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The face of Ohio’s two-year colleges has been changing over the past several years. Two-year colleges continue to face increased demand from the communities they serve, tougher funding models from the state and large enrollment increases.

The problem of this study was to (a) compare and partially replicate the demographic data of the 1989 Trustee profile presented by J.W. Hill to the 2003 trustee data from the current study, including personal, career and educational characteristics of the trustees of Ohio’s two year college system. (b) the study explored trustee training and their perceived needs in training. (c) investigate the self reported perceptions of trustees as they understand the nature of their roles, the depth and breadth of their knowledge and responsibilities.

Descriptive statistics were used to describe and understand who is the two year college trustee in 2003. Further, trustees were asked to rate questions describing training received and desired. The data collected on the various scales and questions measuring trustee perceptions, utilized various statistical techniques evaluating correlation of scales with demographics and specific questions. Significance would be at .05 alpha level.
Comparison of data collected was compared with national data whenever such data was available.

The face of the two year college trustee has changed little in over 15 years, while the demographic face of the students in higher education has changed significantly. With racial and gender equality having been a focus of private and public sector arenas over the past forty years it is essential that key leadership of higher education reflects this emphasis in diversity. National, state and local leadership must recommit to new models for providing all levels of training for their trustees. The success of the two year trustee is dependent upon the depth of knowledge as well as the advocacy of role of trustee can provide their institution.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background

Higher Education is a constantly changing and evolving environment. Community colleges have had increased demands to be flexible and responsive models of higher education that adapt to the ever changing needs of their students and communities. The leadership of Ohio's two-year colleges is responsible for meeting these needs. The leadership needs to work closely with their trustees, local leaders and political forces to develop policy and procedures that create flexibility in the administration of higher education. Trustees act in collaboration with two-year college leadership to "create policy at the recommendation of its president and other administrators or by imposing policy, when needed, at their discretion" (Hill, 1989, p. 2).

Ohio’s community colleges have seen significant change and increased acceptance and visibility over the past five to seven years. Ohio has continually been plagued by low participation rates (39% in the nation) in higher education while also struggling with some of the nation’s highest tuition rates (7th nationally). In addition, Ohio as a state has been changing from an industrial and agriculture economy of the past 200 years to a Knowledge Economy. A Knowledge Economy is defined as the “training of individuals to generate discoveries that fuel economic growth and create new opportunities”. (www.ohioknowledgeeconomy.org) A Knowledge Economy is based on ideas, innovation and technology, basically based on the thought and mind processes, not the hand or physical labor processes of Ohio’s past history. Community Colleges are
excellent change agents and have played an important and ever emerging role in Ohio’s new Knowledge Economy. In 2003, Governor of Ohio, Bob Taft, created a Governor’s Commission on Higher Education and the Economy. This commission brought together Ohio’s brightest and largest employers along with two year college leaders. The commission included three community college presidents. The charge to this commission was (1)“making Ohio Competitive in the Knowledge Economy”
(www.ohioknowledgeeconomy.org), basically examining the needs of students, employers and the economy and relating to the future needs and goals of higher education. (2) “Promoting access and creating opportunities for all students”
(ohioknowledgeeconomy.org), the need to find ways to attract and enable more students to participate in higher education. (3) Delivering results for public investments”
(www.ohioknowledgeeconomy.org), identifying the appropriate roles for competition and collaboration among Ohio’s colleges and universities. This commission’s work still continues. The Ohio Board of Regents sees the community colleges as part of the solution to the Knowledge Economy and completed an enhanced transfer and articulation process which debuts fall 2006. However, OBR is still concerned with graduation and placement rates and is undertaking a mandated study (Am. Sub. H.B. 66, Section 209.64.99 a study on the distributing state share of instruction funds based on the number of degrees and certificates awarded. “The study shall examine whether it is feasible to retain a portion of the State Share of Instruction distributed to campuses until such time as the certificates or degrees are conferred”. (Higher Education Funding Study Council, Section 209.64.99) Increased participation by the community colleges will lead to greater accountability.
The Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) put forth a comment paper toward the Knowledge Economy objectives. The paper entitled “What Community Colleges Can Do to Rebuild Ohio’s Economy” focuses on the ability of community colleges to serve as “key change agents in the communities that they serve and in the people’s lives that they reach. They have become the portal of entry for hundreds of thousands that would otherwise be denied access to higher education with their demonstrated, historic commitment, to affordability.” (OACC, comment paper, 2006)

The paper points out that Ohio associate degree holders are employed more quickly than their bachelor degree counterparts immediately following graduation and the associate degree holder makes more money immediately following graduation ($34,400 versus $32,207 in 2003). (OACC Comment Paper, 2006) Ohio must look to creative and bold thinking to solve the problems that plague Ohio’s citizens. OACC makes recommendations on increasing awareness and college going aspirations among Ohioan’s is key to better participation rates. They also point out that community colleges face an inverted funding model since “higher education skews results in such a manner as to increase the student share of higher education costs for lower division education...” OACC comments that the Access Challenge has produced savings and results at Ohio’s community colleges. OACC goes further to recommend that Ohio “create a vision that every high school graduate earns at least a term of college credit before high school graduation or a term of postsecondary occupation certification”. (OACC, p4) partnerships could then formed with four year colleges to help with the articulation from two year colleges to four year colleges. OACC cites Lorain County Community College as a success story for the University Partnership program which provides place bound adults
an opportunity to complete their four year degree locally. (OACC, p5) Ohio’s citizenry is undereducated and the 25 and older age group is a true “melting pot” of opportunity for two year colleges. OACC offers a proposal for Accelerate Ohio which “would begin to fund instruction in carefully defined areas that have obvious benefits in improving the Ohio economy, that are affordable to low-wage working Ohioans, and have a strong potential for further education”. (OACC, p6)

Community colleges continue to see increased enrollment, in the fall term 2004, Ohio’s two year schools enrolled 171,671 students which represents around 50% of the college going population in Ohio. (www.ohiocc.org, college facts) Today, many community colleges rival four-year colleges in numbers of students that they serve. Community Ohio families are beginning to see community colleges are equals to their four year counterparts but they have reduced costs and lower class sizes. In the 2005-06 academic year tuition at Ohio’s community colleges averaged $3,201 compared to $8,434 at Ohio’s public four year main campuses. In addition, Ohio's community and technical colleges are teaching and learning-centered institutions with a median lecture class size of less than 20 students. Full-time faculty at these colleges spend on average 71% of their work time on teaching activity. University faculty spend less than half of their time on teaching activities, because of more varied responsibilities to their institutions. (www.ohiocc.org, college facts) The demand upon Ohio’s community colleges and two year campuses is growing and the time has come for the community college to get its deserved “time in the spotlight”. “The climate in Ohio is right for increased focus on higher education. Richard A Stoff, President of the Ohio Business Roundtable, recently
suggested that we might be at point similar to where primary and secondary education was at the beginning of the decade.” (Thomas, OACC, 2006)

Therefore, the issue of governance at the community college has become an even greater priority “in the changing field of education, trustees must keep abreast of the latest in technology and instruction techniques, as well as staying politically aware of the outside force that could change the way we operate and affect the results we want for our students” (Shumway, Spring 2001, p2). Community college board of trustees play a major role in the governance of the campus. “A governing board is more than the sum of its individual members. Interactions among members and between the CEO and members make boards dynamic and complex entities” (Boggs, 1996, p. 1). There are six major types of boards identified by Baldridge:

a. Long Range: Board works on vision and mission for institution. Trustees look at progress toward short-term goals, but are more concerned with long-range goals.

b. Activist: Board involved in daily decision making everything from hiring to budgeting.

c. Lay Board: Care for students and faculty but are primarily responsible to the larger society that funds the college and provides it with a legal charter.

d. Autopilot Board: Do not micromanage; endorse every policy proposed at the college because of relationship with President.

e. College Board: Board authority is limited due to State Governing Board or District Board.
f. Controlled Board: Board insists that all decisions be subject to the approval of a given political party or organization. (Baldridge, 1996, P. 11)

Ohio's two-year colleges have primarily lay boards. Trustees are not compensated for their positions. The Governor, the County Board of Commissioners, or a caucus of public school board presidents in the technical college service district can appoint trustees to a board. (Ohio Revised Code Section 3357)

Ohio recognizes two types of community colleges: the traditional community college and the state community college. The difference is in the funding of these institutions. Ohio Revised Code section 3354 applies to community colleges and section 3358 of the Ohio Revised Code applies to state community colleges. Section 3358 of the O.R.C. allows for a state community college to seek amendment to its charter in order to become a community college. Section 3358.02 (D) states:

Upon a proposal of the board of trustees of a state community college district, the board of regents may amend the charter of a state community college to change it into a community college as defined in section 3354.01 of the Revised Code, in order to permit the college to seek a local levy. Such amendment of the charter is effective immediately upon its acceptance by the board of regents, and the state community college district shall thereupon become a community college district. On the effective date of a charter amendment the board of trustees of the state community college district shall become the initial board of trustees for the community college district to serve for the balance of their existing terms, and the board or boards of county
commissioners from the counties involved shall fill the first six vacancies occurring on the community college board, and thereafter board members shall be appointed under section 3354.05 of the Revised Code. If such an amendment takes effect and is subsequently voided under this section, any persons appointed to the board during the period the amendment was in effect shall be considered members of the state community college district board, and thereafter trustees shall be appointed in accordance with section 3358.03 of the Revised Code. (ORC 2001, 3358.02(D))

By amending their charter a state community college may seek local funding through a tax levy to support the college. The state community college is protected against levy defeat because the statute states:

> If a levy is defeated by the voters or if no levy is approved by the electors within one year after the date the amendment takes effect, such amendment becomes void, and the college shall thereupon become a state community college, and the district operating such college shall become a state community college district. (ORC 2001, 3358.02(D))

*Appointment Procedures for Trustees*

Ohio community colleges, defined in Ohio as receiving a mix of state funds and local levy funding, have nine trustees, six trustees are appointed by the Board of County Commissioners in the service county(ies), and three trustees by the Governor with consent and advice of the Ohio Senate. Term for trustees run for five years, with each term ending on the same day of the same month of the year as did the term that it succeeds.
State community colleges, defined in Ohio as being fully supported by state funds, are vested in a board of nine trustees, who are appointed by the Governor from within the district, with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. Terms for trustees run for six years, with each term ending on the same day of the same month of the year, as did the term that it succeeds.

Ohio's technical colleges with one county service area are vested in a board of seven trustees. Two trustees are appointed by the Governor with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. Five trustees are appointed by a caucus of school board presidents within the service district. Terms extend for three years.

Ohio's technical colleges with multi-county service districts are vested in a board of nine trustees. Three trustees are appointed by the Governor from within the service district, with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. Six trustees are appointed by a caucus of school board presidents from within the service district.

Trustee appointment in Ohio is by statutory provisions in section 3354, 3357, and 3358 of the Ohio Revised Code. Colleges receive guidance and oversight from the Ohio Board of Regents. Legal counsel for these colleges is arranged through the Ohio Attorney General.

Responsibilities of Trustees

Trustees are responsible for their college. So what does that mean exactly? Sherman describes the six essentials for successful boards as; ethical behavior, open and appropriate communication, understand board versus CEO responsibilities, annual evaluation for Board and CEO, encouragement for professional development and lastly, facilitating the board process which means improved teamwork and reduced
conflict. (Sherman, Trustee Quarterly, Spring 2001, p 22.) “The primary responsibility of a board of trustees is meeting the changing educational needs of the community, while reflecting the community’s values in fulfilling the college mission” (ACCT, 1999, p. 2).

Two year colleges are governed by lay boards entrusted to provide ethical leadership and responsible stewardship in balancing current and emerging needs of many constituencies” (ACCT, 1999, p. 4). “Ideally, the CEO and the board should be viewed as a team of leaders who share common philosophies and objectives” (Boggs, 1996, p. 1). Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell (1996) take this concept further and believe that “developing a shared vision requires a special set of leadership skills because it is a conceptual and creative process” (p. 1). Presidents at two year colleges have growing job responsibilities and “must know their strengths and not try to do everything at the college” (Smith, 1996, p. 1). “A college’s success requires visionary leadership among governing board members. Their role in policy development and in driving the mission, vision and goals of the college is critical to continued strong learner-based services” (Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 2). Heelan, Redwine and Black (2001) describe a new form of authority for trustees described as “synocracy”. Synocracy is defined as “a government of, by and for the people who are attuning to the same pattern, the same universal law of transformation through a synergistic union of freely cooperating parts.” (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2001, p 16) The aforementioned authors, contend that “the organizations that get things done will no longer be hierarchical pyramids with most of the control at the top. They will be systems-interlaced webs of tension in which control is loose, power is diffused and centers of decision plural.” (p 16). If we look back at the work of Wheatley or Kellner-Rogers they would describe “an organization as a living system as
opposed to machines”. (p16) They would go further to indicate “that living systems have boundaries that facilitate interaction with the environment.” (p16) An example of such a relationship would be a community college and its relationship to the community it serves. In order to achieve synocracy, the authors point out that college leadership needs to practice “participative leadership ...which engages all members of an organization in the decision that directly affects them. “ (p16) Boylan and Field (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2001), describe Trustee responsibilities as “The great task remaining before us” borrowing form the great speech in 1863 delivered by President Abraham Lincoln.(p20) The authors contend that it is the responsibility of the community college trustees to recognize that “as a nation, we believe in democracy and the theory of majority rule. Yet, majority rule has generally been in the best interest of those who are in the majority, rather than those who are not.” (2001, p20) This basic democratic belief is the basis of America and who we are but it may not be at the heart of who the community is and will become. “Community Colleges were founded on the belief that everyone deserves the chance to benefit from an education”. (p21) This theory is demonstrated at Ohio’s community colleges through Open door admission policies. Community colleges have “perhaps had their greatest impact as societal equalizer, enabling generations of students to change theory socioeconomic status and ultimately their quality of life. “ (p21) It is therefore imperative that Trustees recognize “the direct relationship between democracy and diversity and the need to take a stand “for diversity and democratic issues. In the fall of 2001, AACC asked its member colleges to take a stand on this issue. They offered a resolution which “called upon member institutions to ensure equal access, fairness, and inclusion in their policies and practices.” (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2001 p 21)
“Trustees must also receive training on the system of higher education and the legislative processes that control budgeting, regulation and capital expenditures” (Davis, 1999, p. 12). In spring 2002, Shumway explained that ACCT had created a model for good practices for trustee boards. ACCT feels “that standards of good practice for community college boards should be emphasized and this should be a part of our ongoing training for new trustees as well as more experienced trustees”. (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2002, p2) In the Smith, Piland, Boggs 2001 study indicated “that trustees rely on a wide variety of sources for information and advice related to their decision making. College Administrators, other trustees on the board, students, and the college faculty member shave the most influence, followed closely by individual community members, state associations and ACCT. Groups with reputations for strong political influence, including unions, financial supporters, and appointing authorities are not generally important sources of information” (p10). Shumway describes education of trustees as a way to be a more effective advocate. “Times like these demand that trustees have the most current information concerning the educational, social, economic and technological environment in which we make policy, and that we have skills and knowledge to assure the efficiency and effectiveness of college governance.” He goes further to say “These are the kinds of skills and knowledge trustees learn in exchanges with their peers from other institutions, and in presentations and workshops, at meetings of their national and state associations. “ (Trustee Quarterly, Spring 2001, p 2) Effective training can help trustees have a better vision of their role and responsibilities.

J.W. Hill conducted a study in 1989 that looked at the issue of a two year college trustee profile. His study explored characteristics, roles and attitudes of trustees in the
Ohio two-year college system. Hill’s study yielded statistical data such as demographic information and also explored the perception of trustees as it related to their roles and responsibilities. His study supported “the increased participation of women and minorities in higher education” in Ohio (Hill, 1989, p. 95). Although we have seen increased women and minorities appointed to the CEO and Trustee level, Smith, Piland and Boggs confirm in their national 2001 study that two thirds of the nation’s trustees are still male, age 55 and over, hold at least a bachelors degree and are politically moderate (p. 6).

Trustees are also responsible for assessment. A major issue colleges are dealing with in the light of reduced funding is the question of sufficient and effective assessment. Assessment focuses on a variety of areas including the college's academic, student, and financial services. The Ohio Board of Regents provides specific assessment measures that are tied to all types of state funding of the institution (OBR 2001, p. 12). In addition, Trustees are responsible for the assessment of the President's performance. In contrast, it is important that the trustees be evaluated on their performance and be given feedback from the president or other key constituents.

Many community colleges have strong Boards that serve a directive role towards future visions, goals and directives. The trustees in partnership with college administration aim to achieve the college’s vision and mission while serving the needs of the community it serves. Hills’ 1989 study recommends further research into trustee preparedness, turnover of trustees, some periodic administration of the same survey to keep a current trustee profile on file, and lastly he recommended a review of the appointment and/or election process for trustees (1989, p. 97).
This study will look at a sample of trustees from Ohio’s two-year college system. The research will seek to gather the self reported perceptions of trustees as they understand the nature of their roles and the depth and breadth of their responsibilities. The research will also explore trustee education and experience as it relates to the longevity of trustees. Lastly, the research will update the demographics of the 1989 Trustee profile presented by J.W. Hill which described the personal, career and educational characteristics of the trustees of Ohio’s two year college system.

Two-year colleges in Ohio are governed through lay boards, which can present an interesting challenge to the CEO. Board members must receive significant training in order to better serve in their unpaid capacity as a two-year college trustee. With training, hopefully the trustees receive a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities, as they relate to the fulfillment of the college mission and goals. To make this complex relationship work there must be clear understanding and effective and ongoing communication. To create more effective relationships it is important that there be an accurate and up to date profile of Ohio's trustees. Furthermore, the attitudinal data related to perceptions of roles and responsibilities would be helpful information for college presidents and administrators. To better understand the issues at hand, it is important to have data on the current demographics and attitudinal outlooks of trustees.

Trusteeship is an area where there is more research being conducted. AACC and ACCT are actively seeking more understanding of where trustees come from, how they are appointed or elected and what they need to be successful as trustees. This research will look at Ohio's two-year college trustees' roles and responsibilities as well as update the personal, career and educational characteristics of Ohio’s two year trustees. This
study will replicate a past study that was conducted on the profile of Ohio’s two-year college trustees.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to (a) compare and partially replicate the demographic data of the 1989 Trustee profile presented by J.W. Hill to the 2003 trustee data from the current study, including personal, career and educational characteristics of the trustees of Ohio’s two year college system. (b) the study explored trustee training and their perceived needs in training. (c) investigate the self reported perceptions of trustees as they understand the nature of their roles, the depth and breadth of their knowledge and responsibilities

Subproblems/Research Questions

1. What is the current profile and characteristics of trustees of two-year community colleges in Ohio and has there been any significant change since 1989?
   a. What are the key descriptors of the trustee including gender, age, race, educational level, etc.?
   b. How are trustees selected for their positions?
   c. Are trustees trained for their board service and if so how and to what extent?
   d. How has the trustee for two-year community colleges changed since the 1989 Hill study?
2. What training was received by the trustees of community colleges, what training was viewed as beneficial and what additional training is perceived add additional value?
   a. Was board orientation available and did it provide clearly defined expectations and responsibilities?
   b. Did the trustee participate and perceive benefit from state, regional and/or national association involvement?
   c. What areas of training did the trustee perceive as beneficial to them in their role as trustee of a community college?
   d. What areas of training did the trustee perceive as necessary to improve their trustee role?
   e. What recommendations can be made to two-year community colleges, board of trustees, state board of education, and other key groups to better identify, train and support effective and knowledgeable board members?

3. What is the trustee’s perception of their role and responsibility as a board member in knowledge of expectations, constituents served, the evaluation process and strategic planning of their institution?
   a. What is the trustees’ perception of their level of knowledge of information on higher education issues?
   b. What is the trustee perception of their level of knowledge of students, faculty, administration and staff, and community of the institution?
   c. What is the level of leadership served by trustees in college?
d. What role do trustees play in evaluation at the college?

e. What level of political involvement do trustees serve?

f. What descriptive factors correlate with trustee members who reports strong knowledge of two-year community college?

Hypotheses

Descriptive statistics were used to describe and understand who is the two year college trustee in 2003, further, trustees were asked to rate questions describing training received and desired.

The data collected on the various scales and questions measuring trustee perceptions, utilized various statistical techniques evaluating correlation of scales with demographics and specific questions. Significance would be at .05 alpha level. Comparison of data collected was compared with national data whenever such data was available.

Hypothesis One:

1. Was there significant change to the profile of the trustee of Ohio’s public two-year community colleges over the past fourteen years (Chi-square):

   \( H_{01a} \): There is no significant difference between the racial make up of the trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

   \( H_{01b} \): There is no significant difference between the gender of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.
H01c There is no significant difference between the age of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

H01d There is no significant difference between the educational level of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

H01e There is no significant difference between the appointment process of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

H01f There is no significant difference between trustee time spent on Board in 1989 and trustee training in 2003.

Hypothesis Two

2. Was there a significant correlation between type of public two-year institutions and reported level of knowledge and college involvement of trustees? Was there a significant correlation with reported level of knowledge and involvement of trustee as it relates to the training of college trustees?

H02a There will be no significant difference between level of knowledge of trustees and the type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)

H02b There will be no significant difference between level of involvement of trustee and type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)
Hypothesis Three

3. Was there significant correlation between the length of service of college president and the reported level of knowledge and involvement of trustee?

H_{03a} There will be no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of knowledge of trustee.

H_{03b} There will be no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of involvement of trustee.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The composition of the Board of Trustees is imperative to the success of the colleges. Colleges must utilize their Trustees to the maximum potential in order to further the vision and mission of the institution. In order for CEO’s to maximize their trustees they must first understand the characteristics of those that makeup the Board of Trustees. Secondly, the CEO must understand how the position of trustee can assist the institution. Lastly, the CEO must understand the Trustee’s perception of the Trustee role and responsibilities. These lay individuals work in cooperation and collaboration with the CEO under Ohio’s Revised Code.
This descriptive research study will update demographics of the trustee profile that was created by J.W. Hill in 1989 and expand the research initially conducted. This study will further explore the characteristics, roles and responsibilities of trustees in Ohio’s two year college system by examining the trustees’ perceived roles and responsibilities, the impact of trustee education/training and the effect of experience and performance review in relation to longevity. In addition, this study will compare the December 2003 profile with the 1989 predecessor, to determine if there are any major changes or trends that should be noted.

Nationally trustees are either appointed or elected. There are 19 states that appoint trustees, in 18 of those appointment states the appointment is made by the governor, local officials or a combination of both. (Smith, Piland, Boggs, 2001, P. 2.) The road to be named to the trusteeship comes in the form of appointment in Ohio. Trustees are appointed to represent the attitudes and needs of their community, the college’s students and the best interest of the college. Trustees must be willing to create a shared vision, which requires a special set of leadership skills because it is not only a conceptual, but also a creative process (Myran, Zeiss, and Howdyshell, 1996, P. 1). Two-year colleges have to believe in and help their trustees to help the institution obtain its vision and stay true to its stated mission.

The descriptive research provided an update to the 1989 study, which provided a benchmark which identified the characteristics, roles and functions of Ohio’s two-year college trustees. The research provided valuable input for Ohio’s two-year college CEO’s as well as those involved in the appointment and training process for trustees. The study provided valuable information that can assist college presidents in improving the
selection, differences and efficiency of their trustees. Presidents must realize the potential of their Trustees and foster an environment that will help to lead the institution towards its vision and mission. Trusteeship means more than just coming to a Board Meeting six times a year, for two year colleges it means being able to provide support and promote the mission at any given time.

The study described who the two-year college trustees were and what they were thinking about their roles and responsibilities. Some books and/or articles have been written about the position and its many challenges, but we are limited in Ohio specific research. This research served as an update to the original benchmark and can be the cornerstone for further discussion and research, as institutions become partners with their Trustees in order to achieve their vision and mission.

Limitations of the Study

The most significant limitation for the research was the response rate of the participants. Time constraint is already an issue for volunteer trustees, so asking them to give more of their time was a major issue for the study. In addition, information needed to be collected from college presidents, and again they already have huge responsibilities and major time commitments, which could have affected their responsiveness to the survey instrument.

Another significant factor for the study will be size of the random sample. For the purpose of the study sixty two completed surveys will need to be collected and compiled to assure a strong representative sample of two-year college trustees. It was difficult at best to receive a completion level of that size.
Delimitations of the Study

The study will be delimited in the following way:

1. There was not specific current research on the topic and comparisons for characteristics may need to extrapolate from data in other two-year college systems or four-year college trustee research.

2. This research was limited to two-year colleges in the state of Ohio and therefore is limited in generalizing to other states.

3. The study was not conducted on private two year colleges from Ohio or other states.

Definition of Terms

The definitions of the terms used in this study were:

Activist: Board involved in daily decision making everything form hiring to budgeting.

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC): The national two-year community college professional association.

Association of Community Colleges (ACCT): The two-year community college trustee professional association, based in Washington D.C.

Autopilot Board: Do not micromanage; endorse every policy proposed at the college because of difference with President.

Campus Climate: The current attitude and governance structure in place for the campus to move towards it vision and mission.
Caucus: School Board presidents from all local, exempted or other school districts within the proposed service district.

Charter amendment: A change in the official plan of the institution for such purposes as acquiring additional lands or structures, disposing of or transferring lands or structures, erecting structures, or changes to curricular programs.

College Board: Board authority is limited due to State Governing Board or District Board.

Community College: A public institution of education beyond the high school organized for the principal purpose of providing for the people of the community college district wherein such college is situated the instructional programs defined in this section as "arts and sciences" and "technical," or either, and may include the "adult-education" program as defined in this section, not exceeding two years' duration.

Community College District: A political subdivision of the state and a body corporate with all the powers of a corporation, comprised of the territory of one or more contiguous counties having together a total population of not less than seventy-five thousand preceding the establishment of such district, and organized for the purpose of establishing, owning, and operating a community college within the territory of such district

Conflict of Interest: A decision on an issue, which will effect in some manner the college’s relationship with the trustee. An example is that the
trustee may benefit personally form the decision made on the college’s behalf.

**Lay Board**: Care for students and faculty but are primarily responsible to the larger society that funds the college and provides it with a legal charter.

**Long Range**: Board works on vision and mission for institution. Trustees look at progress toward short-term goals, but are more concerned with long-range goals.

**Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC)**: The state two-year community college professional association. Organization is based in Columbus, Ohio.

**Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.)**: The laws of the State of Ohio, which are enacted by the Ohio Legislature.

**Role Responsibility**: The responsibilities and tasks assigned to the job of trustee.

**Size of institution**: For the purpose of this study, size will be determined by fall quarter/semester headcount for those students enrolled.

**State Community College**: A two-year institution, offering a baccalaureate oriented program, technical education program, or an adult continuing education program. The institution’s charter determines the extent to which the college offers baccalaureate oriented and technical programs.

**State Community College District**: A state community college district may be created to take the place of a technical college or a university branch.
with the approval of the Ohio board of regents upon the proposal of the board of trustees of a technical college district, or upon the proposal of the board of trustees of a state university, or upon the joint proposal of both such boards, and pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 3358.05 of the Revised Code

**Technical College**: An institution of education beyond the high school, including an institution of higher education, organized for the principal purpose of providing for the residents of the technical college district, wherein such college is situated, any one or more of the instructional programs defined in this section as "technical-college," or "adult-education technical programs," normally not exceeding two years duration and not leading to a baccalaureate degree.

**Technical College District**: A political subdivision of the state and a body corporate with all the powers of a corporation, comprised of the territory of a city school district or a county, or two or more contiguous school districts or counties, which meets the standards prescribed by the Ohio board of regents pursuant to section 3357.02 of the Revised Code, and which is organized for the purpose of establishing, owning, and operating one or more technical colleges within the territory of such district.

**Trustee**: An appointed or elected member of the community who will serve on the governing board for the community college in their area. The trustee will establish policy and monitor financial and human resources of the institution.
Trustee Education: Training and additional information provided to trustees in an organized manner.

Two Year College: A community or state supported community college chartered by the state governing body; the highest degree conferred would be an associate degree, but could also offer technical certificates.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the literature on two-year trustees; the selection process, the characteristics of those chosen, both locally and nationally, and their perceptions of the roles and responsibilities set before them.

The review of the literature related to this study was organized in this chapter as follows: (1) trustee selection and the law, (2) characteristics of two year college trustees, (3) the college they serve, and (4) perceptions of trustees and the variables related to their responsibilities.

Trustee Selection

The issue of governance at the community college has become an even greater issue in recent years because of the increased need for adaptability and flexibility. Community college trustees play a major role in the governance of the campus. "A governing board is more than the sum of its individual members. Interactions among members and between the CEO and members make boards dynamic and complex entities." (Boggs, 1996, P1) Ohio's two-year colleges have lay boards with trustees who are not compensated for their positions. The Governor, the County Board of Commissioners, or a caucus of public school board presidents in the technical college service district can appoint trustees to a board. Ohio community colleges have nine trustees, six trustees are appointed by the Board of County Commissioners in the service county(ies), and three trustees by the Governor with consent and advice of the Ohio Senate. Terms for trustees run for five years, with each term ending on the same day of the same month of the year, as did the term, which it succeeds. (OBR, 2003)
State community colleges are vested in a board of nine trustees, who shall be appointed by the Governor from within the district, with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. Terms for trustees run for six years, with each term ending on the same day of the same month of the year, as did the succeeding term. (O.R.C. 2003)

Ohio's technical colleges with one county service area are vested in a board of seven trustees. The Governor with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate shall appoint two trustees. A caucus of school board presidents within the service district shall appoint five trustees. Terms for all of the trustees are for three years. (O.R.C. 2003)

Ohio's technical colleges with multi county service districts are vested in a board of nine trustees. Three trustees shall be appointed by the Governor from within the service district, with advice and consent of the Ohio Senate. A caucus of school board presidents from within the service district appoints six trustees. Terms for all of the trustees are for three years. (O.R.C. 2003)

Trustee appointment in Ohio is by statutory provisions in section 3354, 3357, and 3358 of the Ohio Revised Code. Colleges receive guidance and oversight from the Ohio Board of Regents. The Ohio Board of Regents was created in 1963 to provide a state-level perspective on all higher education matters. The 11-member board, appointed the governor for nine-year terms, considers the higher education needs of all Ohioans, as well as the role of individual public and independent college sand universities in meeting those needs.” (OBR, 2004) The regents have a direct, non-governing relationship with all of Ohio’s colleges and universities.” (OBR 2004) Legal counsel for these colleges is arranged through the Ohio Attorney General’s Office. The Ohio Attorney General
represents the legal interests of these schools as they receive state funding and have state reporting accountability.

Ohio recognizes two types of community colleges: the traditional community college and the state community college. The difference is in the funding of these institutions. Ohio Revised Code section 3354 applies to community colleges and section 3358 of the Ohio Revised Code applies to state community colleges. Section 3358 of the O.R.C. allows for a state community college to seek amendment to its charter in order to become a community college. Section 3358.02 (D) states:

(D) Upon a proposal of the board of trustees of a state community college district, the board of regents may amend the charter of a state community college to change it into a community college as defined in section 3354.01 of the Revised Code, in order to permit the college to seek a local levy. Such amendment of the charter is effective immediately upon its acceptance by the board of regents, and the state community college district shall thereupon become a community college district. On the effective date of a charter amendment the board of trustees of the state community college district shall become the initial board of trustees for the community college district to serve for the balance of their existing terms, and the board or boards of county commissioners from the counties involved shall fill the first six vacancies occurring on the community college board, and thereafter board members shall be appointed under section 3354.05 of the Revised Code. If such an amendment takes effect and is subsequently voided under this section, any persons appointed to the board during the period the amendment was in effect shall be considered members of the state community college district board, and
thereafter trustees shall be appointed in accordance with section 3358.03 of the Revised Code. (ORC 2001, 3358.02(D))

By amending their charter a state community college may seek local funding through a tax levy to support the college. The state community college is protected against levy defeat because the statute states: “if a levy is defeated by the voters or if no levy is approved by the electors within one year after the date the amendment takes effect, such amendment becomes void, and the college shall thereupon become a state community college, and the district operating such college shall become a state community college district” (ORC 2001, 3358.02(D)).

Trustees are given complex and powerful positions. They are responsible for their college. When appointed to the community board, a trustee has a fiduciary duty to represent the interest of both the college and its constituents. “The primary responsibility of a board of trustees is meeting the changing educational needs of the community, while reflecting the community’s values in fulfilling the college mission.” (ACCT, 1999, p. 1) Two year colleges "are governed by lay boards entrusted to provide ethical leadership and responsible stewardship in balancing current and emerging needs of many constituencies". (ACCT, 1999, p. 1) The Ohio statute provides the administrative code by which a two-year college must operate. The Ohio Revised Code contains the codified sections of acts signed by the Governor. The Ohio Administrative Code provides administrative rules, written statements of law adopted by an administrative agency pursuant to authority granted by the General Assembly to carry out the policies and intent of a statute enacted by the General Assembly

(http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/laws.cfm, 2006).
Conflict of Interest

In the community college system many of the trustees are named to the board through a political process. This may “force a board to serve a single master rather than the public interest (Davis, 1999, p. 9). Politically controlled boards can insist that a specific political party approve any decisions made by the board. “Public interest can never be reduced to the interests of those who work at the college” (Davis, 1999, p. 9). Many boards want to be open to the public so they may include a student or faculty representative on the Board of Trustees. This creates inherent conflict of interest. The Board is essentially asking the student or faculty to be loyal to the Board, but inherently they feel loyalty to their own group. A better solution if input is needed is to solicit input from these parties prior to making major decisions. “Boards need input, not conflict of interest” (Davis, 1999, p. 9).

It is important to remember that we are all humans and that it is natural for humans to be curators of self-preservation. The fact is that conflict of interest can lead to unethical behavior. Although “unethical behavior is common but does not make it acceptable.” (Davis, 1999, p. 12) Setting aside one’s own self-interest can be monumental in this setting. It is important for boards to have early detection systems for conflict of interest. Many boards have adopted codes of behavior, which outline acceptable action and behavior on the part of the trustee.

Trustees who are either elected or appointed to the Board are usually recognized in the community as leaders. Harpool (1998) speaks of the “profile paradox” in his literature. The Profile paradox speaks of the profile of an ideal trustee. “One profile of an
ideal trustee is a powerful and influential individual, who controls significant business interests, has equally prominent associates and acquaintances, can enter into transactions that benefit the organization and will persuade other to do.” (Harpool, 1998, p. 32)

Inherent in the profile itself is conflict. This creates “governing boards …. populated by powerful people who are restricted in how they may wield their power.” (Harpool, 1998, p.32) Old case law sets the precedent for disclosure and notification for conflict of interest. In the 1974 case *Stern v. Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries*, the court established “outlined steps that a trustee needed to take to handle a conflict of interest to fulfill his or her fiduciary duty with reasonable diligence and care.” (Harpool, 1998, p.33) The court set forth recommendations for non-profit and private charitable boards. The court’s four recommendations were:

(1) Prior disclosure: A trustee must disclose all real and potential conflicts to the board.

(2) Nonparticipation: A trustee must not participate in any discussion in which he or she has a conflict of interest.

(3) Disinterested Review: The remaining trustees who do not have self-interest in the outcome of a decision should objectively make the decision that is in the best interest of the institution.

(4) Documentation: The board secretary should keep accurate minutes that:

a. Report that a conflict was disclosed.

b. That the conflicted trustee did not participate in a vote. The minutes should also reflect that the remaining board members without self-interest reviewed the decision and approved it, believing it was in the
best interest of the institution. (Harpool, 1998, p.33)

Many colleges have worked from these four recommendations to create their own conflict of interest policy that governs trustees, faculty and staff. The first issue institutions are defining is conflict of interest. There are four major schools of thought in area of conflict policy:

(1) Independent Judgment Clauses: Contains two parts: First, statement defining conflict of interest as a personal interest of the trustee that “might impair or reasonably appear to impair” a trustee’s “independent, unbiased judgment.” Secondly, the policy defines the potential conflict “as one in which a family member or close associate of the trustee has an interest (usually financial) that would impair the trustee’s independent unbiased judgment.”

(2) Fiduciary Responsibility Clause: “Simply informs trustees of their “fiduciary responsibilities” and leaves to the entire board or a board committee the responsibility for determining conflicts of interest on a case-by-case basis.”

(3) Threshold Clauses: “Acknowledge that trustees often have a duality of interest. The policies determine whether a conflict of interest exists on the basis of the degree of interest a trustee has in an entity or relationship outside of the institution.”

(4) Conflict-Listing Clauses: Attempt to define when a conflict of interest occurs, usually by citing examples. (Harpool, 1998, p.33-34)

No matter which clause an institution adopts for their policy the four outlined clauses “always conclude that a conflict of interest occurs when a trustee is a director or officer or owns a requisite percentage of another entity doing business with the
institution, or when the trustee gains financially from a transaction between the institution and an outside entity.” (Harpool, 1998, p.34) One way to combat the issue of conflict of interest and unethical behavior is through trustee education, which allows the trustees to explore ethical issues and the techniques of ethical decision-making. (Davis, 1999, p.13)

Trustee Characteristics

Two-year college trustees come from various career backgrounds, ethnic groups and personal experiences. Diversity is at the heart of the two-year college; and there is no better evidence of this than when we look at the CEOs of these colleges. In recent years there has been a major demographic change in the presidency, that is one of the female and minority populations being named to the presidency. “A comparison of data on presidents hired from 1995 to 1998 indicates that 34.4 percent are women; 7.9 percent are African American; Asian Americans, 0.8 percent and Hispanic 6.6 percent; and American Indian, 0.4 percent. Women continue to make significant gains.” (Polonio, 2001) In Hill's 1989 research of the two year college trustees he found that the profile was as follows: "The average trustee: (a) represented an institution of 2500 or less full time equivalent students in a rural location; (b) was a professional or in management; (c) was white, male, and over the age of 50; (d) had at least a bachelor's degree; (e) was appointed by local members of the school board caucus or county commissioners; (f) appointment was initiated by another board of the administration of the college; (g) had an average income in excess of $50,000, and (h) spent at least 6-10 hours per month in trustee related activities" (p. 91). Hill's research further explained that in 1989, Ohio had a greater representation of women on two-year college boards than the national average. He pointed out that the representation of minorities on two-year college boards in Ohio did
not meet the level of involvement on the national level. Hill pointed out that "in addition to increasing diversity of the trustees', colleges should "do all things necessary to identify and appoint the most qualified and experienced individuals bringing continued breadth of knowledge to its boardrooms" (1989). Polonio points out that “minority representation …is unlikely to increase significantly – unless hiring practices are altered. “Generally, the procedure for appointment of the president or chancellor in the colleges is through a committee interview and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final selection.” (Viltz, 2001) The committee usually is selected from a cross section of administrators and even students on the college campus. “Once the committee screens the applicants and provides a final list of candidates to the board of Trustees, there is no guarantee that committee’s choice will be the final selection of the board. It then becomes a political decision and often takes on a personal tone as the board members decide whether or not they can work effectively with the final candidate.” (Viltz, 2001, P.1) Unfortunately, due to the political nature of CEO position “the most qualified candidate may not always be the one who receives the majority of votes.” (Viltz, 2001 P.1) The CEO and Trustees must represent the diversity of the community which the college represents. “The critical issue facing community college administrators will be how to develop programs and policies that enable their institutions to achieve racial diversity within the confines of emerging legal framework” (Shepard and Seewald, 2000, P. 1) In Regents of University of California v. Bakke 1978, Justice Powell “indicated that institutions of higher education could take race into account as a relevant factor in support of their efforts to achieve educational diversity within their student bodies”. (Shepard and Seewald, 2000, P. 2) Although community colleges are open admissions, they still strive to have
representative diversity as it relates to the community it serves.

The 1997 research conducted by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) indicated the average Trustee to be: male, white, and over the age of 50, business professional or manager. (p. 4) The AGB research survey highlights indicated "the typical board of a two year single campus institution has 19 members, while boards of four year colleges and universities average 33 members" (p. 4.). Ohio boards differ; they have six to nine members, which are legislated in the Ohio revised code.

In 1999, Jeff Hockaday and Don Puyear provided traits for effective leaders in the comprehensive community college. Their research included the following traits:

- Effective community college leaders have vision: the leader has a vivid sense of what the college should look like and be doing in the near and immediate future.

- Effective community college leaders have integrity: the leader is reliable, works for the good of the organization and will not abandon supporters in the critical times.

- Effective community college leaders have confidence: their confidence comes from planning that leads to the desired outcome for the college. Confidence comes from practice and study.

- Effective community college leaders have courage: the ability to lead where others have not treaded.
Effective community college leaders have technical knowledge: understanding the business of the college and drawing from business for previous experience.

Effective community college leaders are collaborators: developing partnerships that will benefit the college and the community.

Effective community college leaders are persistent: with a clear vision, one can continue in the right direction even when things take a wrong turn.

Effective community college leaders have good judgement: "good judgement is the result of understanding the social, political, interpersonal, and financial forces that are at work in the community and being able to accurately predict the reaction of individuals and groups to certain actions" (p. 5).

Effective community college leaders have desire: the strength to lead and the ability to handle risk of actions.

Trustees that are selected to serve on the boards of America’s colleges and universities are business and professional people who make their living in the corporate arena. Many times they become frustrated by the lack of accountability and control they see being practiced in the college. Emmert (1998, P. 3) uses the following excerpt from a conference where he was the speaker, he has discussed in long detail the fact that the institution was facing major financial shortfalls and that he had no idea how the college would remedy the situation. After much time for explanation one of the business people in his audience stood up and said “From my point of view, you are in a business where you have nearly complete control over what you teach, how you teach it, who teaches it, and what you pay people to teach it. You have more qualified people wanting to work for
you than you could possibly hire, and you have customers who fill out forms and pay money just to see if you will allow them to buy your product. You are telling us despite all this managerial control you cannot handle a 4% revenue shortfall” (1998, P.6) The businessperson then asked “Do you understand why that makes no sense to business people?” (Emmert, 1998, P.6) It is critical to the college operation that it be viewed as a business entity. This philosophy will allow the college to compete effectively in the marketplace. "State community college boards must play a role in the preparation of future community college leaders. In colleges where presidents and trustees believe that upward mobility of employees is a responsibility of the institution, emerging leaders are a valued asset." (Hockaday and Puyear, 1999, P.10) The business professional must have an understanding of campus climate and organizational structure to better understand the business of the college.

Campus Climate/ Organizational Structure

The community college of today is a unique and ever changing institution. A study by Underwood and Hammons provided data that revealed “two-thirds of the community colleges in the study had reviewed their organizational structure within the past 18 months.” (1999, P.41) Underwood and Hammons undertook a study in 1991; they took a random sample of all single campus, public, two-year institutions. The test population was 135 schools representing small, mid-size and large campus populations. Many community colleges have seen new leadership in the past 12 to 24 months. This has not been the major cause of campus reorganization. Eighty-four percent of campuses state that they review their organizational structure on a yearly basis. With systematic change in place, in addition to situational change, it takes a very involved trustee to
understand the structure and stay in tune with the college. "Change is usually not embraced with open arms, especially when a board and CEO have developed a trusting, effective and comfortable professional relationship over a period of years. A change in trustees can threaten to disrupt the culture that has been developed." (Boggs, 1996, p. 4) Trustees of community colleges usually meet six to eight times per academic year. They are usually not on campus unless they have official board business and then they come in for the meeting and leave. Stratton, 2001 discussed that “unless the board chairman is skilled at mixing up the energy levels around the board table throughout the meeting, the energy of the board has a high potential to become stagnant or entrenched in this “foreign” environment.” (p15) “Understanding the fabric and resiliency of each other around the table creates the possibility of a board process based in mutual respect and trust. For many boards, developing trust around the board table takes time, intention and design. …The spirit of the board is based on understanding of the board as an inclusive whole and how the whole is contained in each of the parts.” (Stratton, 2001) Stratton suggests that facilitated Board retreats provide an opportunity to educate while also working to build the “whole” of the board. The only way that the board is educated about the campus climate is through the President. Community College Presidents, “62% ...agreed that their current organizational structures were effective.” (Underwood and Hammons, 1999, P. 48) If presidents feel that comfortable with their organizational structures then they would have no reason to report any issues to the Board as they relate to campus climate. Boards must have their own understanding of the campus climate so that their governance is well received and effective.
Trustees must understand the often complicated and bureaucratic processes that colleges and universities face for funding and other issues. It is important that trustees understand governance via the organizational model of their institution. McCauley, 2002 highlights the three most common models as: “The bureaucratic model which is seen as a “Formal structure having defined patterns of activity related to the functions spelled out in the law and in the policy decisions. “” (p 4) The second model explored was “Shared authority, which shows the impact of joint participation throughout the organization.” (ibid, p 4) Lastly, McCauley explains the political model which was proposed by Victor Baldridge back in 1971. The model “represented the institution as a “Shifting coalition of power blocs and vested interests”. The governing body’s power emanates not from the institutional boards but rather from the special interest groups operating within a social context.” (McCauley, 2002) “…We have crafted organizational cultures that value convention and continuity and whose resistance to change is legendary” (Emmert, 1998, p. 7). Higher education creates its own barriers through its loyalty to tradition. "The traditional leadership model, which rarely takes full advantage of the resources and knowledge of college staff, is too slow in responding to the pace of change" (Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 1). The challenge for trustees and administrators is to manage the change from tradition to reality in ways that respect and support academic values and institutional mission. "The assumptions of the old model of leadership may be familiar and comfortable, but they are increasingly dysfunctional" (Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 1). ACCT adopted model standards of good practice for Trustee Boards in October 2000.
In support of effective community college governance, the Board believes:

That it derives its authority from the community and that it must always act as an advocate on behalf of the community.

That it must clearly define and articulate its role;

That it is responsible for creating and maintaining a spirit of true cooperation and a mutually supportive relationship with its CEO.

That it always strives to differentiate between external and internal processes in the exercise of its authority;

That its trustee members should engage in a regular and ongoing process of in-service training and continuous improvement;

That its trustee members come to each meeting prepared and ready to debate issues fully and openly;

That its trustee members vote their conscience and support the decision of policy made;

That its behavior, and that of its members, exemplify ethical behavior and conduct that is above reproach

That it endeavors to remain always accountable to the community;

That it honestly debates the issues affecting its community and speaks with one voice once a decision is made. (ACCT, 2000)

“However, we must be mindful of the critical distinction between guiding values on the one hand and traditions and standard operating procedures on the other” (Emmert, 1998, p. 8). Higher education must recognize the needed skills that will enable institutions to react quickly and efficiently to changing market conditions and legislative demands. “Organizational change also must occur in the context of diffused authority and responsibility that accompanies shared governance” (Emmert, 1998, p. 8). Trustees must make themselves aware that to effectively manage change. They must “(1) integrate academic values in a way that faculty recognize and support and (2) allow progress to
occur in manageable pieces that serve as examples of improvement yet to come” (Emmert, 1998, p. 9). Trustees have the responsibility to guide the institution to its long-term vision and mission so therefore they can guide the institution toward an environment that takes control of its future.

College Vision and Mission

A shared vision is important to the future of the college. "A compelling vision can allow faculty and staff to break through the boundaries of their current thinking and discover future possibilities around which they can rally and to which they commit inspired performance" (Myran, Zeiss, and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 1). Senge defines vision as “The discipline of building shared visions is centered around a never ending process, whereby people in an organization articulate their common stories – around vision, purpose, values, why their work matters, and how it fits in a larger world.” (Synocracy, 2001, P3) The institution must create the strategic plan, capital plan and their operating budget together in a cooperative and cohesive manner. Neither can be achieved without the others. All three must be mutually supportive and interrelated in order for the institution to achieve its vision, mission and goals. Trustees must be able “to take a long view, to select a course of action and stay with it, and to believe in what the institution is capable of becoming” (Saluzzo & Baroni, 1998, p. 36). Trustees have the responsibility to guide the institution to its long term vision and mission so therefore they can guide the institution toward an environment that takes control of its future rather than waiting for the future to be dictated by external forces. Trustees have a role to play: as a community representative in planning and visioning for the college, however, is significant to the college’s future.” (Synocracy, 2001, P.1) With increased demand for services,
community colleges have been looking at their mission statements and deciding if revision to the mission is needed. St. Petersburg (FL) Junior College did just that in 2001 and decided that a revision to include four year degrees was needed. (Polk, 2001, p. 11) They received legislative approval move to four year status and then they removed Junior from their name. “While there can be advantages to changing to mission and nature of an institution, it requires a great deal of political and public relations work. “ (Polk, 2001, P. 12) Two-year colleges must be responsive to community needs or the governing body might take it upon itself to mandate change in prescribed time frame and manner.

Public Policy, Legislative Process and Liability

Trustees must also understand the delicate balance between an institution and the legislature. It is extremely important that trustees understand the position of their institution on the issues involved before making statements or phone calls on the schools behalf. Trustees need to understand that those serving community colleges are a unique group. Community colleges until recently have generally been compared against their four year counterparts. “The serious danger, of course, is that in the absence of systematic research evidence, higher education policymakers will rely on unsubstantiated beliefs, stereotypes, and even publicly accepted myths in making judgments about the educational effectiveness and funding priority of community colleges” (Pascarella, 1999, p.10). David Pierce in 2001 as he stepped down from his presidency with the AACC stated “I think there’s a higher level of acceptance and understanding of community colleges on the part of federal and state policymakers today than there was 10 years ago. I think, in general, the public likes us, though I do not think that they fully understand us.” (p. 9) He stated “I’m sure that most people, locally, understand their community college
about as much as they want to. And they don’t stop to worry about the larger movement or the connectivity of it all.” (Pierce, 2001, P. 2) This is the key to understanding where the CEO and the Board of Trustees must connect the pieces of the puzzle. George Boggs as he took over the helm of AACC in 2001 committed that one of his top goals in his administration would be “establishing a stronger community college presence in the media, especially in policy areas and field development”. (Frengel, 2001, P 2.)

Terry Thomas, Executive Director, Ohio Association of Community Colleges submitted a discussion paper in May 2004 titled Community Colleges to Serve All Ohioans. In the document OACC puts forth recommendations and options to educators and local officials interested in providing better access to education opportunities. (OACC, 2005) The recommendations cover: incentives for partnerships with four year schools for smooth articulation, technical colleges being given priority on conferring Associate of Arts and Sciences when there is a branch campus locally and allowing for expansion of districts that are in adjacent counties or areas. (OACC, 2005)

Public Policy and Legislative Process

Trustees must not go along with the traditional research that compares apples to oranges. Community colleges reward their faculty for teaching, have open admissions policies, and serve a non traditional population of students who are may be under prepared for higher education or have limited time and resources to pursue their higher education. “Accountability in higher education ranks as one of the three top priorities for policymakers. …. “But a recent ACCT policy survey found that community college trustees are largely ignored by state policymakers.” (Brown, 2001, P17) In the national 2000 Presidential election “Republican and Democratic education platforms emphasized
fundamental change in American education policy.” (Rucker, 2000, P12) Some of the
issues that have historically served as barriers to community college have been eliminated
or reduced greatly. Past research has shown that the issue of a transfer from one
institution to another has created great barriers to community college students wanting to
continue their education at a four-year institution. During the 1990s, institutions have
worked diligently to eliminate the transfer barrier; this has been accomplished through
state legislation of core basic educational requirements, articulation agreements and more
collaboration between institutions and their academic counseling personnel. Community
colleges are there in the community playing a vital role in economic development and
training. “There is evidence to suggest that community colleges may be fostering student
talent along a variety of cognitive and developmental dimensions with about the same
degree of proficiency as many four-year colleges and universities”(Pascarella, 1999, p.
13). Pascarella’s research suggests that community college students “change essentially
the same amount on the five dimensions of cognitive growth as do four year student”
(1999, p. 13). When cost is factored into the equation community colleges are an
“effective way for substantial numbers of students to obtain their first two years of post-
secondary education without necessarily sacrificing the intellectual/developmental impact
of their college experience or their relative competitiveness in the marketplace”
(Pascarella, 1999, p.13). ACCT introduced “the economic impact model for community
community college has in its region by using earlier detailed economic studies and census
information along with data from the colleges to put dollar figures on the direct income
benefits and indirect social benefits of a community college. “ (ACCT, Spring 2001)
Trustees must understand the unique and non-traditional nature of the community college and its economic impact on the community it serves. Trustees must reach out to the community in order to fully understand the needs. Maricopa Community College (AZ) has engaged the public through “Strategic conversations between their board and community members.” (Synocracy, 2001, P. 6) “…Strategic planning that involves the entire college and its community, involving community groups in dialogue with the college, and engaging students with the administration and faculty in a dialogue about an image or a focus for the college.” (Synocracy, 2001, P. 4) Community colleges must not move into the future satisfied with the past tradition of comparison and analysis, “we cannot afford to continue to operate in ignorance of the educational influence of a set of nearly 1,300 post-secondary institutions that educate almost forty percent of our nation’s students” (Pascarella, 1999, p. 13). Trustees must be savvy and understanding of the population they are charged to serve.

Liability

A recent court case Laszlo N. Tauber, et al v. Commonwealth of Virginia, sets the precedent for penalty of trustees for non-profit boards. The ruling “subjects governing bodies of all nonprofit institutions-including colleges and universities-to liability under the laws of the state in which the institutions are incorporated”. The ruling creates an unfriendly environment in which Trustees would make prudent and informed business decisions for the college they represent. Steinbach and Pelesh believe that this court ruling could create undue caution on the part of the trustees, therefore creating a slow moving bureaucratic process that cannot be responsive to the ever changing environment of higher education. Recently, community colleges are facing increased issues of liability.
A major example of this is: information security. Nationally campuses are dealing with “many types of security incidents that can occur but the three most likely are denial of service, viruses, and hacking”. (Sloan, 2001, P23) Sloan describes the knowledge that needs to exist with Senior administrators as well as with Board members who can affect strategic plans for the liability. (Sloan, 2001, P24) Colleges and universities then would not be able to make the sometimes risky contributions that they make to their communities and constituents.

In 1997, Congress passed a “Volunteer Protection Act… which expressly limits liability for harm caused by acts or omissions of volunteers of nonprofit organizations acting within the scope of responsibilities” (Steinbach & Pelesh, 1998, p. 4). Many states already have laws that protect trustees relief from personal liability if they serve on a charitable or non-profit board of trustees. It is thus, imperative that states evaluate their protection laws against their laws that govern fiduciary responsibilities. “Exposing trustees to multiple and inconsistent liabilities not only intrudes upon internal governance but also undermines the predictability upon which corporate governance depends” (Steinbach & Pelesh, 1998, p. 3) Clearly, communities and constituents will be the real losers if states impose conflicting laws to the role of the volunteer trustee.

Trustees Perceived Roles and Responsibilities

It is very important that trustees understand their role in the plan of college governance, understand the college structure which they represent as well as understand their responsibilities as a trustee. “Trusteeship is a solemn responsibility, a great opportunity, and a keystone in our democracy. “ (Taylor, 2000) ”The primary responsibility of a board of trustees is meeting the changing educational needs of the
community, while reflecting the community's values in fulfilling the college mission" (ACCT, 1999, p. 1). “Trustees who are effective in their role have both sophisticated governing skills and comprehensive knowledge about the district and community. New Trustees are faced with the challenging task of absorbing much new material about their districts and their roles” (Smith, 1999). As with any new job, one would expect to receive a job description and job expectations. ACCT describes "the primary functions of the trusteeship are certifying the consistency of missions and goals with community need, formulating policy, and ensuring effective leadership and responsible use of resources” (1999, p.1). Colleges must work with the trustees so that they understand these important issues. Gary Davis believes that setting role expectations is important to the point of making sure that the trustees understand they have a long term responsibility while the president or the provost should be charged with running the daily operation of the institution (1999, p.5). There is a fine line for trustees between micromanagement and “rubber stamping” when it comes to the governance of the college. “The temptation to endorse every policy proposed at the college is especially acute for trustees who have long and positive relationships with the chief executive officers” (Davis, 1999, p. 5).

“The Board’s primary role is to focus and deliberate. Its responsibility lies in developing sounds policy, linking to the external community, and linking with the college president.” (Davis, 1999, p6) “Trustees and the CEO should continuously identify and develop social relationships with people and organizations who are able to affect their institutions" (Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 2). “Trustees are advocates (Advocates of the community, of students, of our colleges, and of citizen governance.” (Shumway, 2001, P2) Trustees should work to guide the institution toward its long-term vision and mission.
“Times like these demand that trustees have the most current information concerning the educational, social, economic, and technological environment in which we make policy, and that we have skills and knowledge to assure the efficiency and effectiveness of college governance.” (Shumway, 2001, P2)

Trustees are faced with many urgent and pressing issues but they must maintain their distance from the situation and always keep the long-term goals in mind. Salluzzo and Baroni cite five major issues facing today’s trustees: changing “demographics, public policy, economics, technology, and organizational pressures” (1998, p. 33).

Two-year colleges are seeing demographic changes in their student populations. Many have seen the age of their average student decrease over the past few years. Some research points out a product of the booming economy of the late 1990's and early 2000.

Public policy has forced two-year colleges to jump into the digital age and provide greater access. Ohio's two-year colleges have operational funding that is attached to these initiatives; this creates major incentive for the colleges to be flexible and creative. In addition, public policy in 2000-2001 actually created a punitive restriction for two-year colleges that raised their annual tuition and actually rewarded institutions that decreased their tuition. When institutions do not respond quickly enough, sometimes public policy forces immediate or future change.

Ohio's economy plays a huge role in the activity of two-year colleges. Enrollment trends show that when the economy is booming, two year colleges will grow but not as rapidly as when there is a recession. Ohio's push to better educate its workforce has forged partnerships with two-year colleges and the State of Ohio. With a good economy employers can also find it hard to hire good employees. That has created a partnership
with two-year colleges and businesses that once they find a good employee they either provide tuition reimbursement or direct contract education for their employees. Employee retention is important in a booming economy.

The digital age is upon us and no one knows better than two-year colleges. Known as leaders in technology, two-year colleges can provide cutting instruction and state of the art facilities for the teaching of technology. Sinclair Community College in the early 1990's was a strong partner with the General Motors Company and in partnership they built the AIM Center. Aim stands for Automated Infrastructure and manufacturing. This center was built as GM was moving to automated CAD and CAM processes. This facility served as a training ground for both SCC student and GM employees. It was a national showcase of how technology was leading both business and education.

Campus climate can create institutional pressures to succeed or exceed standards of performance. Institutional pressure can be everything from union problems to an institution being land locked. The stresses that are inherent in the business of education play a large role in the efficiency and effectiveness of the college community, college president and its Board. "When each unit must be able to respond quickly to the changing needs of its customers, all college personnel must have an internalized beacon of institutional vision and values to guide daily decisions" (Myran, Zeiss and Howdyshell, 1996, p. 2).

Since many trustees come from private industry it is important for the president or provost to point out the difference between corporate boards and college boards. “Corporate boards make strategic decisions aimed at increasing shareholder value.
College trustees have the more complex task of considering their institution’s performance within the context of its mission, as task made more difficult-perhaps impossible-if the mission is unclear” (Salluzzo & Baroni, 1998, p. 35).

**Time and Energy Commitment**

In order for trustees to fulfill their role competently there is a great amount of time and energy that must be invested. “Being an effective trustee requires a commitment of time by the trustee, CEO, and board chair, and by the institution as a whole. Trustees estimate they spend from two to ten hours per week reading materials, keeping up to date, and attending meetings. Conferences and board retreats require additional time.” (Smith, 1999, P6) Many trustees are appointed to the community college because of their expertise in their career area: (i.e.: accounting, law, banking, community, non-profit agencies, etc.). These established professionals already have positions that require a lot of their time. “Limits of time and energy put great pressure on the volunteer trustees’ ability to discharge their duties effectively. Instead of regrouping and figuring out a method to permit the board to focus on issues of paramount importance, some boards simply go with the flow- trusting the mountains of reports they receive from college presidents until the college makes a fatal mistake” (Davis, 1999, p. 10). Davis states that surveys indicate that trustees spend little time on board work outside of board meetings. It is presents a tough question for trustees especially since there is so little respect authority and lawsuits currently threaten all public servants in unprecedented ways (Davis, 1999, p. 10).

Trustee positions may not be as easily filled today as they were in the past years. Many of the movers and the shakers in the community have so many commitments that they truly do not have the time to contribute to the community college trustee position.
Trustee positions are volatile if they are politically appointed since with entering political party you will continue to have a “changing of the guard.” This can create a board that isn’t consistent and is constantly on the learning curve. The process of college governance can be a confusing and time consuming process.

Davis states “problems of current governance stems not so much from the trustees’ lack of commitment, preparation and understanding but rather from flaws in the governance system.” (Davis, 1999, p. 13) When there is quality and ample trustee training trustees can still not be effective in their positions. Many colleges in the name of “learning communities” have moved to a model of shared governance. What this has meant at many colleges is the increased use of committees for decision-making. This was thought to be the model for learning communities but instead can lead to cumbersome and time-consuming decisions. The economy and public demand is changing at the most rapid pace in years, and community colleges need to find a way to be responsive to those needs. Unfortunately for some trustees they find themselves frustrated and unable to move important policies and issues forward for progress. The committee decision process eliminates any single individual from taking responsibility for the decisions that are made. “ A system of governance contributes to a college’s accountability when it encourages rapid and prudent direction of the institution. When its complexity bogs the college down or causes trustees to lose interest, the system should be reformed“ (Davis, 1999, p. 14).

Assessment

A major issue colleges are dealing with in the light of reduced funding is the question of sufficient and effective assessment. Assessment of the college's academic,
student, and financial services is required on a yearly basis. “Trustee boards are part of the checks and balances system available to policymakers who want to ensure community representation and community service.” (Brown, Spring 2001) The Ohio Board of Regents provides specific assessment measures that are tied to all types of state funding. (OBR, 2001) Ohio’s challenge measures have produced in Ohio, “A significant proportion of campus appropriations are performance based. The largest portion of state funds, the State Share of Instruction, is based on statewide average costs and campuses have an incentive to keep costs low.” (OBR 2004) Ohio two year colleges are also funded under the access challenge program, which rewards colleges for costs savings while providing vital services to their students. Colleges are also charged with Managing the Future which was implemented by then-Governor Voinovich when he “launched a long-term statewide strategic cost reduction effort that paralleled the state’s Management Improvement Task Force. This accountability program is still in place and has resulted in two year and technical college savings of $27.1 million from 1993-96. (OBR, 2004)

In 2006, the Higher Education Funding Study Council requested under Section 209-64.99 a study on distributing state share of instruction funds based on the number of degrees and certificates awarded. The Council requested OBR to “Examine whether it is feasible to retain a portion of the State Share of Instruction distributed to the campuses until such time as the certificates or degrees are conferred, whether the existing appropriation is sufficient to fund such an initiative, and how much in additional funding might be necessary to significantly increase the number of certificates and degrees earned by Ohioans each year.” (Am Sub H.B. 66 Mandated Studies) Another requested study by the Council looked at “the feasibility of devising a performance-based grant to provide
incentives to university branch campuses, community colleges, state community colleges, technical colleges and the community and technical colleges at Youngstown State University, the University of Cincinnati, and the University of Akron to increase the number and proportion of Ohio students who receive a certificate or an associate degree, or who transfer to a four year institution of higher education.” (Am Sub H.B. 66 Mandated Studies) The end result of this study would look at the possibility of “developing measures of certificate and degree completion, as well as transferal to a four year institution of higher education”. (AM Sub H. B. 66 Mandated Studies)

McColgan (1999) suggests three questions of assessment:

1. What is the mission of the institution? It should reflect opportunities, competence and commitment.

2. What are the results you hope to achieve? Measure outputs and focus on the long-term goals.

3. How do you allocate resources to match results? Look at systematic abandonment, scale, and scope.

There are many ways to measure or assess results. There must a systematic process for that assessment to occur on a scheduled basis. Colleges are looking to the Baldridge model for assessment. “An era of tightening resources has spawned an increased emphasis on accountability and performance based funding, raising the stakes on how trustees approach the issue of ensuring that community colleges are held accountable in ways appropriate to their mission and governance structure. Most states rely heavily on outputs or outcomes that simply are not reflective of the mission of the majority of community colleges. (Brown, 2001) Gillette points out in his 2001 article that “even with
about half our students having a degree, we still have a much larger number of students that drop out rather than graduate". (Gillette, 2001)

"Regular evaluation of the CEO and board performance provide opportunities for the board and the CEO to clarify expectations and to assess progress toward meeting college or district goals" (Boggs, 1996, p. 3). Trustees are responsible for the assessment of the President's performance and it is important that the trustees be evaluated on their performance and be given feedback from the president. The CEO should develop yearly goals and objectives related to the long term vision and mission of the college.

*Trustee Training and Leadership*

Trustees must be very knowledgeable about many things. It is difficult at best, to represent an institution that you don’t work at on a daily basis. "Selection and professional development of qualified trustees is essential to overall excellence in community colleges." (ACCT, 1999) The only way for trustees to become knowledgeable of the institution is to make training opportunities available for the trustees. Davis states "community college boards indicate that many trustees understand the limits of their powers better than they understand the potential of their collective authority." (1999, P.6) There is a fine line for trustees of knowing their boundaries or defaulting and delegating important decisions to college administrators. Trustees must be taught in their orientation that they need to be involved in the “systematic discussion of issues related to the college’s mission” not absorbed into updates by the President of the all the good things happening at the college. Leadership is more persuasion than precision. (Hockaday and Puyear, 1999, p1) It is the responsibility of the trustees to guide the college in the
direction that their mission has set forth. The board has the responsibility of creating the strategic path that the college will follow in the long term. The community college trustee must also be trained to be the college’s advocate. The trustee is a great person to work public relations for the college. Trustees “should discuss common issues with high school boards, hospital boards, county boards, city councils, and chambers of commerce” (Davis, 1999, p. 7). Trustees must be trained to look to the future and the mission of the institution. Unfortunately what is often the case is that the trustees are only updated on the current issues of the college. The president of the community college must insist that the trustee belong to both state and national trustee organizations.

These organizations, in Ohio: Ohio Association of Community Colleges and nationally: The Association of Community College Trustees can provide valuable and timely information about issues that are relevant to the community college. The Ohio Association of Community Colleges is a state professional organization for the two-year college presidents and senior administrators of Ohio. The mission of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, an organization of independent public community and technical colleges, is to promote the continued quality, strength, vitality, and effectiveness of its members. In fall 2001, OACC’s Education Committee “contracted with ACCT and a Michigan consulting firm, Leading Edge Mentoring, to collaborate in developing a package of courses and training for trustees.” (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2001) “The Association regularly presents educational programs on matters of common interest. “ACCT President Ray Taylor said the association is a natural partner to develop this comprehensive statewide trustee education to complement Ohio’s successful advocacy program.” (Trustee Quarterly, Fall 2001) A new series of interactive skills development
workshops for Board members of all experience levels are being offered by the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) to include conceptual presentations, discussion of the application of Board theory to Board process, and practice of the skills to be developed. (OACC) Training topics include: How to Deliberate Issues in a Public Forum, Developing Effective Policy, Strategic Thinking and Collaborative Discussions, Conflict Resolution for the Board, Connecting with the Community, Effective Board Process, and Introduction to Policy Governance® Education. A diverse group of courses for a diverse group of trustees (ACCT, 1999).

The Association also develops a list of community college priorities in conjunction with its 23 member colleges and interacts with related organizations in support of these objectives. The most recent document is titled An Action Agenda to Maximize Ohio’s Use of Its Community College, and it outlines 12 priorities for OACC:

1. Develop an early awareness and reward program for middle school students and their parents on the importance of postsecondary education in a knowledge economy.

2. Equalize the student share for the cost of undergraduate studies at the freshman and sophomore levels, so that it does not exceed that at other levels of postsecondary education.

3. Restrain tuition at Ohio’s two-year and other access campuses where students are the most “sticker price” sensitive.

4. Consolidate developmental education services to the extent possible at Ohio’s two year and other access campuses.
5. Create a vision that every high school graduate earns at least a term of college credit before high school graduation.

6. Provide high achieving community college graduates tuition at an Ohio public university at community college rates to encourage initial enrollment at the most affordable institutions.

7. Offer incentives to universities to provide baccalaureate degree completion programs for place bound adults on two-year campuses.

8. Build community colleges into any discussion of increasing degree production in STEM programs (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics).

9. Develop applied baccalaureate degrees at Ohio public universities that are fully articulated with community college associate degrees to meet the changing requirements of the workplace.

10. Fund noncredit instruction in carefully defined areas that have obvious benefit in improving the Ohio economy, that are affordable to low-wage working Ohioans, and have a strong potential for further education.

11. Enhance workforce system cohesion and delivery of services between community colleges and adult career-technical centers.

12. Assign all counties to a community college service district as appropriate to the needs and wishes of the affected communities.


OACC also represented its member’s thoughts during the biennial budget discussions with a report entitled “That Community College Can Do to rebuild Ohio’s Economy”. This document points out the responsiveness of the two year colleges and
their ability to respond to the needs of the community in a timely manner. In a
“September 23, 2005 letter to university and college presidents” Ohio House Speaker Jon
Husted, “certainly seemed to confirm the notion that higher education will be a leading
eedge issue during both the 2006 gubernatorial election year and the subsequent FY 2008-
09 biennial budget debate.” (Thomas, 2006)

The American Association of Community College Trustees is the national
organization for two-year college boards. The Association of Community College
Trustees (ACCT) is a nonprofit educational organization of governing boards,
representing more than 6,500 elected and appointed trustees who govern over 1,200
community, technical, and junior colleges in the United States, Canada, and England. The
Association of Community College Trustees exists to develop effective lay governing
board leadership to strengthen the capacity of community colleges to achieve their
missions on behalf of their communities. ACCT provides executive search assistance to
governing boards of community colleges, board leadership retreat services and interim
president services to help the college maintain a smooth transition to a new permanent
chief executive officer. Some of the topics for trustee training would include:

- The Power of Trustee Leadership
- Policy Governance
- Board Ethics and Ethical Decision-Making
- Board Self-evaluation as a Power Tool
- Board Chair/President Connection
- Board/President Communications Dynamics and Systems
- Board/President Planning and Goal Setting
- Board/President Performance Assessment Tools
- President and Board Performance Evaluation
- Institutional Budget Planning, Development Processes and Financial Statements
- The Trustee and Board Role in Community College Advocacy
- Developing and Promoting the Community College Legislative Agenda
- The Role of Trustees in Resource Development
Building Community College Linkages and Partnerships through Trustee Leadership
- Board and President Public Relations Planning and Execution Strategies
- Community College Workforce Development Initiatives
- Long-term Implications of Distance Education
- Impact of Technology on Community Colleges
- The New Millennium: New Directions for Community Colleges

Training has become an important issue in past years for the effective and efficient use of trustee time and energy. The trustee's job can not be under-appreciated since the Board of Trustees govern 1200 community colleges nationwide that enroll 11 million students annually. (ACCT, 2002) In addition these associations offer training opportunities and conferences. It is important for local trustees to network with other trustees from like institutions. The networking allows for the vision of a larger picture of the community college world.

Trustee orientation is also an initiative that helps the new trustees. Boggs wrote "orientation sessions provide an opportunity for the CEO and college staff to inform new trustees about the college, its mission and its operations while providing an opportunity for them to learn more about their role in policy setting and monitoring" (1996, p. 2). Some state associations also offer orientation courses. CEOs need to work to develop a new trustee's pride in the two-year college. CEOs should discover what motivates the trustee to serve and find something significant for the trustee to do which helps to meet their goals and the goals of the college (Boggs, 1996, p. 2). Davis point out job descriptions for trustees is not out of the question but very rarely used.

Knowing the College They Represent

Community College Trustees need to understand the community, students, faculty and staff of the college they represent. Sherman, in his 2001 board booklet describes “
you need a team to lead a college. It takes a collaborative effort”. (Sherman, 2001, Fall)

That collaboration includes, trustees, college employees, the president, community leaders and legislators. It is difficult to fight for what’s right if you do not have any idea of the needs of those you are representing. Trustees must be firm in requesting information from the President about the demographics of the institution for students, faculty and staff. It is also important that trustees be invited and attend special events on campus so that they can meet and get to know the constituents that they represent. Davis states, “trustees must become students of social change”, the boards must find ways to communicate with those who work at and use the services of the college (1999, p. 8).

Community colleges become the family to some students and many community college students have special needs. “The nation’s hope for prosperity is to corner the knowledge industries...which requires a highly skilled, highly productive workforce” (McCabe, 1998, p. 23). The board must understand the inherent values of the campus and respect and appreciate them. Governance breaks down when those making the decisions don’t understand the values of those who enforce the decisions. “Boards must also stay in touch with the prevailing political currents. When trustees fail to grasp either the needs of students, requirements of employers, or the politics of social change, governance breaks down and respect for the trustees erodes” (Davis, 1999, p. 8). “Trustees need to know why students enroll, what obstacles they face, what they expect from the college, and evidence that the students are getting what they seek“ (Davis, 1999, p. 10). If the Board understands their constituency then they can do a better job of monitoring expectations and success. “Nothing that community colleges can do for the country is more important than helping the under prepared contribute fully” (McCabe, 1998, p. 23). Trustees can
gain the insight they need through Trustee Orientation.

Smith (1999), points out that an effective trustee training program will include:

Individual orientation sessions. The most common component of local trustee orientation is a series of session for the new trustee with the CEO, the board chair and senior administrators. Some districts also arrange introductions to faculty, classified staff, and student leadership groups. These sessions are usually scheduled throughout the first few months of a new trustee’s term. They educate trustees on board operations, policies and the college programs and services, and provide ample opportunity of the new trustees to ask questions and learn protocol.

College and program tours. Other common components in local new trustee orientation programs are scheduled tours of the college and arranged visits to educational programs and services.

Mentoring. Experienced trustees are a source of wisdom and information, and mentoring of new trustees often occurs naturally. Some districts assign a mentor from the board to initiate contact and attend events with new trustees.

“The major purposes of local trustee orientation are to provide new trustees with a sense of the history, traditions, and culture of the colleges in the district; knowledge of their policy roles and responsibilities; and an overview of district programs and services. All of these goals can be achieved through effective trustee orientation.” (Smith, 1999)

Research by Baker speaks of building the comprehensive community college in the 21st century. Baker believes “for community colleges, the year 2000 will become a watershed for finally delivering on access, academics, and diversity issues” that were major topics in the twentieth century (1999, p. 33). Baker cites a Brookings Institute study from 1981 that speaks to the options of the future: “keep the status quo, fully develop the collegial model, or become a community-based career development center” (1999, p. 33). Some Community College Trustees have seen that vision and have moved their organizations toward these ideas. The Maricopa Community College District has teamed up with local unemployment agencies to provide full service to those
seeking employment. The program allows individuals to come into what would appear to be a for-profit search firm, (no look or feel of a state agency) the individual is provided access to career and educational counseling. Educational records can be accessed on the spot and registration can occur while the student is there. Local individuals are given the opportunity to receive help with their resume and interviewing skills and also state of the art equipment such as computers and fax machines. Was Maricopa futuristic in their vision or just able to effectively respond to the needs of the community constituents that it serves? Trustees must understand that the element of risk for community colleges is a new concept. “Community colleges developed in response to historical, social, and economic forces, with a structural design similar to universities and private colleges. From that structure, community colleges have expanded with mostly professional faculty deciding the critical issues of course design, workload, tenure and academic freedom” (Baker, 1999, p. 33). Academic and student diversity continues to grow and community colleges may not be prepared to cope adequately with the changing demographics of its students. “In every mission of the comprehensive community college is the idea of creating wealth at the individual, local, regional, and national levels through job skills in the short term and lifetime education in the long term” (Baker, 1999, p. 35). This has created complexity and urgency to the mission of the institution and a greater need for futuristic focus.

Community colleges are expected to respond to social, economic, and human resource development demands. However, we cannot deliver on promises unless and until we restructure ourselves as career colleges and as organizations in and of the community with a design that provides unique response to all aspects of
assigned and implicit missions. The next transition for comprehensive community colleges must be enhancing the links among curricula, programs, and careers, including the success of adult students and the communities in which they live. …

We will design curricula that also equip students with the job and life skills necessary to enjoy the fruits of a good career through competency based experiential learning (Baker, 1999, p. 35).

Comprehensive community colleges must “embrace a mission designed to address adult learning principles; to link learning to earning; to benchmark best practices; to be dedicated to productivity through effectiveness and efficiency; to become a partner in linked learning opportunities; to strive for constant improvement; to employ faculty and staff who are energetic, competent lifelong learners; and to become a learning organization by producing performance data and by reinvesting energy into change strategies that work” (Baker, 1999, p. 35). Through the transition community colleges can continue to be flexible and address the needs of their constituents. Trustees must make themselves available and be known as the key visionaries for the institution.

Complex and bureaucratic governance structures can sometimes be difficult for community and constituents to understand. Students as well as local leaders must know how to ask for needed change or additional services that the community college can provide. “To speed the pace of college governance, all stakeholders must understand who is responsible for which decisions and face up to their responsibilities” (Miller, 1998, p. 20). In today’s political and societal climate there are many critics of higher education a recent study by Miller states that perhaps the “critics are dissatisfied because they realize that the systems of campus governance that created some of the best colleges and
universities in the world is no longer adequate, now that higher education in the United States is no longer a booming, protected business” (Miller, 1998, p. 20). McCabe refers to this phenomena as optimism being replaced by cynicism” (1999, p. 22). Higher education has become a much more competitive industry over the past few years thanks in part to accelerated adult learning programs, cohort alternative scheduling programs and distance education. But, truly there must be more to the story and isn’t the real problem really “Who’s in charge?” The frustration many times revolves around the fact that in the days of shared governance and decision by committee, it is hard to find the person or persons who have the authority to make the decision. Many times committees are given the charge to investigate the issue, but not provided the authority to implement their findings into an action plan. Instead their ideas are forwarded to upper administration and there the plans are other shelved or revisited. Miller suggests that authority to make decisions goes hand in hand with the accountability. “Some administrators rightly question whether anyone who cannot be held accountable should have the authority to make decisions” (Miller, 1998, p. 21). Unfortunately, many times there is debate among the parties, President, trustees, administrators, faculty and staff about who has the authority or who doesn’t want the authority.

To find resolution what is a campus to do? Miller cites four problems that lead to the confusion of “who’s in charge”: a diffusion of authority, a lack of clear accountability, a paucity of information, and an unworkable time frame” (1998, p. 22). The problems are obvious and also stand in the way progress, but how can an institution deal with such monumental issues while at the same time continuing to move forward? Miller offers the following guidelines:
(1) Clarify authority: everyone needs to understand who is responsible for which decisions, even though the decision makers may need to consult and communicate with others during the decision-making process.

(2) Clarify accountability: Those who make the decision should be clearly accountable for them, based on whether the results are what the decision makers said should happen within a reasonable time.

(3) Clarify where the buck stops: ultimate decisions should rest with only a few designated people-although they should consult with many others- so that issues can be resolved (Miller, 1998, p. 23).

Institutions must create a plan and clarify roles and authority while maintaining open communication and accountability among those responsible for the major decision of the institution.

Summary

Trustee selection is a political process conducted either at the local or state level. The last Ohio research completed in 1989 showed little or no diversity among trustees. National research shows greater diversity among CEO's and some movement toward diversity of board members. The two-year college campus is a rapidly evolving organizational structure. College vision and mission are driving the evolution. In addition, public policy is playing a key role in refining two-year college curriculum and educational success. The former slow moving decisions making philosophy of two year colleges is being transformed into a rapid response philosophy that is able to respond rapidly to ever changing needs of the community.

The trustee's perceptions of their roles and responsibilities are changing. Through
trustee orientation and training programs, trustees can better define their roles and receive information that can help them to better carry out their responsibilities. Through membership in state and national trustee associations, trustees can have access to valuable resources that are there to assist them while they carry out their responsibilities. The training can also provide the trustee with a better understanding of the national movement of two-year colleges and how that collaborates with the state's goals for two-year colleges.

Trustees have a great responsibility; they have fiduciary duty to run a public entity. Two-year colleges are constantly being assessed on their performance. Through trustee resources, trustees can get a better understanding of how their college measures up to the standards. In times of strict fiscal policy, sound assessment can be very important. Trustees need to understand the assessment process and its results. All areas of college operations should have effective assessment plans.

The assessment of human resources is usually done on a systematic basis on a yearly schedule. The CEO and the trustees should participate in their own assessment process. There are many forms of human resource assessment, no matter the model of assessment, it should be honest and its results delivered in a respectful and communicative manner. Two-way communications can help to ensure trustee integration and understanding.

Through the research it seems that although trustee selection is a political process, the chosen trustee can be given tools and information that will smooth the transition into the board and provide the framework for fruitful trusteeship. "New challenges arise quickly, issues are increasingly complex, resources are limited, demands on colleges are
increasing, and decisions are not always easy. Trustees are only successful if they continually seek information, are open to new ideas, and engage in ongoing education. Boards will improve their effectiveness if they have plans and policies for trustee education that:

- Addresses individual needs, wants and learning styles.
- Provides opportunities for discussion and problem-solving.
- Includes a variety of strategies, such as reading, Web access, conference attendance, retreats, study sessions, and mentoring.
- Is fully supported by the CEO and board chair.
- Has adequate financial support.

By being actively involved in ongoing trustee education, a board becomes a model for the entire institution….” (Smith, 1999) “…Ohio is an under-educated state” (OBR, 2004) which means that fostering an environment of learning for the entire institution should be what it is all about. Ohio and its colleges view “Higher Education: A Strategic Investment” (Governors Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, 2006) which means Ohio’s economy is depending on “higher education’s potential for fueling economic growth”. (Governors Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, 2006) “Yet the task of building a knowledge driven economy that relies on the assets of higher education cannot be left to chance. It must be pursued systematically,…” (Governors Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, 2006) The fact still remains that “higher education is a tremendous value for both individuals and society”. (Governors Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, 2006)
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Research Design

The study was descriptive, comparative survey research, which identified the personal, educational and career characteristics of two-year college trustees. The research also provided a glimpse of the perceived roles and responsibilities of the trustees.

The procedures of the research were to include:

1. A thorough review of literature on the topics of college trustees and governance
2. Contacting Ohio Association of Community Colleges and seeking a list of the two-year college trustees and their presidents.
3. Development of a survey instrument, which is included in appendix A.
4. Determine number of respondents in sample and the appropriate response rates.
5. Mailing of questionnaire/survey instrument to the entire population of Ohio two year trustees.
6. Thorough analysis of all associated data.

Data analysis of the survey results determined the demographics of two-year community college trustees and the institutions served, the trustees' evaluation of training, and evaluation of the effectiveness of college governance structure.

A similar study of characteristics and roles among Ohio's two year college trustees (Hill, 1989) was used in the design of the survey instrument. Hill surveyed Trustees on their basic personal, educational and professional characteristics and their evaluation of various functions they performed as Trustees. The Hill survey provided the comparison
group for analysis of change in trustee demographics. All relevant information pertaining to this study is addressed in this chapter including: definitions of important variables, population, instrumentation, pilot of instrument, reliability, validity, data collection procedures, research questions and data analysis procedure.

Definitions of the Variables

**College Constituents** those represented by the college and trustees.

**College Governance** – the process of governing or managing the college.

**Method of Appointment** – Ohio recognizes appointment by Governor, County Commissioners or School Board Caucus.

**Two Year College Trustee** – person representing the constituency through their appointment to the board.

**Type of Institution** – Ohio recognizes three types of two year schools: State Community College (funded through state dollars), Community College (funded through state and local tax dollars) or the technical college.

**Key Issues of beneficial training received by trustees** – were categorized by topic:

- Finance/State Funding Issues
- Legislative Issues that affect Colleges
- Planning and Goal Setting
- Ethics
- Future of Community Colleges
- Advocacy and Working with State Elected Officials
- Assessment and Evaluation
- Technology
- Compliance Issues
Enrollment Management Information

Advocacy and Working with National Elected Officials

Key issues of desired training - were categorized by topic:

Future of Community Colleges - long term plan for college.

State Funding of College – funding plan by institutional type.

Planning and Goal Setting – Proactive vision for future.

Legislative Issues

Finance

Assessment and Evaluation

Technology

Enrollment Information

Ethics

Compliance Issues

Population

The population for the study was Ohio public two-year college trustees. The Ohio Association of Community Colleges’ Executive Director, Terry Thomas provided a listing of the trustees for the survey process. All trustees were included in the survey. There were a total of 208 possible survey participants, due to position vacancies and self elimination, the population was reduced to 196 possible in the survey population. The entire population was used so that the characteristics profile can be as accurate as possible. The anticipated response rate was 50% or 98 survey responses and analysis was acceptable at a 35% or 62 survey responses.
**Instrumentation**

A researcher-developed questionnaire titled Trustee Survey Instrument (Appendix A) was developed based on the Hill research, previous interviews with Terry Thomas, OACC Executive Director, and information gathered from review of the literature.

Questions one through eight and question fifteen provided demographic information on current trustees and their board involvement. Questions nine through fourteen provided demographic information on the two-year community college served. Questions sixteen through eighteen make up a scale that evaluated the trustee's initial training (IT). Question nineteen through twenty-three make up a scale that evaluated the trustee's ongoing training (OT). Question twenty-four asked for qualitative information on types of training received. Question twenty-five asks for qualitative information on training needed. Questions twenty-six through twenty-nine makes up a scale that evaluated the level of higher education information received (HEI). Question thirty asks respondents to rate their trustee knowledge of higher education issues. Questions thirty-one through thirty-five make up a scale that evaluated the level of trustee understanding of the college (UC). Questions thirty-six through forty make up a scale of the trustee's evaluation of input from college constituents (ICC). Question forty-one asked respondents to rate their knowledge of their institution. Question forty-two asks respondents to rate the effectiveness of their institutions President. Question forty-three asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of their Board. Questions forty-four through forty-six make up a scale of the trustee's evaluation of their involvement in their institution's governance (ICG).
The survey instrument was a creation of the researcher and was pilot tested to determine the clarity of the questionnaire, the reliability of the answers to the questionnaire and to refine the wording and order of the instrument. Approximately thirty-five instruments will be distributed to past Ohio two-year college trustees for the pilot process.

**Pilot of Instrument**

On August 1st, 2003, a random sample of 10 trustees was chosen as a sample. They were mailed the survey instrument, with a cover letter explaining that the instrument was being tested and requesting any feedback and a return envelope. The sample received eight replies. Basic wording changes were made to the instrument but no major design issues were noted at the time.

**Reliability**

Cronbach’s alpha will be used to establish the reliability of the data. It is anticipated that the measured reliability will be 0.5.

**Validity**

Content validity of the survey instrument was established through the review of literature and with the basis of the instrument being formed from the Hill (1989) and Davis (1999) research. In addition, the instrument will be reviewed by Ohio University faculty experts and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges administration, to determine the instrument’s content and face validity.

**Data Collection Procedure**

1. Trustee names and addresses were obtained from Terry Thomas, Executive Director of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges.
2. The survey instrument, along with a cover letter and return envelope was provided to 196 trustees. The cover letter provided an explanation of the study and some basic information on the researcher.

3. Initial mailing occurred on September 15, 2003. In order to follow-up with non-respondents, return envelopes were numbered allowing for surveys returned to be confidential, yet records kept of respondents. The returned envelopes were cross-referenced with the list of numbers issued to survey participants only for follow-up of non-respondents and were not linked to actual returned surveys.

4. Two weeks after initial mailings, a second request packet was mailed to non-respondents. All responses received by November 15, 2003 were used in the research study.

Data Analysis Procedures

Descriptive statistics were used to describe and understand who is the two year college trustee in 2003. Further, trustees were asked to rate questions describing training received and desired.

The data collected on the various scales and questions measuring trustee perceptions, utilized various statistical techniques evaluating correlation of scales with demographics and specific questions. Significance would be at .05 alpha level. Comparison of data collected was compared with national data whenever such data was available.
1. Was there significant change to the profile of the trustee of Ohio’s public two-year community colleges over the past fourteen years (Chi-square):

H_{01a}. There is no significant difference between the racial make up of the trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

A Chi Square test was used to assess if there was a significant change in the racial make up of Two Year college trustees.

H_{01b}. There is no significant difference between the gender of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

A Chi Square test was used to assess if there was a significant change in the gender of Two Year college trustees.

H_{01c}. There is no significant difference between the age of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

A Chi Square test was used to assess if there was a significant change in the age of Two Year college trustees.

H_{01d}. There is no significant difference between the educational level of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

A Chi Square test was used to assess if there was a significant change in the educational level of Two Year college trustees.

H_{01e}. There is no significant difference between the appointment process of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

A Chi Square test was used to assess if there was a significant change in the appointment process of Two Year college trustees.
2. Was there a significant difference between type of public two-year institutions and reported level of knowledge and college involvement of trustees? Was there a significant difference with reported level of knowledge and involvement of trustee as it relates to the training of college trustees?

H₀²ᵃ There will be no significant difference between level of knowledge of trustees and the type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)

An independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the knowledge of the college (UC) scale and the type of two year college. Significance was set at the .05 level.

H₀²ᵇ There will be no significant difference between level of involvement of trustee and type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)

An independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the involvement of the college (ICG) scale and the type of two year college. Significance was set at the .05 level.

H₀²ᶜ There will be no significant difference between perceptions of higher education information by the type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)

Independent sample t-tests were conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the perception of higher education
(HEI) information by type of two year college. Significance was set at the .05 level.

H02d  There will be no significant difference between level of training and the level of involvement of college trustees.

A chi square was computed to determine if a significant difference exists between level of training and level of involvement of trustees.

H02e  There will be no significant difference between level of training and the level of involvement of college trustees.

A chi square was computed between both the IT and OT scales and the ICG scale to determine if there is a significant difference between level of training and the level of involvement of college trustees.

3. Was there significant difference between the length of service of college president and the reported level of knowledge and involvement of trustee?

H03a  There will be no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of knowledge of trustee.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between length of service of president and the reported level of knowledge of trustee (UC).

H03b  There will be no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of involvement of trustee.
A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between length of service of president and the reported level of Involvement of trustee (ICG).

**Research Questions**

The research questions addressed in the study were designed to gain descriptive statistics on Ohio’s public two-year community college trustees, compare current information with past descriptive data, and identify important correlations with trustees that report strong knowledge of their institution and evaluation of training.

1. What is the current profile and characteristics of trustees of two-year community colleges in Ohio and has there been any significant change since 1989?
   a. What are the key descriptors of the trustee including gender, age, race, educational level, etc.?
   b. How are trustees selected for their positions?
   c. Are trustees trained for their board service and if so how and to what extent?
   d. How has the trustee for two-year community colleges changed since the 1989 Hill study?

2. What training was received by the trustees of community colleges, what training was viewed as beneficial and what additional training is perceived add additional value?
   a. Was board orientation available and did it provide clearly defined expectations and responsibilities?
b. Did the trustee participate and perceive benefit from state, regional
   and/or national association involvement?

c. What areas of training did the trustee perceive as beneficial to them in
   their role as trustee of a community college?

d. What areas of training did the trustee perceive as necessary to improve
   their trustee role?

e. What recommendations can be made to two-year community colleges,
   board of trustees, state board of education, and other key groups to
   better identify, train and support effective and knowledgeable board
   members?

3. What is the trustee’s perception of their role and responsibility as a board
   member in knowledge of expectations, constituents served, the evaluation
   process and strategic planning of their institution?

   a. What is the trustees’ perception of their level of knowledge of
      information on higher education issues?

   b. What is the trustee perception of their level of knowledge of students,
      faculty, administration and staff, and community of the institution?

   c. What role do trustees play in evaluation at the college?

   d. What level of political involvement do trustees serve?

   e. What descriptive factors correlate with trustee members who reports
      strong knowledge of two-year community college?
CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

This chapter includes the presentation and interpretation of the data and a statement of the findings. This chapter will consist of three sections: demographic information about two-year college trustees and their institutions, their perceptions concerning their roles, training and functions as trustees and statistical comparison between the current study and the Hill’s 1987 study of two-year college trustees. The population for the study was 100% representation of the Ohio two-year college trustees as of January 2004 as provided by the Ohio Association of Community Colleges.

This study involved surveying individuals currently serving as trustees in Ohio’s two-year college system. The total population numbered 208 trustee positions, yet ten vacancies existed therefore at the time of this study 198 trustees received the survey. One respondent indicated that he or she was no longer a trustee and with the one deletion, the population consisted of 197 individuals. Of the 197 sent, 98 were returned prior to the thirty days after the second follow-up reminder. Data from the study was drawn from the 98 questionnaires or 50% of the questionnaires distributed.

Presentation of the Data

The data obtained from the study is presented in Tables 1 thru 19.

First Research Question

The first research question addressed the current profile and characteristics of trustees of two-year community colleges in Ohio and if there has been any significant change in
demographics since the 1989 Hill study. Tables 1 thru 9 present data according to response rate of trustees by institutional characteristics and by trustee characteristics.

Tables 1 through 9 are summaries of the response rate by the demographic variables showing the frequency of responses and the percentage equivalent of each demographic characteristic surveyed.

As indicated in Table 1, 63.3% or 62 trustees are 50 to 69 years of age. There is an almost equal distribution of 40 to 49 year olds 13.3 % or 13 trustees and 70 to 79 year olds 17.3% or 17 trustees. Outliers included 1 trustee in the under 39 years old category and 5.1% or 5 trustees indicating age of 80 years or older.

Respondents provided data to support that 89.7% or 87 trustees are white/Caucasian and 10.3% represent non-dominant groups including African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanics or Native Americans. According to the 2000 census, Ohio’s population was racially broken down as 84% Caucasian, 11.5% African American, 1.2% Asian-American, 1.9% Hispanic and .2% Native American.

Distribution of trustees by gender indicate that less than one quarter are female which is dramatically below Ohio’s gender distribution from the 2000 census which indicated that 51.4% of individuals were female. State community colleges, community colleges and technical colleges all have a greater representation on their respective boards of male and Caucasian trustees as illustrated in Table 1.

Ohio has an educated core of trustees with 86.7% of trustees holding a bachelor’s degree or higher. With 70.4% or 69 trustees holding Bachelor or Master’s degrees, 16.3% or 16 trustees hold advanced degrees either doctoral degrees or professional degrees as indicated in Table 1.
Ohio’s trustees have experience with the institutions that they are representing with 37.8% of trustees having personally attended a community college for educational purposes (Table 1), therefore bringing personal experience as a student of a two-year community college to their job as trustee.

Table 1

*Descriptive Characteristics Relating to Trustee Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Highest Degree Attained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates’ Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community College Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data, as illustrated in Table 2, indicates 63.3% or 62 trustees represent state community colleges, 19.4% or 19 trustees represented community colleges and 17.3% or 17 trustees represented technical colleges. Of the population available to respond, 50% of
that population was represented by community or state community colleges, therefore of those who responded 82.7% represent community or state community colleges.

As indicated in Table 2 trustees reported urban, suburban and rural locations of institutions and Table 4 contrasts location with type of the institution served by respondents. Of those that responded, 24.7% or 24 trustees report an urban location, 28.9% or 28 trustees indicate a suburban location, while 46.4% or 45 trustees respond that a rural area is their institutions location. The high percentage of rural locations of the institutions is representative of the state’s plan during the Gov. Rhodes (circa 1970s) years to locate a technical or community college within 50 miles of each citizen of Ohio. Many of the rural location institutions represent multiple counties in rural areas of the state. Of those that responded that they represented a state community college; 24.6% or 15 trustees were from an urban location, 18.0% or 11 trustees reported suburban with the remaining 57.4% or 35 trustees representing the technical college sector. Of the respondents who reported they were from a community college, 26 total respondents with 47.4% or 9 Trustees representing an urban location, 36.8% or 7 Trustees from Suburban locations and the remaining 58.8% or 10 Trustees from rural locations.

The Technical College respondents, not surprising were all from rural locations, none reported from urban or suburban locations. There were 41.2% or 7 Trustees from this category of school. This is not surprising data, since the technical colleges in Ohio tend to be outgrowth from the four year colleges and they are usually away from the metropolitan areas.

The data has some interest in that the major state community colleges and community colleges with large enrollment are in urban locations in Ohio, with the
exception of Owens Community College which would be considered suburban. The data shows that of the respondents 46.4% or 45 trustees reported their college as being in a rural location. This number is higher than what would have been expected. There was almost equal representation among the urban and suburban categories with 24.7% or 24 trustees representing urban colleges and 28.9% or 28 trustees representing suburban colleges. From this data it could be interpreted that more of the smaller community colleges and state community colleges responded rather than the large urban colleges.

A little more than one third, 36.5% or 35 trustees of the trustees represent smaller institutions which represent enrollment of less than 2,499 students in Fall 2003. The 29 trustee respondents or 30.2% that lead the next largest group are those reporting from institutions with enrollment of 2,500 to 4,999. Therefore, 66.7% or two thirds of the respondents in this survey represent institutions with enrollment of 5,000 or less.
Table 2

Study Characteristics/Demographics Relating to the College That the Trustee Represents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Community College</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of the Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2499</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 to 4999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More in-depth demographic information can be understood in looking at demographic variables in sub groupings. Table 3 and Table 4 illustrate cross tabulation of type of institution by trustees gender and race respectively.

Table 3

*Distribution of Gender of Trustees by Type of Institution Represented*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Community College</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>State Community</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African- American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian- American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State community colleges, community colleges and technical colleges all have a greater representation on their respective boards of male and Caucasian trustees as illustrated in Table 3 and Table 4.

Ohio still has a large disparity between male and female trustees in all sectors of two-year colleges. State Community Colleges which would encompass all location demographics, men are appointed 3:1 or represent 78% of the board. The community colleges in Ohio, which would include four of the larger urban community colleges, still show disparity with men being appointed 3:1 or represent 74% of the board. This data is very curious since the aforementioned colleges have a majority representation of female presidents. Of significance is the differentiation of “hiring” of the position of president in comparison to the trustees. Presidents are hired by the Board but the board is appointed through political processes either by the Governor, local political parties of county commissioners or a school board caucus.

In Table 5 the research looks at distribution of trustees by gender and size of institution. This data is reviewed to see how closely it might reflect the gender distribution by institution type data that was presented earlier.
Table 5

*Distribution of Trustees by Gender and Size of Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2499</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 to 4999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for trustee gender by institution size look very similar to the gender distribution by institution type. The data runs along the original concept of the 3:1 ratio for male to female board members discussed previously. Interestingly the 20,000 to 29,999 group is much closer to the 1:1 ratio with men representing 57.1% and women representing 42.9%. There were seven respondents from this group. Interesting is the fact that the colleges that would fall into this category are headed mostly by female Presidents, with the exception being Sinclair Community College.

In Table 6, the data is shown for the distribution of trustees by ethnicity and size of institution. The data follows along the same data lines for as it relates to ethnicity by institution type which was discussed earlier.
Table 6

Distribution of Trustees by Ethnicity and Size of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Asian-American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2499</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 to 4999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for ethnicity by size of institution found suggests that the results fall in line with the ethnicity analysis by institution type. The data shows an average of 89.7% of board members being Caucasian. The outlier in this analysis falls in the 10,000 to 19,999 range where Caucasians only represent 55.6% of the trustee population, with equal distribution for African-American, Hispanic and Native American.

Table 7 presents data on the distribution of current occupation of trustees. An overwhelming 70% come from private sector or professional positions. Table 8 shows the distribution of current trustees in Ohio’s two year colleges by their previous service
on boards by occupational type. In Table 8, the data shows 99% of trustees bring
previous board experience with them to their current position.

Table 7

Distribution of Current Occupation of Trustees in Ohio’s Two-Year Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 70% of the trustees are professionals, attorneys or judges, bankers or
hold private sector positions. 7.2 % or 7 trustees hold government jobs with 12.4% or 12
trustees representing careers in education.
Table 8

*Distribution of Current Trustees in Ohio’s Two-Year Colleges by Previous Service on Boards by Occupational Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Occupation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These career statistics support the strong board involvement of trustees with other boards. Ninety-nine percent or 97 trustees indicate previous service on other boards. Previous board service is very common among trustees and trustees indicated their service on boards was substantial with over 33% indicating they have served over three years, and over 10% having served over ten years on other boards.

Table 9 indicates the method of appointment for the trustees in the survey. The method of appointment is established by law (O.R.C. 3354.05, 3357.05, 3358.03)
The majority 63.3% or 62 trustees indicate Governor Appointment to their position therefore corresponding to the legislative appointment process for state community colleges. Community colleges by definition having levy support, represents 19.4% or 19 trustees who are appointed by county commissioners. Technical colleges still have appointment through a caucus of school board appointees and have 17.3% or 17 trustees represented in this survey.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor Appointee</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commissioners Appointee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucus of School Board Appointee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of Trustees: Training.

Data illustrating how the respondents perceive the training received from within and outside their institutions is summarized in Table 10. Trustees were asked if they were provided training at the time of appointment to the board, annually and if they participated in various state and national training or conferences. A survey of this table reveals that the majority of respondents agreed that training and expectations were/are provided.
### Table 10

**Training Received by Ohio’s Two-Year Trustees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a. Comprehensive orientation/training
- 2.0 | 24.5 | 15.3 | 49.0 | 9.2 |

#### b. Clearly defined board authority
- 1.0 | 17.3 | 15.3 | 48.0 | 18.4 |

#### c. Accurate estimate of time and energy commitment
- 5.1 | 17.3 | 14.3 | 55.1 | 8.2 |

#### d. Yearly board training
- 0.0 | 17.7 | 14.6 | 52.1 | 15.6 |

#### e. Access to state, regional, and national organizations
- 0.0 | 2.0 | 7.1 | 57.1 | 33.7 |

#### f. ACCT Conferences
- 0.0 | 5.3 | 28.9 | 48.7 | 15.8 |

#### g. OACC Conferences
- 0.0 | 2.4 | 25.3 | 50.6 | 21.7 |

#### h. Ohio Board of Regents biennial trustee training
- 0.0 | 3.8 | 32.9 | 53.2 | 10.1 |
**Comparative Data**

Comparison of the profile of two-year college trustees found by Hill in 1989 with this study can be seen in Table 11.

Table 11

*Comparison of Ohio's Two-Year College Trustees from 1987 to 2003 by Percentage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.2**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hill did not distinguish categories of Asian-American or Native American in his survey

**This figure is an addition of the distinguished categories of Asian-American and Native American
Table 11: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 39</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>50.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hill did not distinguish categories of 70 to 79 and 80+ on his survey

** This figure is an addition of the distinguished categories of 60 to 69, 70 to 79, and 80+

Education Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hill did not distinguish categories of High School/GED and Associates Degree on his survey
Comparison to Hill’s 1987 Findings

In addressing the first research question and hypothesized differences between the 1989 and 2003 study, the following statistical tests were completed.

Results of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

$H_{01a}$. There is no significant difference between the racial make up of the trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

The 2003 trustees were compared with Hill’s 1989 trustees using a chi-square test to assess if there was a significant change in their race. Since Hill’s data set only presented data on Caucasian and African Americans, the 2003 trustees were divided into two groups of Caucasian and Other (including African American, Asian American, Native American, Hispanic and other). The comparison was then made as to the difference between the 2003 and 1989 trustee group between Caucasian and minority representation. Using a chi-square test there was no significant difference between the 2003 and 1989 groups. The results of the test were, $\chi^2(1, N=97) = 2.82, p = .093$.

Ohio’s two-year college boards have decreased in representation of African Americans 1.5% (from 6.2% in 1987 to 4.7% in 2003) while Hispanics have increased 1%, (from .0% in 1987 to 1.0% in 2003) over the previous Hill trustee demographic
survey. Asian-Americans and Native Americans are assumed in the category of Other in Hill’s 1987 study and compare with the current study increasing 2.2% (from 3.0 in 1987 to 5.2 in 2003). Despite these small changes there is no significant difference in race between the 1989 and 2003 two-year college trustees.

\( H_{01b} \) There is no significant difference between the gender of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

The 2003 trustees were compared with Hill’s 1989 trustees using a chi-square test to assess if there was a significant change in their gender. Using a chi-square test there was no significant difference between the 2003 and 1989 groups. The results of the test were, \( \chi^2 (1, N=97) = .630, \ p = .428. \)

Ohio’s two-year college trustees have a decrease of 3.5% for women on its boards as compared to 1987 data, indicating a small reduction that was not significantly different. The 2003 data shows 78.1% or 75 trustees that responded were male while the 1987 research yielded 74.6% or 97 trustees reported being male. In 2003, 21.9% or 21 trustees reported being female while the 1989 study reported 25.4% or 33 trustees reported as female. There was no significant difference in the gender of trustees from the 1989 study to the 2003 research.

\( H_{01c} \) There is no significant difference between the age of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

The 2003 trustees were compared with Hill’s 1989 trustees using a chi-square test to assess if there was a significant change in their age. Hill’s data set presented age in five categories; 29 or below, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 or older, the 2003 trustee age data was altered to four categories including; 39 or below, 40-49, 50-59 and 60 or older.
The comparison was then made as to the difference between the 2003 and 1989 trustee group with regards to age. Using a chi-square test there was a significant difference between the 2003 and 1989 groups. The results of the test were, $\chi^2(3, N=97) = 15.929, p = .001$.

Ohio’s two-year trustees age categories had a significant difference in the under 39 category, this category decreased in 2003 to 1% versus the 10.6% or 14 trustees in 1987 that were in the under 39 category. Another significant difference in age came in the 50-59 age group, showing an increase of 12.5% over the trustee group from 1987, thus translating into a significant number trustees of being between the ages of 40-59 serving Ohio’s two year colleges.

$H_{0,ld}$ There is no significant difference between the educational level of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.

The 2003 trustees were compared with Hill’s 1989 trustees using a chi-square test to assess if there was a significant change in their educational level. Hill’s data set presented educational level in six categories; non-degree, associate, bachelor, masters, doctorate and professional and the 2003 trustee age data had an additional category of post doctoral work which was collapsed into the doctorate level for comparison. The comparison was then made as to the difference between the 2003 and 1989 trustee group with regards to educational level. Using a chi-square test there was a significant difference between the 2003 and 1989 groups. The results of the test were, $\chi^2(5, N=97) = 11.618, p = .040$.

Educational level of two-year college trustees in Hill’s 1989 study, 38.6% or 51 trustees held Bachelor’s degrees, 22.7% or 30 held Master’s degrees, 3.8% doctorates and
15.9% professional degrees. The current study indicates 49% or 48 hold Bachelor’s degrees, 21.4% or 21 hold Master’s degrees, 7.1% doctorates and 9.2% professional degrees. In 1987 18.9% of the trustees had not achieved a Bachelors degree in contrast to 13.3% in the current research. The current research supports fewer trustees have no college education, a larger percentage hold bachelors degrees, while fewer hold professional degrees.

\[H^0\text{c} \quad \text{There is no significant difference between the appointment process of trustees in 1989 and trustees in 2003.}\]

The 2003 trustees were compared with Hill’s 1989 study using a chi-square test to assess if there was a significant change in their appointment process. Using a chi-square test there was a significant difference between the 2003 and 1987 groups. The results of the test were, \(\chi^2(2, N=97) = 47.261, p = .000\).

The appointment process in Hill’s 1989 that was used most often was the Caucus of school board appointees which was 49.2% of two year college appointments in 1987, in the 2003 research only 17.3% or 17 two year college trustees had been appointed through the aforementioned process. This is due in large part to the movement in Ohio in the 1990’s of moving our technical colleges to state community colleges. Governor appointment was the second largest group of appointees in 1987 with 43.2% or 56 trustees being named to the board in that manner, but in the 2003 research there was a 20% increase in this appointment type bringing 63.3% or 62 trustees being named to their current board positions through the governor, which again supports the movement of Ohio’s two year colleges from technical colleges to state community colleges. The 2003 research also shows the movement of our colleges to levy supported “community
colleges” with 19.4% or 19 trustees in 2003 compared with 7.6% or ten trustees in 1987 being named to the college board through the county commissioners. Ohio’s 23 two year colleges have changed; Ohio only has four technical colleges today, in their focus over the past 15 years, thus creating a significant difference in the way two year college trustees are appointed to the board.

Second Research Question

The second research question dealt specifically with trustees’ perception of beneficial areas of training and needed areas of additional training. Tables 12 to 14 provide percent of response for trustee perceptions of their roles and functions, the information received prior to their activity on the board, quality and type of training, and quality of information about the institution they serve.

Table 12 summarizes the responses to how trustees perceived initial information and training about the trustee position. When asked if comprehensive trustee orientation/training was provided, 58.2% of trustees agreed or strongly agreed that training was received. In contrast 24.5% of trustees disagreed and 2% strongly disagreed that comprehensive trustee orientation/training was provided. When asked if the authority of the board was clearly defined, 66.4% agreed or strongly disagreed and 18.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed that compressive trustee orientation/training was provided. When asked if the authority of the board was clearly defined, 66.4% agreed or strongly disagreed and 18.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed that compressive trustee orientation/training was provided. When asked of the trustee was given an accurate estimate of time and energy demanded of the job, 63.3% agreed that expectations had been clearly defined, while 17.3% disagreed with 5.1% that strongly disagreed that an accurate estimate of time and energy were provided. An Initial Training (IT) scale was developed of the three survey questions and examined for a significant difference between the trustee’s perception of
their own information regarding higher education issues and their perception of their knowledge of their institution.

Table 12 also summarizes the responses to how trustees perceived ongoing information and training to support their trustee position. When asked if yearly Board training on important issues was provided, 67.7% agreed or strongly agreed, while 17.7% disagreed that yearly board training on important issues was provided.

Training of trustees through access to associations was examined and a resounding 90.8% of respondents felt that access to associations was encouraged by their campuses. Of those responding 7.1% stated neither agree nor disagree and only 2.0% disagreed that access to associations was encouraged by their colleges.

Additionally, the research looked at the trustees’ access to the annual ACCT conference with 64.5% of the trustees agreeing that the conference was helpful, while 28.9% stated neither agree nor disagree and 5.3% disagreed that the ACCT conference was helpful.

The Ohio Association of Community Colleges is a state organization providing ongoing training to trustees on situational topics and also offering two conferences a year. The data reports that 72.3% of the trustees agree or strongly agreed that the OACC conferences are helpful, while 25.3% stated neither agree nor disagree and 2.4% disagreed that the conferences were helpful.

The Ohio Board of Regents training for trustees was evaluated with 63.3% of the respondents stating the OBR trustee training was helpful, while 36.7% disagreed that the training by OBR was helpful.
An Ongoing Training (OT) scale of the five survey question was developed and examined for a significant difference between the trustee’s perception of their own information regarding higher education issues and their perception of their knowledge of their institution.

Table 12

*Summary of Trustees Perception of Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training area</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree or Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Trustee Orientation/Training</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority is Defined</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate Estimate of Time and Energy</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Board Training</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Regional and National Association</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT Conference</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OACC Conference</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents Biennial Trustee Training</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further investigation of the two training scales (IT and OT) with regards to institution type was done using independent sample t-tests to see if there was a significant difference between perception of training and type of institution of trustee. Tables 13 to 15 describe and summarize the results of the IT and OT with regards to institution type. There was no significant difference found between trustees’ perceptions of either IT or OT and type of institution of trustee.

Table 13

*Initial Training Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidy Institution</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

*Ongoing Training Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidy Institution</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*T-Test of Difference Between Type of Institution and Initial Training or Ongoing Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific areas of training the respondents received that they felt were beneficial are summarized in Table 16. Over sixty-nine percent (69.4%) of respondents reported that training on Finance/State Funding Issues was most beneficial, followed by 66.3% indicating training on Legislative Issues was beneficial.

Table 16

*Areas of Training Beneficial to Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance/State Funding Issues</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Issues that affect College</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Goal Setting</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of Community Colleges</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and Working with State Elected Officials</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were also asked what areas of training in which they would like to participate. Table 17 summarizes their responses. Highest, with 52.0% of respondents indicating a desire to participate in training on the Future Of Community Colleges, followed by 43.9% indicating a desire to participate in training on State Funding. Respondents also included a desire to participate in training on Planning and Goal Setting, Legislative Issues, Finance, and Assessment and Evaluation.

Table 17

Areas of Training Respondents Desired Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future of Community Colleges</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding of College</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Goal Setting</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Issues</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis Two**

In addressing the second research question four hypotheses were generated. The first two hypotheses looked at the difference between the type of two year college and level of knowledge of the trustees and involvement of the trustees. A scale of the five survey question was developed to measure trustee perception of their understanding of their college (UC) they served. The question included perceptions of their understanding of: the policies and procedures; the unique population served; obstacles affecting students’ success; student expectations and factors contributing to student success.

$H_{02a}$ There will be no significant difference between level of knowledge of trustees by the type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college)

An independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the knowledge of the college (UC) scale and the type of two year college. Significance was set at the .05 level. Tables 18 and 19 summarize the results. The UC scale had no significant difference by the type of two year college.
Table 18

*Knowledge of College Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidy Institution</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

*T-Test of Difference Between Type of Institution and Knowledge of College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A scale of the three survey questions was developed to measure trustee perception of their involvement in campus governance (ICG). The questions included perceptions of the trustee’s understanding of: long range goals of the institution; review of institutions vision and mission and participation of political advocacy.

H$_{02b}$ There will be no significant difference between level of involvement of trustee by type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college).

An independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the involvement of the college (ICG) scale and the type of two year
college. Significance was set at the .05 level. Tables 20 and 21 summarize the results.

The ICG scale had no significant difference between the type of two year colleges.

Table 20

*Involvement in College Trustee Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidy Institution</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*T-Test of Difference Between Type of Institution and Involvement in College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A scale of four survey questions was developed to measure trustee perception of higher education information (HEI) received from the college and external sources such as the Ohio Association of Community Colleges and other associations.

$H_{02c}$ There will be no significant difference between perceptions of higher education information by the type of two year college (technical, community college and state community college).

Independent sample t-tests were conducted to evaluate the hypothesis of the significance between the perception of higher education (HEI) information by type of two
year college. Significance was set at the .05 level. Tables 22 and 23 summarize the results. The HEI scale did not have a significant difference between the type of two year college.
Table 22

*Perception of Higher Education Information of College Trustee Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Institution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidy Institution</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

*T-Test of Difference Between Type of Institution and Perception of Higher Education Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_{02d} \] There will be no significant relationship between level of training and the level of knowledge of college trustees.

Correlation coefficients were computed between both the IT and OT scales and the various knowledge scales. All three knowledge scales (HEI, UC, ICC) were significantly correlated with initial training (IT). Using a Pearson-product correlation a p-value of less than .05 was required for significance. The result was that the IT scale was significantly correlated with the higher education information received (HEI), \( r = .222, p = .05 \). In addition, the IT scale was significantly correlated with their perception of their knowledge and understanding of their college (UC), \( r = .489, p = .01 \). Lastly, the IT scale was significantly correlated with their perception of the input from college.
constituents (ICC), $r = .409, p = .01$. Only the trustee’s perception of information about higher education issues (HEI scale) was correlated with ongoing training, $r = .406, p = .01$. Initial training clearly demonstrates a significant difference between the trustee’s perception of their level of knowledge.

One scale was developed to measure trustees’ perception of their involvement in the college and its governance (ICG). The ICG scale consisted of three survey questions that included the trustees understanding of the long range goals and objectives of the college, strategic planning and political advocacy.

$H_{02e}$ There will be no significant difference between level of training and the level of involvement of college trustees.

Correlation coefficients were computed between both the IT and OT scales and the ICG scale. Using a Pearson-product correlation a p-value of less than .05 was required for significance. The result was that the IT scale was significantly correlated with the trustee’s involvement in the college (ICG), $r = .438, p = .01$. There was no significance found between ongoing training and the ICG scale.

*Perception of Trustees: Information*

Trustees reported satisfaction with information they receive with 76.3% indicating they agree (61.9%) or strongly agree (14.4%) that overall they feel well informed about higher education issues. Only 12.4% indicated that they disagreed that they were well informed. Data illustrating how the respondents perceived specific information helpful to their role as trustees are summarized in Table 24.
Table 24

*Perception of Helpfulness of Information Received by Ohio’s Two-Year Trustees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. President</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ACCT</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. OACC</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ohio Board of Regents</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information from the College Presidents received the highest ranking with 41.8% indicating they strongly agree that they receive helpful information on higher education issues from the college President. The Ohio Board of Regents was ranked lowest with 21.0% of respondents indicating that they strongly disagreed (2.1%) or disagreed (18.9%) that they receive helpful information on higher education issues from the Ohio Board of Regents.

*Perception of Trustees: Understanding of College*

Data illustrating how the respondents perceived they understood key issues that impact their role as trustees are summarized in Table 25.
Table 25

Perception of Understanding of Key Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree or Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/ Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Policies and Procedures Manual</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unique Population Served</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Obstacles that Affect</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student Expectations</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Factors that contribute to student success</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding the policies and procedures manual that governs the institution and student expectations received the lowest ratings with trustees reporting that they disagree or strongly disagree at 13.7% and 8.3% respectively. Overall, respondents indicated a strong understanding of key issues with all five areas reporting over 75% of trustees agree or strongly agree that they understand key issues.

Perception of Trustees: Input from College Constituents
Data illustrating how the respondents perceived they receive input from college constituents in their role as trustees are summarized in Table 26.

Table 26

Perception of Input from College Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student Input</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Faculty Input</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Staff Input</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administration Input</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Community Input</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student and faculty input were rated lowest by the respondents with 27.3% and 24.0% reporting disagree or strongly disagree respectively. Respondents agreed or strongly agreed that student input was adequate only at a 35.8% rate and faculty input was adequate only at a 55.2% rate. Administration input was ranked highest with
respondents indicating 72.2% agree or strongly agree that administrative input is adequate.

Perception of Trustees: Evaluation

Trustees reported high satisfaction in the effectiveness of their evaluation of the President with 82.6% indicating they agree (52.0%) or strongly agree (30.6%). Only 10.2% indicated that they disagreed (10.2%) or strongly disagreed (2.0%) that the evaluation of the President was effective. Trustees reported more moderate satisfaction with the Board’s evaluation procedure. One and one tenth percent indicated they strongly disagree, 10.9% disagreed, 20.7% neither agreed nor disagreed, 47.8% agreed and 19.6% indicated they strongly agreed that the Board’s evaluation procedure is effective.

Perception of Trustees: Governance

Data illustrating how the respondents perceived their involvement of college governance in their role as trustees are summarized in Table 27.
Table 27

*Perception of Involvement in College Governance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a. Understand Long-Range Goals**
  - 0 0.0 1 1.0 5 5.1 64 65.3 28 28.6

- **b. Review Vision and Mission**
  - 3 3.2 10 10.8 7 7.5 49 52.7 24 25.8

- **c. Participate in Political Activities**
  - 0 0.0 11 11.7 19 20.2 44 44.7 22 23.4

Trustees reported high satisfaction in their understanding of the long range goals and objective of the institution with 93.9% indicating they agree (65.3%) or strongly agree (28.6%). Only 1.0% indicated that they disagreed and no one strongly disagreed.

Trustees reported that they participate in annual review of vision and mission of institution with 78.5% saying they agree (52.7%) or strongly agree (25.8%). Fourteen percent reported that they either disagree (10.8%) or strongly disagree (3.1%) that they participate in review of the institution’s vision and mission annually.

Trustees reported high levels of political advocacy for their institutions with 68.1% indicating they agree (44.7%) or strongly agree (23.4%). Only 11.7% indicated that they disagreed and no one strongly disagreed.
Third Research Question

The third research question dealt specifically with trustees’ perception of their role and responsibility as a board member in knowledge of expectations, constituents served, the evaluation process and strategic planning of their institution. Tables 28 summarize the responses for trustee perceptions of their level of knowledge of information: on higher education issues; of students, faculty, administration, staff and community of institution; the role they play in evaluation of the president; and their political involvement. When asked their perception of being informed about higher education issues that support their trustee position, 76.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they were informed and 12.4% disagreed.

When asked about the trustee’s perception of the level of input from the community the college serves, 61.9% agreed or strongly agreed that they received adequate input, while 28.9% chose neither agree or disagree and 9.3% disagreed that adequate input was received from the community.

When asked about the trustee’s perception of the effectiveness of the evaluation procedure of the president by the trustees, 82.6% agreed or strongly agreed that evaluation was effective, while 10.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked about the trustee’s perception of their participation and political advocacy on behalf of the college they served, 68.1% agreed or strongly agreed that they participate in political advocacy on behalf of the college, 20.2% neither agree or disagree and 11.7% disagree that they participate in political advocacy.
Table 28

**Summary of Trustees’ Perception of Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Informed on Higher Education Issues</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Input from Community</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Evaluation of President</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Political Advocacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results of Hypothesis Three**

\[ H_{03a} \] There is no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of knowledge of trustee.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between length of service of president and the reported level of knowledge of trustee (UC). The independent variable, the length of service of president included 5 levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years and greater than 20 years. The dependent variable was the level of knowledge reported by the trustee (UC). There was no significance interaction found. Descriptive statistics for level of knowledge by president’s tenure are in Table 29 and the ANOVA is in Table 30.


Table 29

*Level of Knowledge by Presidents Tenure Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Served by President</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

*Analysis of Variance for Level of Knowledge by Tenure of President*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of term</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>543.96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H_{03b} There will be no significant difference between length of service of presidents and the reported level of involvement of trustee.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between length of service of president and the reported level of Involvement of trustee (ICG). The independent variable, the length of service of president included 5 levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years and greater than 20 years. The dependent
variable was the level of involvement reported by the trustee (ICG). There was no significance interaction found. Descriptive statistics for level of involvement by president’s tenure are in Table 31 and the ANOVA is in Table 32.

Table 31

*Level of Involvement by Presidents Tenure Descriptive Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Served by President</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

*Analysis of Variance for Level of Involvement by Tenure of President*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of term</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>348.62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
Summary, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter is the conclusion of the study looking at the perceptions of two year college trustees as it relates to their performance of their duties and the education provided and received. In this chapter there will be a summary of the research, a summary of the findings, the conclusions and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Research

The current study surveyed all two year colleges in Ohio in an attempt to distinguish how the profile of the trustee progressed or changed from Hill 1989 study. In addition to looking at the demographics of the two year trustee the second aspect of the current research was to evaluate the training trustees receive and its impact on their participation and knowledge of institutions served. The two-year college campus is a rapidly evolving organizational structure. College vision and mission are driving the evolution. In addition, public policy is playing a key role in refining two-year college curriculum and educational success. The former slow moving decisions making philosophy of two year colleges is being transformed into a rapid response philosophy that is able to respond rapidly to ever changing needs of the community.

The trustee's perceptions of their roles and responsibilities are changing. Through trustee orientation and training programs, trustees can better define their roles and receive information that can help them to better carry out their responsibilities. Through membership in state and national trustee associations, trustees can have access to
valuable resources that are there to assist them while they carry out their responsibilities. The training can also provide the trustee with a better understanding of the national movement of two-year colleges and how that collaborates with the state's goals for two-year colleges.

Trustees have a great responsibility; they have fiduciary duty to run a public entity. Two-year colleges are constantly being assessed on their performance. Through trustee resources, trustees can get a better understanding of how their college measures up to the standards. In times of strict fiscal policy, sound assessment can be very important. Trustees need to understand the assessment process and its results. All areas of college operations should have effective assessment plans.

Despite the fact that trustee selection is usually a political process, the chosen trustee can be given tools and information that will smooth the transition into the board and provide the framework for fruitful trusteeship. Trustees are only successful if they continually seek information, are open to new ideas, and engage in ongoing education.

Three key aspects were the focus of the current research: (a) compare and partially replicate the demographic data of the 1989 Trustee profile presented by J.W. Hill to the 2003 trustee data from the current study, including personal, career and educational characteristics of the trustees of Ohio’s two year college system. (b) the study explored trustee training and their perceived needs in training. (c) investigate the self reported perceptions of trustees as they understand the nature of their roles, the depth and breadth of their knowledge and responsibilities.
The study was descriptive, comparative survey research, which identified the personal, educational and career characteristics of two-year college trustees. The research also provided a glimpse of the perceived roles and responsibilities of the trustees.

Summary of Findings

First Research Question

The first research question addressed the current profile and characteristics of trustees of two-year community colleges in Ohio and if there has been any significant change in demographics since the 1989 Hill study. Sixteen years have passed and the face of the two year college trustee has changed very little. The majority of trustees are over the age of 50, white and male. The state of Ohio in 2000, has a population of which 16% are non-white/Caucasian, 51% are female and the community college student population is clearly serves a female and minority population.

Educationally two year college trustees have strong higher education experience with over 85% holding a bachelor degree or higher and over 16% with either a doctoral or professional degree. In addition, 38% of two year college trustees have personally attended, therefore bringing personal experience as a student of a two-year community college to their job as trustee.

Across Ohio, the two year trustees live in the area that the college serves. The Technical College respondents, not surprising were all from rural locations, and urban institutions from major urban centers and surrounding suburban communities.

Second Research Question

Training for trustees was easily distinguished between initial training and ongoing training. Over 40% of respondents did not receive any initial training or orientation to
the expectations and role of trusteeship for the institution. One impact of the lack of initial training is over a quarter of the respondents questioned the authority of the board. On going training was provided in over two thirds of the institutions, yet over 90% of trustees indicated they had access and were encouraged to participate in outside training through state and national associations. Whether this was actively pursued would demand further study. Two thirds of trustees that did attend the ACCT conference, did indicate it was helpful and over 70% indicated that OACC conference was helpful, and over 60% of those who attended the OBR biennial training felt it was helpful.

Key areas of training respondents felt were beneficial were in the areas of: finance, legislative issues, and ethical/legal issues. When asked what areas trustees wanted additional training, overwhelming the viability and strategic management of two year colleges was at the top of their request. Training on the future of community colleges, state funding, planning and goal setting, were three key areas that respondents felt necessary for future training in their role as a two year college trustee.

Third Research Question

Trustee’s knowledge of the role and responsibility as a board member and the institution served provided much information. Over 75% of the trustees, felt informed about higher education issues that would impact their institution. Yet, when asked about their perception of input from constituents of the institutions they serve, almost 40 % felt the input was inadequate. In contrast, over 80% felt they had an effective evaluation procedure of the president.
Limitations of the role of the trustees as defined by participation in political advocacy was evident. Over one third of the trustees did not participate in political advocacy on behalf of the institution they serve.

An interesting observation that tied the second and third research questions together was that trustee knowledge of their institution was significantly related to ongoing training.

**Conclusions**

The face of the two year college trustee has changed little in over 15 years, while the demographic face of the students in higher education has changed significantly. From 1987 to 2003, little change in the two year college trustee can be seen in race, age and gender. The two year college trustee is overwhelmingly older (approximately two thirds are 50-69 years of age), white/Caucasian (over 89%), and male (over 75%). In contrast, students pursuing secondary education are showing increased demographics in racial diversity, age and gender. With racial and gender equality having been a focus of private and public sector arenas over the past forty years it is essential that key leadership of higher education reflects this emphasis in diversity. Diversity brings to the table a better understanding of needs of citizenry being served. As can be seen with the significant change in boards of industries that serve and support higher education (private and government educational finance, state governing boards, and service companies that support the infrastructure of the institutions) Governing boards of two year colleges must be more aggressive in achieving the diversity that better understands the constituents that it serves.
The unique niche that two year colleges serve and their ability to deliver educational services to meet the demand for flexibility of students and industry, also must be understood by governing board members. With over a third (37.8%) of the two year college trustees having personally attended institutions like those they serve, clearly they bring to the board decision making a more in depth understanding of the institutions served. Two year colleges and state appointing agencies need to continue to be vigilant that a key component of board members must have personal or very close experience within the two year college arena.

The appointment process of board of trustees for two year colleges must make a paradigm shift that better reflects diversity in institutional leadership. This can be accomplished at multiple levels; institutions must better identify minority individuals within the community for future board of trustee positions. This can be achieved with the institution of community advisory boards that serve specific foci at the two year college. For example, an advisory board for student services might consist of mental health professionals, medical professionals, performing art professionals, etc; academic advisory boards might include local business leaders, government leaders, and four year college leadership. These advisory boards offer two year colleges the opportunity to see preview potential board of trustees prospects. State and two year college administrators could resource local political parties to identify diverse community members who could be potential candidates for board appointment.

Training of two year college trustees clearly fell into two distinct categories: initial training and ongoing training. Training was clearly valuable to trustee members with ongoing training as a key predictor of trustee involvement and knowledge of their
institution. In any organization training is essential to supporting individuals in making well-informed and strategic decisions to achieve success in a dynamic environment. The current study found, approximately one fourth of the trustees indicated no comprehensive trustee orientation was provided. Two year college and state leadership must put measures in place to ensure that initial training and clear definitions of roles and responsibilities of trustees are initially provided for new trustees. Almost twenty percent (18.3%) of the trustees reported the authority of the board was not clearly defined and over twenty percent (23.4%) felt the amount of time and commitment to the board position was not initially accurately defined.

Trustees reported on going training was provided over two thirds of the time (67.7%), ongoing training included: institution provided retreats and education, as well as access association conferences and training. The key national association for two year college trustees Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), which provides ongoing legislative research and other support materials for the leadership of two year colleges; the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) and the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) were indicated by approximately two thirds of trustees as being valuable in providing information and training that enhanced the leadership for the trustees in two year colleges. Trustee members reported that ACCT, OACC, and OBR were helpful in providing on going training, 64.5%, 72.3% and 63.3% of the time.

The current study also asked respondents to identify areas of training that trustees perceived would be beneficial. Specifically identified with over fifty percent of respondents indicating a desire to participate included: finance/state funding, legislative issues facing college, an ethics. Additionally, over one third of respondents indicated a
desire to participate in training in the following areas: future of community colleges, advocacy and working with state and local officials and assessment and evaluation processes. With respondents clearly asking for information and professional development in so many key areas, board of trustee members clearly know that the role of the board of trustees is one that needs continual training and in depth understanding of leadership best practices.

National, state and local leadership must recommit to new models for providing all levels of training for their trustees. Board leadership must develop at an organized orientation for new board members that give in-depth understanding of the institution and communities serves as well as the intricacies of roles and responsibilities of board members. In addition, one recommendation might be for two year board of trustees might be in the development of mentorship programs. Mentorship might be provided from former trustees, current trustees or trustees from other like or sister institutions. The ACCT, OACC and OBR could provide a coordinated structure in identifying mentors with the knowledge and time to guide new two year board of trustee members. Secondly, the board of trustees might look to faculty, administration and students to support education new trustees as to the changing needs and challenges facing all areas of the institution. Thirdly, national, state and institutional leadership must continually assess what areas of education and knowledge that will support the leadership role of trustees.

The success of the two year trustee is dependent upon the depth of knowledge as well as the advocacy of role of trustee can provide their institution. It is not surprising that President of the institution is reported (86.7%) to provide the greatest amount of helpful information for the trustee. More than two thirds of trustees indicated that ACCT
and OACC provided helpful information. Surprisingly, only approximately fifty one percent indicated information received from the Board of Regents was helpful. Trustees felt they had strong understanding of a variety of key issues including: policies and procedures, the unique population served, obstacles that affect student success, student expectations and factors that contribute to students’ success. With regards to input from the diverse constituents of the institution served, as would be expected, the administration was ranked highest in input received. Faculty and students input was received approximately fifty percent or less.

With regards to involvement in college governance trustees reported strong understanding of institutional long range goals, continual review of vision and mission and participation in political activities. Yet with regard to review of mission and vision and participation in political activities over ten percent indicated a lack of involvement. With the critical role board of trustees play in the leadership of the institutions they serve, a reporting of ten percent lack of participation is not acceptable. As with any organization involvement of leadership is key to success in dynamic and essential role that higher education plays in our society.

Areas of development of the knowledge and involvement of two year trustees should not be overlooked. First, the essential role of the Ohio Board of Regents as an important provider of information to institutions of higher education including the board of trustees must be enhanced. The Board of Regents must reevaluate its communication procedures with governing boards of two year colleges. OBR must reach governing boards of two year colleges through diverse electronic and direct communication systems, emphasizing the important information they have to provide two year college leadership. Second, with
regards to individual institutional knowledge, college leadership should explore how to more successfully include the voice of faculty and student constituents at the trustee level. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, representation of faculty and students in both formal and informal meetings with the board of trustees could be explored, as well as the opportunity for trustee interaction with faculty and students in both classroom and campus activities. Third, institutional leadership, in coordination with board leadership, must annually communicate and review the vision and mission of the institution and ways for board members to politically advocate for the institution served. Access to local, state and national decision makers must be encouraged and provided by both institutional leadership and state and national organizations.

Summary of Recommendations for Future Practice

1. Political advocacy training should be developed for all Ohio trustees. Should be a complete and yearly training provided by OACC, as well as, a component of the OBR training sessions for trustees.

2. Early identification of minority individuals within the community who show interest and would be good candidates for future board vacancies.

3. Ohio must find a better appointment process. The demographic make up of our presidents at Ohio’s 23 two year schools has changed over the past ten years to reflect the diversity of the school’s which they lead. The board of trustees however, continues to mirror the historical trends of the boards; being 50-70 year old, Caucasian, male with at least a bachelor’s degree. Ohio’s boards need to better represent the diversity of the colleges which they represent.
4. Develop mentorship programs for trustees with trustees from other like or sister institutions. OACC could also work to develop partnerships with other “like kind” colleges and create a broader mentorship program.

5. Ohio’s 23 two year schools should develop community advisory boards to seek community input and develop rapport with community citizens. This group could help with the aforementioned idea in number two above.

6. Colleges could work with local political parties to better identify community resources for trustees as it relates to the appointment process.

Recommendations for Future Research

Continual research on trustee leadership in two year colleges is essential for ensuring higher education access is provided to the broadest constituency that the of our society. Now more than ever, an educated populous is essential to keeping the United State competitive in a world where economy is dependent on technical knowledge and critical thinking. The following recommendations for future research are based upon review of the literature, outcomes and statistical significance of research findings for this study.

1. The study should be replicated for demographics incorporating the gender and ethnicity of President.

2. The study should be replicated in other states with similar structures of higher education and appointment process to validate the findings of the correlation in this study.

3. The study should be replicated to better understand appointment process and the nomination process.
4. The study should be replicated to solicit input on other areas where trustee training and education are obtained.

5. The study should be replicated to better understand the political advocacy perception among trustees. Trustees report low participation but rank it high in importance of their job.

6. The study should be replicated in 2013 to update the base line data of who are the two year college trustees of Ohio.
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APPENDIX A

Trustee Survey Instrument
All responses will be kept confidential
This survey is designed to be completed by a Two-year Community College Trustee. There is very little recent research exploring the factors that contribute to the success of the two-year trustee. The following questions will provide critical data that will allow for analysis and conversation on the important issues that affect trustees. Your specific answers will only be offered through statistical summaries and never by identifying the School or Trustee.

DESCRIBE YOUR INSTITUTION

Please check the BEST response

1. Your age is:
   - □ 20 to 29
   - □ 30 to 39
   - □ 40 to 49
   - □ 50 to 60
   - □ over 60

2. My ethnicity/race is:
   - □ Caucasian
   - □ African-American
   - □ Asian-American
   - □ Hispanic
   - □ Native American
   - □ Other

3. My gender is:
   - □ Female
   - □ Male

4. My occupation is or has primarily been:
   - □ Education
   - □ Government
   - □ Private Sector Owner, Management etc.
   - □ Banking or Finance
   - □ Legal Profession
   - □ Other Professional (Doctor, Dentist, Chiropractor, Nursing, etc.)
   - □ Other (please specify)

5. What is your level of education?
   - □ High School
   - □ Associate Degree
   - □ Bachelor’s Degree
   - □ Master’s Degree
   - □ Doctoral Degree
   - □ Post Doctoral Work
   - □ Professional Degree (MD, JD DDS, etc.)

6. Have you previously served on corporate or community boards?
   - □ No
   - □ Yes:
     If yes, how many? ______

7. How many years have you served on the community college board? ____

8. Type of public institution:
   - □ Tax levy supported
   - □ Only state support
   - □ Other (please explain)

9. Size of the institution - Fall 2001 approximate student headcount
   - □ Less than 2,499
   - □ 2,500 to 4,999
   - □ 5,000 to 9,999
   - □ 10,000 to 19,999
   - □ 20,000 to 29,999
   - □ 30,000 or more

10. Does your institution have branch campuses?
    - □ No
    - □ Yes:
      If yes, how many additional locations? ______

11. Primary location of the community college is:
    - □ Urban
    - □ Suburban
    - □ Rural

12. Other than Board Meetings, approximately how much time per month do you spend on college related activities?
    - □ 1 to 5 hours
    - □ 6 to 10 hours
    - □ 11 to 15 hours
    - □ 16 to 20 hours
    - □ over 21 hours

13. How were you appointed to the Board?
    - □ Governor Appointee
    - □ Appointed by State Governing Board
    - □ Appointed by Chancellor of District
    - □ Public Election
    - □ Other (Please explain)
For the following questions please **CIRCLE THE NUMBER** which indicates how much you **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** with each statement using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. The **authority of the Board is clearly defined** for new Board Members? (Job description, etc.)

12. New Trustees are provided with a comprehensive **Trustee Orientation**.

13. **Yearly training opportunities** are provided for Trustees.

14. **Access to state, regional and national associations** are provided for Trustees (i.e.: Association of Community College Trustees?)

15. I attend yearly **ACCT Conference**.

16. I feel I have a **strong knowledge of the institution** for which I serve on the board.

17. Prior to my board assignment, I **was told about the time and energy commitment** required for service.
18. Information given to be prior to my serving on the Board was **accurate**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

19. I understand **why students enroll**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

20. I understand the **obstacles that affect student success**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

21. I understand **student expectations of the institution**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

22. I understand what **factors contribute to student success**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

23. My Board has **an adequate written code of behavior** for Board members.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

24. I feel I receive **adequate input from students**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |

25. I feel I receive **adequate input from faculty**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | □ Don't Know
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree |
21. I feel I receive **adequate input from staff**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

22. I feel I receive **adequate input from the community**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

23. I evaluate the performance of the President.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

24. The evaluation procedure for the President is **effective**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

25. As a board member, I am evaluated annually.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

26. The Board's evaluation procedure is **effective**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Don't Know | Agree |

27. I feel I understand the long range goals and objective of the institution.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

28. I participate in review of the institution's vision and mission annually.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

29. I participate in the political process when it comes to lobbying for legislation or funding on behalf of the community college, which I serve.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

30. I receive information about legislation and funding for higher education from **ACCT**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |

31. I receive information about legislation and funding for higher education from **State Professional Association**.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly Agree | Don't Know |
Disagree          Agree

32. I receive information about legislation and funding for higher education from President.

1  2  3  4  5         □ Don’t Know
Strongly Disagree Neither Agree Strongly Agree
Disagree

33. I receive information about legislation and funding for higher education from weekly or monthly publications.

1  2  3  4  5         □ Don’t Know
Strongly Disagree Neither Agree Strongly Agree
Disagree

34. I have read policies and procedures manual that governs the institution, its faculty and staff.

1  2  3  4  5         □ Don’t Know
Strongly Disagree Neither Agree Strongly Agree
Disagree

35. I have am familiar with the policies and procedures manual that governs the institution, its faculty and staff.

1  2  3  4  5         □ Don’t Know
Strongly Disagree Neither Agree Strongly Agree
Disagree

Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to complete this survey. Your assistance is invaluable to my research. Please return the attached postcard if you would like to receive a copy of the final research report. I anticipate the research being completed by early 2003.
Appendix B

TAD Survey Form

Certificate of Completion

This certifies that Katherine Bontrager, a student at Ohio University, has completed the Survey of Earned Doctorates on 4/29/2008.

If required you may print this certificate (press Ctrl-P) and present it to your graduate school to show completion of the Survey of Earned Doctorates.
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