in completing this survey questionnaire. Your thoughts on Michigan's board member training program are important.

*This is the first statewide survey of its kind ever done, and we really appreciate your help!*

Many thanks!

A STUDY CONDUCTED BY HENRY BOTHWELL III IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A DOCTORAL DEGREE FROM WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.

Note. The researcher used Dillman's procedure and the words used in the last sentence above are also his. See "Mail and Other Self-Administered Questionnaires" by D. Dillman, 1983. In P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (pp. 359-376). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
PART I  CBA RELATED QUESTIONS:

These questions are related to the subject of school board member training in general and to the Michigan Association of School Board's Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program in particular. Please check the most appropriate response.

Q-1 Did you participate in any type of orientation program when you became a new member of the board of education?

1. ☐ YES  (If yes, go to question 2)
2. ☐ NO  (If no, go to question 4)

Q-2 If yes, who provided the orientation training?

1. ☐ LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT'S SUPERINTENDENT
2. ☐ INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT
3. ☐ MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS (MASB)
4. ☐ COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
5. ☐ DON'T KNOW
6. ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY)________________________________________

Q-3 If yes, what was the nature of the training?

1. ☐ MEETING WITH THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
2. ☐ MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
3. ☐ INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT / MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARD (MASB) / NEW BOARD MEMBER ORIENTATION PROGRAM OR CONFERENCE
4. ☐ UNIVERSITY COURSE, CONFERENCE OR SEMINAR
5. ☐ OTHER (SPECIFY)________________________________________

Q-4 Does your board of education have a written school board member in-service training policy?

1. ☐ YES
2. ☐ NO
3. ☐ NOT AWARE OF A POLICY

Q-5 As a member of the board of education, do you feel that in-service training for school board members should be mandatory or voluntary?

1. ☐ IT SHOULD BE MANDATORY
2. ☐ IT SHOULD BE VOLUNTARY
3. ☐ NO OPINION

—1—
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Q-6  In what year were you CBA Certified?

1. □ 1990  
2. □ 1991  
3. □ 1992  
4. □ 1993  
5. □ 1994

Q-7  As a CBA certified school board member, how important do you feel it is that the following course topics be included in the CBA training program? (Please place a check in the appropriate response category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Topics</th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT 4</th>
<th>IMPORTANT 3</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 2</th>
<th>UNIMPORTANT 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101 or CBA 501 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103: School Finance &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-8 Please rate the quality of the course material, and the quality of course instruction for each of the CBA courses you completed. (Please place a check in the appropriate response category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>High Quality</th>
<th>Above Average Quality</th>
<th>Average Quality</th>
<th>Below Average Quality</th>
<th>Poor Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101 or CBA 501 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103 School Finance &amp; Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-9  The assumption is that completion of the CBA Program will improve your effectiveness as a member of the board of education.

Please rate the value of each CBA course you have completed as it relates to your overall effectiveness as a school board member. (Please place a check in the appropriate response category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>HIGHLY VALUABLE</th>
<th>VALUABLE</th>
<th>SOMewhat VALUABLE</th>
<th>NOT VALUABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101 or CBA 501 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103: School Finance &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-10 Overall, how often do you use the knowledge you received from the CBA courses you completed when making decisions as a member of the board of education? (Please place a check in the appropriate response category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>NOT OFTEN</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101 or CBA 501 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102 Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103: School Finance &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104 School Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105 Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106 Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107 Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-11 Are there any other topics you would like to see included in a school board member training program?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

______________________________

Q-12 Is there anything else you would like to tell us regarding the CBA school board member training program?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
PART II

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS:

Finally, we would like to ask some questions about you for the statistical analysis. Please check the most appropriate response.

Q-13 Are you male or female?

1. □ MALE
2. □ FEMALE

Q-14 What is your age?

1. □ LESS THAN 30
2. □ 31-40 YEARS
3. □ 41-50 YEARS
4. □ 51-60 YEARS
5. □ OVER 60 YEARS

Q-15 What is your highest level of education?

1. □ LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL
2. □ HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA (or G.E.D.)
3. □ POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION
4. □ ASSOCIATE DEGREE (JUNIOR COLLEGE)
5. □ COLLEGE DEGREE
6. □ GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL DEGREE

Q-16 What is the classification/enrollment of your school district? Please select the appropriate group.

1. □ GROUP 1 — INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT
2. □ GROUP 2 — 0-1,500 STUDENTS
3. □ GROUP 3 — 1,501-3,000 STUDENTS
4. □ GROUP 4 — 3,001-7,500 STUDENTS
5. □ GROUP 5 — 7,501-15,000 STUDENTS
6. □ GROUP 6 — 15,001-100,000 STUDENTS
7. □ GROUP 7 — OVER 100,000 STUDENTS
Q-17  How many years have you served on the board of education?

☐ LESS THAN ONE YEAR
☐ 1-3 YEARS
☐ 4-6 YEARS
☐ 7-9 YEARS
☐ 10-12 YEARS
☐ MORE THAN 12 YEARS

Q-18  In what region of Michigan is your school district located? Please use the map and county listing to locate the appropriate region.

1994 REGIONS

REGION 1: UPPER PENINSULA COUNTIES
All U.P. Counties choose either location:
U.P. East  U.P. West

REGION 2: NORTHERN COUNTIES
Alcona  Emmet  Montmorency
Alpena  Grand Traverse  Ogemaw
Antrim  Iosco  Oscoda
Benzie  Kalkaska  Otsego
Charlevoix  Leelanau  Presque Isle
Cheboygan  Manistee  Roscommon
Crawford  Missaukee  Wexford

REGION 3: WESTERN COUNTIES
Ionia  Mecosta  Oceana
Kent  Muskegon  Osceola
Lake  Montcalm  Ottawa
Mason  Newaygo

REGION 4: CENTRAL COUNTIES
Arenac  Clinton  Midland
Bay  Gladwin  Saginaw
Clare  Gratiot  Shiawassee
Isabella

REGION 5: THUMB COUNTIES
Genesee  Lapeer  St. Clair
Huron  Sanilac  Tuscola

REGION 6: SOUTHWEST COUNTIES
Allegan  Branch  Kalamazoo
Barry  Calhoun  St. Joseph
Berrien  Cass  Van Buren

REGION 7: SOUTHEAST COUNTIES
Eaton  Jackson  Monroe
Hillsdale  Lenawee  Washtenaw
Ingham  Livingston

REGION 8: METRO COUNTIES
Macomb  Oakland  Wayne
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School Board Member Training

Does it Meet Your Needs?

Thank you for your interest in this project.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.
Appendix D

Follow-up Postcard to Nonrespondents
Dear School Board Member:

Thank you for your participation in the study of Michigan's school board member training program.

If you've not yet had the opportunity to return the survey you recently received, please do so at your earliest convenience, or before Jan. 4, 1995.

As a CBA certified school board member your response is essential to the results.

Once again, thank you for your interest in this project.

Yours Truly,

Henry Bothwell III
Appendix E

Second Mailing Follow-up Letter to Nonrespondents
January 13, 1995

Dear

This is a follow-up letter to one you may have received during the holidays that asked for your participation in a study of Michigan’s voluntary school board member training program.

As you may know, this project will examine the perceived effectiveness of the Michigan Association of School Board’s “Certified Boardmember Award” (CBA) program. The study has been endorsed by Justin King, Executive Director of MASB. As a school board member who has completed training through the CBA program, your responses are of particular importance.

I know that the start of the New Year is a hectic time, but I would be most grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. I will still be able to include responses in the final group tabulation of results if you can send them to me on or before January 23, 1995.

Once again, thank you for your interest in this project, and for all that you do for Michigan’s children.

Yours truly,

Henry Bothwell
Appendix F

CBA Certification Materials
The Michigan Association
of School Boards
Certified Boardmember Award Program
Effective July 1, 1992

CBA course descriptions/syllabi

CBA 101: Leadership Skills (6 hours)
This course, designed for board members with less than four consecutive years of service, covers basic skills needed by every participant in school board governance. Major topics include visionary leadership, communication skills, meeting management, roles and responsibilities, and team decision-making.

CBA 501: Advanced Leadership (6 hours)
This course is designed for board members with at least four consecutive years of service. The workshop covers current concerns and problems, as well as the concept of visionary leadership for long-term planning. Specific topics include curriculum, school law, policy, labor relations, and current legislation [NOTE: CBA 501 will not be offered after December 31, 1992].

CBA 102: Policy (3 hours)
This three-hour seminar is designed to teach the skills necessary for policymaking; identification of common policy errors, identifying what the board wants to do, development of administrative procedures, policy oversight, and use of the Policymaker's Checklist.

CBA 103: School Finance and School Budget (3 hours)
The first portion of this course deals with the current state aid act and its importance to and effect on local boards of education, along with possible ramifications for the future. The second portion explores the development and monitoring phases of the budget for a local district, including possible pitfalls in each phase.

CBA 104: School Law (3 hours)
This course covers governance of Michigan school districts, basic School Code provisions applicable to boards of education, general liability, governmental immunity, liability for acts of employees, selected church-state issues, and current trends and controversies in school law.
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CBA 105: Curriculum and Instruction (3 hours)
The current demand for a higher level of academic achievement is but one indicator of major changes occurring and due in curriculum and instruction. Some of the topics covered in this course include program assessment issues, the introduction of new educational technologies, and new systems for the delivery of the educational program. As the involvement of business and industry — as well as the cooperation of educational consumers and partners — will play major roles in the evolution of the curriculum, these areas will also be discussed.

CBA 106: Community Relations (3 hours)
The basics of building strong community support for your schools and their educational programs are covered. Focus is on generating enthusiasm for public education and transforming that enthusiasm into positive community involvement. Boardmembers will assess the image of their board/district, explore techniques for overcoming a negative image, identify internal and external publics, and develop communication strategies for targeted groups. This course will use a combination of group and individual activities, lectureettes, and visual media.

CBA 107: Labor Relations (3 hours)
This course is conducted by members of the MASB Labor Relations staff. Topics covered include the board's responsibilities under the Public Employee Relations Act, union strategies and tactics, and the role of the board in contract negotiations [NOTE: CBA 108 may be used as a substitute for CBA 107].

CBA 108: Legislation (3 hours)
Grass roots involvement in legislative issues is one of the important functions of a board. This course will examine the legislative process, lobbying techniques, current legislative issues, and how the board and its members can begin to affect legislation [NOTE: CBA 107 may be used as a substitute for CBA 108].
What are the requirements for completion of MASB's Certified Boardmember Award?

To facilitate the development of MASB's CBA Program, the following guidelines are provided (effective July 1, 1992).

Requirements for Certification

NOTE: Once a board member has enrolled in a specific certification track (I through V below), he or she shall remain in that track through the completion of all requirements.

Track I
Board members with less than 4 consecutive years of service on the same board and no Keys awards shall begin with CBA 101 and follow with 6 subject modules. The board member has a choice between CBA 107 and CBA 108 (instruction time: 24 hours).

Track II
Board members with less than 4 consecutive years of service on the same board and the Award of Merit will begin with CBA 101 and follow with any 3 subject modules. (instruction time: 15 hours) [NOTE: This track will be discontinued after June 30, 1993]

Track III
Board members with 4 or more consecutive years of service on the same board and no Keys awards will begin with CBA 501 and follow with any 2 subject modules (instruction time: 12 hours). [NOTE: This track will be discontinued after December 31, 1992]

Track IV
Board members with 4 or more consecutive years of service on the same board and the Award of Merit will begin with CBA 501 and follow with any 1 subject module (instruction time: 9 hours). [NOTE: This track will be discontinued after December 31, 1992]

Track V
Board members with 4 or more consecutive years of service on the same board and the Award of Distinction can attain certification upon completion of CBA 501 (instruction time: 6 hours). [NOTE: This track will be discontinued after December 31, 1992]

TRACK VI (Becomes Track III on December 31, 1992, and becomes Track II after June 30, 1993)
Effective January 1, 1993, veteran board members with more than 4 years of consecutive service - with or without the Awards of Merit and Distinction - wishing to become certified must complete 6 3-hour CBA subject modules (Instruction time: 18 hours).

Terms of Certification

Once a board member has begun the certification process on a specific track, he or she will have 36 months to complete the certification requirements on that track.
Processes and Procedures

1. **Attainment of Certification** Upon completion of the certification requirements, board members will be notified by mail. Board members who have attained certification will be recognized at the MASB Regional Meetings held in March, April, and May.

2. **Continuing Certification.** Certified board members do not have to become recertified under current CBA guidelines. However, certified board members are encouraged to continue their education through Continuing Certification Credits offered throughout the year in various locations.

   MASB will conduct or sponsor continuing certification courses and provide additional recognition for a certified board member's continuing education.

   One hour of coursework, workshop, seminar, or clinic can count as one Continuing Certification Credit (CCC). Different Continuing Certification levels are reached in twenty-hour increments of continuing education.
Greetings:

Enclosed is current information about MASB's voluntary Certified Boardmember Award (CBA) Program and registration forms for CBA courses offered between July 1 and December 31, 1992. Please pay special attention to all "Notes" in the guidelines.

**New Guidelines**

**Continuing Certification**

Previous guidelines allowed for certification to be effective for 36 months after initial certification was attained. New guidelines, effective immediately, eliminate the 36-month time limit on certification, and also eliminate the concept of "recertification."

MASB is introducing a voluntary Continuing Certification Program. Under these new guidelines once a board member has attained certification, he or she will be certified as long as they are a seated board member. Certified board members are encouraged to continue their education by earning Continuing Certification Credits as offered or endorsed by MASB throughout the year.

MASB will conduct or sponsor continuing certification courses, and will provide additional recognition for certified board members who continue their professional development through these programs.

**New CBA Course**

CBA 108: Legislation will be added to the CBA curriculum beginning in September. The addition of a CBA course does not mean that there will be additional requirements for certification; participants will have a choice between CBA 107: Labor Relations and CBA 108: Legislation.
New Board Members

New board members (those with less than four consecutive years of service on the same board) will still need 24 hours of instruction to attain certification, but will have a choice between CBA 107: Labor Relations and CBA 108: Legislation.

As of July 1, 1993, all new board members will need 24 hours of course work to attain certification. No allowance will be made for the Award of Merit, as under current guidelines.

Veteran Board Members

Veteran board members (those with more than four consecutive years of service on the same board) will have only until December 31, 1992 to become certified under current guidelines. CBA 501: Advanced Leadership will not be offered as a track for certification after that date.

As of January 1, 1993, veteran board members seeking certification will be required to complete 18 hours of course work. They will not be required to take CBA 101, but will have to complete CBA 102 through CBA 106, and choose between CBA 107 and CBA 108. No allowance will be made for the Awards of Merit and Distinction, as under current guidelines.

Only Two Tracks

As of July 1, 1993, only two tracks for certification will be available: 1) the new board member track, requiring 24 hours of course work, and 2) the veteran board member track, requiring 18 hours of course work.

CBA 501 Homework

After reviewing our records, we find that a number of board members have not sent verification of their CBA 501 homework to Tom White. Delays in submitting the assignment will mean delays in attaining certification. If you have any questions, please contact Tom or Deb Godden (517/371-5700).

Questions

If you have any questions about the guidelines going into effect January 1, 1993 and July 1, 1993, please contact Richard Funk (517/371-5700).
CBA Information and Registration Procedures

Registration forms will be updated semi-annually and mailed to both board members and superintendents. Classes are filled on first-come, first-serve basis. Registrations accompanied by FULL PAYMENT are processed at the MASB offices in the order received.

The limit to most classes is 40. Confirmations will be mailed to each participant registered in a CBA course. In the event that a class becomes filled before your registration is received, you will be notified and offered the option of being enrolled in another CBA class or having your full payment returned. On-site walk-ins cannot be accommodated unless specific arrangements have been made with the MASB Conference Department.

Board certification is based on classroom hours of instruction; therefore, attendance is closely monitored. Participants are requested to arrive at least 30 minutes prior to the start of the CBA class, and must be in attendance for the entire CBA class in order to qualify for credit. A 30-minute grace period is provided. If a participant is more than 30 minutes late, CBA credit cannot be received for that class. If possible, your classroom space will be given to someone else. Special arrangements will be made for possible refund or registration in a later class.

Class schedules are planned on a semi-annual basis, January to June and July to December. The registration form will include the date, day, time, and location for each class. Please keep the goldenrod copy of your CBA registration form for your records; mail all other copies and full payment for the courses you have selected to MASB, 421 West Kalamazoo Street, Lansing, 48933-2088.

Class transfers are allowed only on a space-available basis, and may be accomplished by telephone. MASB cannot, however, guarantee available space. Transfers cannot be made within the last 7 business days prior to the event you plan to attend. Class transfers cannot be made once the class date has passed, and all monies paid at that time cannot be refunded.

Direct all registration calls to the MASB Conference Department at (517) 371-5700.

Keep this CBA information as a reference and guide.

MASB will strictly adhere to the following refund procedures:

- **20% refund** for cancellations received 7 or more business days prior to the event.
- **50% refund** for cancellations received 4-6 business days prior to the event.
- **No refund** for cancellations received 0-3 days prior to the event.
- **100% refund** should a class be cancelled by MASB due to low enrollment.
WHAT ARE KEYS AWARDS?

MASB's Keys to Better Boardsmanship Award Program, developed in 1982, recognizes Michigan school board members who devote time and effort to improving Michigan's public school system through service and leadership and their own professional development.

Board members earn credits toward their Keys by attending MASB, NSBA, county and local inservice meetings, workshops and conferences. Other leadership experiences and service activities also count as credit toward a Keys award—like serving as a panelist or speaker at NSBA or MASB conferences, submitting an article to the MASB Journal, or serving as a local board officer.

Certified Boardmember Award
Twenty-five bonus credits to be applied toward your Award of Merit or Distinction are awarded upon completion of the voluntary certification program.

Award of Merit
Earn 75 credits

Award of Distinction
Earn 250 credits

Standard of Excellence
Awarded to a district when at least 50 percent of its current board members have received or are eligible for an Award of Merit.

Honor Award
Presented when all members of a board become certified.

MASB
Michigan Association of School Boards
(517) 371-5700  FAX: (517) 371-5338

CERTIFIED BOARDMEMBER AWARD
Your Key to Leadership

A voluntary program to assist school board members in becoming more effective leaders.
Established by the Michigan Association of School Boards
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WHY SHOULD I BE CERTIFIED?

Certification increases your credibility by demonstrating to your community that school board members are 'serious' public servants.

“Education professionals are obliged to respond to tremendous change and ever-increasing demands for productivity and efficiency...school board trustees involved as key participants in education can and certainly should do no less.”

Linda Holm, president, Lakeview Board of Education

Certification will symbolize a board member's achievement in leadership education. The CBA program expands knowledge of education issues and honed leadership skills.

“It was so worthwhile! I came home very energized and more sure of my role.”

LaXi Pierson, new school board member, Eaton Rapids

“Great program! I wish I could have enrolled four years ago as a 'brand new' board member.”

Participant in first CBA class

Certified board members understand the latest developments in education. From curriculum to staffing to school laws, CBA graduates are better able to help their students acquire the right education for life in a globally competitive world.

“This is a great direction for MASB to go. Nothing but good can come from this for board members in Michigan. Thank you very much.”

Robert W. Wright, treasurer, Southfield Board of Education

“The future of education demands very knowledgeable and active board members.”

James F. Quayle, vice president, Munising Board of Education

CBA - CERTIFIED BOARDMEMBER AWARD

Your Key to Leadership

Critical knowledge and leadership skills for effective board service are offered in a formal program of instruction leading to certification.

Achieving certification requires up to 24 hours of instruction, depending on length of board service.

CBA courses provide a systematic approach to board member leadership education.
The complex challenges of the 1990s will require leaders who can study problems from a variety of perspectives.... Whether it's drug abuse or illiteracy, modern society is faced with issues that cut across disciplines and professional boundaries. To be effective, today's decision makers must possess a broad range of knowledge and experience.

Dr. Russell G. Mawby, chief executive officer, W.K. Kellogg Foundation

**WHAT IS REQUIRED?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA 101</td>
<td>Leadership Skills (6 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 102</td>
<td>Policy, Administrative Procedures &amp; Oversight (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 103</td>
<td>School Finance/School Budgets (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 104</td>
<td>School Law (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 105</td>
<td>Curriculum/Instruction (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 106</td>
<td>Community Relations Leadership (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 107</td>
<td>Labor Relations (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA 108</td>
<td>Legislation (3 hrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fee of $55 per 3-hour course is charged ($110 for the CBA 101 — Leadership).

Credit for attending certification courses requires full attendance and participation and may involve some take-home assignments.
**CERTIFICATION QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do I have to do to be certified?</td>
<td>Complete 24 hours of instruction if you are a newly elected or appointed board member and 18 hours of instruction if you are a veteran board member in your second term or longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are Keys Awards and CBA related?</td>
<td>A new board member can view certification as the first step in the KEYS program. After earning your CBA, you receive 25 points toward your Award of Merit. (You need a total of 75 credits for this award.) The rest will be earned through conference attendance, board service and leadership experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I have to be certified before I can work on my Award of Merit?</td>
<td>No. You can work on certification and your Award of Merit (KEYS program) concurrently. However, CBA’s formal instruction in leadership skills and knowledge will contribute greatly to your effective service on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will I be certified?</td>
<td>Until you are no longer a board member. Certification, once achieved, is good for the length of time you are on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about continuing certification?</td>
<td>MASB has designed a variety of activities to recognize board members who wish to continue their professional development. Advanced CBA courses, special programs and special activities in your own area can count toward continuing certification recognition. Upon completion of 20 hours of Continuing Certification Credits, (and in additional 20 hour increments) board members will be recognized by an appropriate certificate or plaque.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB)
Approval Letter
Date: October 14, 1994
To: Henry Bothwell
From: Richard Wright, Interim Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 94-10-11

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "A survey of the effectiveness of Michigan's certified school board member training program (CBA)" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you must seek specific approval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: Oct. 14, 1995

xc: Jenlick, EDLE
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