EVALUATION OF THE BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS

OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

by

John Joe Mitchell

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

_____
W. R. Sullins, Chairman

_____   _____
M. David Alexander   L. L. McCluskey

_____   _____
W. E. Lavery   Don G. Creamer

May, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher appreciates the assistance of the Association of
Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities and the presidents and
trustees of institutions participating in this study. Their
assistance and cooperation made this study possible.

Special thanks are extended to Chairman W. Robert Sullins, M.
David Alexander, Charles A. Atwell, Don C. Creamer, William E. Lavery,
Lawrence McCluskey, and Wayne M. Worner for their guidance, interest,
support and encouragement during the researcher's program of study and
dissertation.

Appreciation also is extended to Patricia E. Kinder whose help
and interest in the preparation of this manuscript has been
unswerving. Finally, thanks to my wife, Kendal, and son, John, for
their patience and support throughout the program of study and
dissertation. Their support brought this project to a successful
conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

v

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of the lay governing board is well established in
American higher education. The members of these boards,
generally called trustees, are charged with "holding something valuable
in trust--the classrooms, the libraries, the laboratories, the
dormitories, the complex interrelationship of students and faculty, the
institution itself--for high purposes and benefits . . . " (Heilbron,
1973, p. 3). The "something valuable" held in trust varies today from
small rural religious institutions with few students, courses and
employees to the multiversities with thousands of students, courses and
employees.

Just as the size and complexity of institutions vary greatly,
so does the number of trustees on their governing boards.
Some boards have as few as three members while others may
have as many as 35 or more (Heilbron, 1973). The University of
California, for example, is governed by a 25 member Board of
Regents; Soumi College in Michigan has 32 trustees, and Longwood
College, Virginia, has nine.

Through the years, the role and responsibilities of trustees
have changed to reflect the various changes that have occurred
in American higher education. As institutions became more complex,
the problems faced by trustees also became more complex. Specifically,
since the 1960s, the role of the trustees has shifted from a passive role

to one of greater involvement in the governance of the institution (Spangler, 1979). And, more recently, because of economic problems, declining enrollments, and pressures from external constituencies, boards are more involved in details of finance, budgeting, tuition and analytical management.

The growth years of the 1960s and 1970s created extensive demands on the education system for expanded services in an inflationary economy only to be followed in the early 1980s with a declining student base and a highly volatile economy. Today, trustees throughout the nation are facing problems relating to declining funds, fluctuating interest rates, uncertain federal and state support, lessened public confidence, increased faculty concerns, and shifting student interests as the job market reacts to economic forces. As a result, expanded involvement in institutional governance requires a greater understanding by trustees of a wide range of areas of importance to the institutions.

How effective trustees have been in handling the problems and issues with which they must work varies widely among institutions. A few institutions have closed or merged with other colleges and universities while others have become major academic research institutions with national and international reputations. Clearly, trustees alone cannot be credited with the success or blamed for the failure of an institution. They are, however, responsible for the governance of an institution, and consequently they make many of the decisions on which the survival of an institution depends.

Much of the success and failure of institutions and their governing boards has been brought to the public's attention through the media. Although media attention has focused on public institutions because their deliberations and meetings are generally, by law, open to the public, confusion concerning the role and responsibilities of trustees is not unique to tax-supported colleges and universities but extends to private institutions as well.

Numerous authors generally agree that trustees need assistance to understand clearly their role and responsibilities as they relate to to a specific institution as well as to trusteeship in general. According to Nason (1975), a few of the trustees should have a knowledge of the currents in our society which will affect higher education in the future, even more should have general knowledge about higher education, and all should be knowledgeable about the programs and activities at their respective institutions.

Various colleges and universities, as well as national organizations, have developed programs for trustees to provide the information and background necessary to assist them in their role as members of a governing board. Institutions have developed orientation and inservice programs designed to acquaint the trustees with the institution. National associations have offered publications and conferences which can assist trustees to better understand the current issues and trends facing higher education. In addition, some states have provided publications and workshops designed to assist trustees of public institutions not only with clarifying responsibilities but also with understanding the relationship of the state to the institution.

There are only two national associations that exist specifically to serve trustees: The Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). Although both associations provide services to members, the AGB has provided a major portion of the literature and research relating to trustee role and responsibilities. Since the 1960s, the AGB has sponsored studies to describe trustees' responsibilities and has developed various programs designed to help trustees understand the nature of trusteeship while gaining valuable background information on topics of importance which require trustee deliberation or action.

In addition to its other services relating to the orientation and inservice education of trustees, AGB offers one inservice program exclusively for its members. This program, originally entitled "AGB on Campus" and now called the "Board-Mentor Program," was established through a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. This program was designed to assist governing boards in understanding the role of trustee boards, to help board members become better informed, and to assist trustees' assessment of board performance. The program also aids boards in the development of strategies designed to "strengthen their role and enhance their effectiveness" (AGB, 1982).

Each Board-Mentor Program is individualized to fit the specific needs of the participating institution. When a college or university requests the assistance of an AGB sponsored "mentor," several mentors are recommended to the president and board by the association; and various materials, both written and visual, are made available to the

mentor and the institution. A board self study is conducted by the trustees and forwarded along with other background material to the mentor prior to a scheduled one or two day session between the mentor and the trustees. Following each program, trustees are asked to evaluate the session; the mentor also completes an evaluation for the AGB. Both evaluations are retained in the association files at the AGB national headquarters in Washington, D. C.

Statement of Problem

From 1977 until the present, the AGB Board-Mentor Program has been conducted for trustee boards representing statewide coordinating/controlling boards, boards of two-year and four-year public and private colleges or universities and graduate seminaries. Prior to the actual board mentor sessions, extensive planning of the program and preparation of mentors was completed by AGB. Following field tests with ten trustee boards in 1977, the program has been conducted at more than 150 institutions through 1985.

In late 1978, an evaluation study was completed on the program by Robert K. Carr and Thomas W. Kelly. This study included a few suggestions for change and concluded that the program was successful (Carr & Kelly, 1979). However, the Carr and Kelly study did not attempt an indepth review of the program including a review of specific strengths or weaknesses or determination of lasting impact.

Even though participating trustees and the mentors were asked to complete evaluation forms following the Board-Mentor Program, no formal

indepth evaluation has been conducted by an outside researcher for this program. As a result, little is known about the extent and nature of changes that may have resulted from participation in the program, if the resulting changes are perceived as positive, or if the program is realizing the original purposes established by AGB. This information is needed by the association to make management decisions about the future of the program.

Purpose of Study

This study assessed the extent to which the AGB Board-Mentor Program was perceived effective by participating trustees and presidents. The data collected were analyzed to detect commonalities, to determine what changes occurred as a result of participation in the program and to determine if the program meets the purposes for which it was established.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent were the purposes of the Board-Mentor Program, as described by the association, perceived important by president and trustees of participating institutions?

2. To what extent did participation in the Board-Mentor Program aid institutions in the realization of program goals?

3. To what degree was there a relationship between the extent to
    which presidents and trustees perceive the value (helpfulness) of
    the program and the stated purposes for which the program was
    initiated?

4. What general changes in the board, campus organization or
    activities can be attributed to participation in the Board-Mentor
    Program, and were these changes perceived positive by president
    and trustees?

5. What changes to make the Board-Mentor Program more effective
    were identified by presidents and trustees who participated in the
    program?

Significance and Need for the Study

Various authors, including Rauh (1959, 1969), Martorana
(1963), Herron (1969), Baldridge, Curtis, Eckey & Riley (1978), Angell
(1978), Carson (1979), Gale (1980) and Ingram (1980b), advocated the
importance of inservice education programs for trustees; various
additional studies documented the lack of activity in programs of this
nature. Rauh, both in 1959 and again in 1969, found little evidence
that educational institutions were providing trustees with information
about their role and responsibilities. Martorana (1963) came to the
same conclusion:

> Little has been done to help trustees gain better insights
> into the character and duties that they (trustees) are

> expected to perform. Until recent years, neither society at large nor the professional community provided much orientation or tangible assistance to college trustees. A trustee most often got an overview of his authority and responsibility only from the charter and bylaws of the institution. (p. v)

Herron (1969), in a study of inservice and orientation programs in selected private colleges, concluded that such programs can provide the background information to make the type of decisions necessary for excellence in institutions. He also concluded that additional studies should be conducted on the extent and type of inservice programs being conducted for trustees.

As recently as 1974, little was being done to provide inservice training to trustees. A survey done for the Association of Governing Boards in that year found that only one third of all institutions, public or private, had a systematic orientation program for new trustees. In addition, only 46% of institutions included in the study provided workshops and retreats for trustees (Ingram, 1980a). Williams (1977) found that 64% of those serving on statewide boards had no formal pretraining and those who did reported no consistency in the programs provided. Shortly after, Baldridge et al. (1978) noted the trend of trustees to become more involved in institutional affairs, requiring more sophisticated knowledge and understanding.

> Intensive training programs, workshops, and inservice experiences for trustees must provide them with background information and orientation to the unique characteristics of academic institutions, their purposes, their role in society, and their distinctiveness as professional organizations; and intensive planning sessions must be developed for trustees and academic administrators. (p. 232)

Angell (1978), Carson (1979), Gale (1980) and Ingram (1980a) all agreed that orientation and inservice education are necessary for trustees to understand their role and responsibilities. According to Ness (1981), the chief administrative officer prefers a board that is willing to update its knowledge, with each meeting agenda providing time for a discussion about issues currently facing higher education.

Although there are programs of inservice education being conducted for trustees, formally or informally, little is known about these programs or how effective these programs are in providing necessary information to trustees. This is also true of the AGB Board-Mentor Program.

Knowledge about the effects of the Board-Mentor Program is important for several reasons. First, AGB is planning to conduct retraining sessions for the program mentors. Information about the program, its objectives, and changes that may occur as a result of participation in the program will be very important to the association in planning and conducting these sessions. Second, this study will assist the association in program refinements as well as provide information which can be used in the development of new and different programs to assist trustees to understand trusteeship. Further, since over 1,000 trustee boards hold membership in AGB, additional knowledge about the Board-Mentor Program could have a positive impact on methods used to assist boards to become more effective.

Limitations of the Study

The population of this study was limited to existing institutions that participated in the AGB Board-Mentor Program during the years 1979, 1980 and 1981. Only presidents who were serving at their respective institutions at the time of the board-mentor session were included. Presidents, to whom the initial AGB contact was made, were also asked to identify only those trustees who had participated in the program at their respective institutions. Further, four presidents elected to send the questionnaires directly to their participating trustees making follow up from the researcher with respondents from those institutions impossible.

Memory of respondents was also a limiting factor, and some trustees were unable to respond fully to the questions asked. Finally, a small number of trustees were included in the sample, either who were no longer a board member or who, for various reasons, had not participated in the institutional board mentor session.

Each Board-Mentor Program varied by type of institution, mentor, special problems and opportunities, number and nature of trustees and the manner in which the program was conducted. While each program was to some degree different, the goals of the program are constant. As a result, this study is designed to measure perceived changes and the extent to which program goals were achieved, regardless of individual program format and variations.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Role and Responsibilities of Trustees.

Considerable work has been done by Nason, Herron, and others to identify the responsibilities of trustees; these responsibilities can vary depending on the nature of the institution and the purpose for which the board was established. Generally, these responsibilities can be found in the articles of incorporation contained in the constitution and bylaws of the individual state or in the articles of incorporation and bylaws of the private and special purpose institutions. Even though institution types vary, there are areas of agreement regarding the responsibilities of trustee boards.

Generally, trustees are responsible for the selection, evaluation, retention, and removal of the chief executive officer or president. In addition to the various mandated responsibilities of a board of trustees, there are informal and implied powers and responsibilities composing what C. S. Peterson (1980) refers to as "gray areas." He listed as "gray" certain areas that interrelate with responsibilities generally assigned to the president or chief executive officer, specifically, to assure fiscal integrity of the institution and to defend the autonomy of the institution. Other trustee responsibilities listed by Peterson are to select, appoint and monitor the president; serve as an advocate for the institution; interpret the campus to the public; and function as a court of last appeal.

Various other authors listed many of the same responsibilities for trustees. Several of these authors, however, noted that trustees today are facing new demands, and as a result of these demands must accept new responsibilities. Nason (1975), for example, listed clarification of purpose, preservation of independence, and self evaluation as three board responsibilities added during the past decade. Even though some confusion may exist, the courts have upheld the power of governing boards and found that they cannot abdicate this authority (Weeks, 1980).

Herron (1969), following his dissertation on inservice education programs for trustees, developed a list of fifteen basic duties and powers of trustees that reflect most college and university trustee boards in the United States. The degree of actual board involvement in these duties will vary depending on the institution. According to Herron those duties are as follows:

1. The board has the power and duty to manage and control the particular institution or institutions it is constitutionally authorized to control.

2. They must exercise control of all records, books, papers, equipment and supplies.

3. They shall have and exercise control of the use, distribution and disbursement of all funds, appropriations, gifts granted, benefit, support and maintenance or capital outlay expenditure of their institution of higher learning.

4. The board has the power to make any adjustment it thinks necessary between various departments or other related areas within the institution.

5. The board may appoint a secretary and elect a chairman to assist in the accomplishment of the purposes for which the board was established.

6. The board is empowered to establish minimum standards of achievement as a prerequisite for admission into the institution and to determine who shall be privileged to enter, to remain in, or to graduate from any of the institutions.

7. The board has the authority to adopt by laws and regulations.

8. If it is a state university, the board has the power to conduct all relationships and negotiations between the state legislature and its various committees and the several institutions.

9. The board may adopt and use in the authentication of its acts an official seal.

10. If public, the board shall keep minutes and records of its proceedings which shall be open for inspection by any citizens of the state.

11. The board shall prepare the proper reports to validate all receipts and disbursements of the institution.

12. The board shall elect the head of the institution and to contract with faculty and staff.

13. The board has the power to terminate the contract of any employee at any time for malfeasance, inefficiency, insubordination, and improper conduct.

14. The board shall serve as the Final Court of Appeal at the institution for faculty, staff, students, and administration.

15. The board has the power to grant honorary degrees to those designated. (pp. 22-23)

Baldridge (1971) outlined the responsibilities of trustees in a similar manner with the primary duty being the employment and possible dismissal of the president. However, he stressed fiscal responsibilities and indicated that much of the academic administration of an institution has been delegated to the faculty.

Zwingle (1979) contended that trustee responsibilities vary from institution to institution, and he divided board responsibilities into "standard expectations" and "new demands" (p. 15-16). Listed as standard expectations are the selection, retention, and replacement of the president, financial management, public relations, and physical plant maintenance and expansion. "New demands" included the clarification of institutional purpose, evaluation of performance both for the institution and the board, serving as an appeals court, and participation in community and state relations, the latter to preserve institutional independence.

The duties and responsibilities of trustees of community colleges are almost identical except for emphasis on change and on local relations. Potter (1976) wrote that the board must create a climate for innovation for the community college to meet the needs of new groups not currently being served. There is also some additional emphasis on local community relations since most community college trustees are local citizens. Pocock (1980) added fundraising as a specific responsibility; M. L. Peterson (1980) added crisis management, and McLeod (1979) cited trustees responsibilities in the area of collective bargaining.

Perhaps the most prolific writer on the subject of trustee responsibilities is John W. Nason. In addition to various articles on the subject, he is the author of a recently completed volume entitled The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards (1982). In this publication, Nason listed specific responsibilities which may vary according to type of institution but

which are common to most. According to Nason these responsibilities are to maintain the integrity of the trust, appoint the president, make certain that the institution is well managed, and to approve the budget. Also included are the ability to raise money, manage the endowment, assure adequate physical facilities, oversee the educational program, approve long range plans, serve as bridge and buffer between campus and community, preserve institutional autonomy, serve as Court of Appeal, and to be informed (pp. 19-43).

There is general agreement in the literature concerning the basic responsibilities of trustee boards. Recent literature by Peterson, Nason and others placed emphasis on less traditional responsibilities such as long range planning and performance assessment including that of the board itself. Clearly this emphasis reflects changes in the type and nature of the problems faced by trustees in recent years.

Inservice Education.

Much of the literature involving inservice programs at educational institutions is directed toward the improvement of elementary and secondary classroom teachers and administrators. During the nineteenth century, it was felt that teachers were so inexperienced and lacked such basic skills that it was necessary to provide additional training to make these teachers more effective, that they were unable to criticize their own teaching and therefore, needed direction for improvement (Ritchey, 1957). Generally speaking, teachers during that period of time were poorly prepared, and it was considered advisable to

use inservice education programs to correct the most obvious defects in the teaching profession.

It was not until the late 1920s and early 1930s that normal schools required a high school certificate as a requirement for admission to the various teacher training programs. Also during the late 1920s, the philosophy of inservice education shifted to a more human relations based effort, and the inservice activities involved not only teachers but the growth of the entire professional staff (Ritchey, 1957).

The literature on inservice education provides some basic precepts for inservice education programs. An early comprehensive volume on the subject is The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education (1957). Kinnick (1957), writing in that volume, offered a number of basic inservice education precepts or generalizations including:

> Those involved should have some part in setting up programs of inservice education, if only the privilege of voting on several plans, preferably more than two.

> Individual differences . . . should be recognized in setting up inservice education plans.

> A primary purpose of inservice programs should be the development in every participant of a sensitivity to the viewpoints of others.

> Whenever possible, inservice programs should utilize the values of informal groups within the structure of formal organization.

> Good communication at each level and between all levels . . . is necessary for the maximum success of the inservice guidelines in action.

> Time is the most pressing resource problem in inservice education.

Evaluation of inservice programs by "evidence" . . . is the best evaluation. . . . (pp. 151-152)

Parker, writing in The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education (1957), also identified a number of guidelines for inservice education:

1. People work as individuals and as members of groups on problems that are significant to them.

2. The same people who work on problems also formulate goals and plan how they will work.

3. Many opportunities are developed for people to relate themselves to each other.

4. Continuous attention is given to individual and to group problem solving processes.

5. Atmosphere is created that is conducive to building mutual respect, support, permissiveness and creativeness.

6. Multiple enriched resources are made available and are used.

7. The simplest possible means are developed to move through decisions to actions.

8. Constant encouragement is present to test and try ideas and plans in real situations.

9. Appraisal is made an integral part of inservice activities.

10. Continuous attention is given to the interrelationship of different groups.

11. The facts of individual differences among members of each group are accepted and utilized.

12. Activities are related to pertinent aspects of the current educational, cultural, political and economic scene. (pp. 103-123)

In summary, Parker stated that inservice education has a basic goal of learning, change and improvement, indicating that

something must be learned if the activities are to be effective; and therefore, the guidelines should be based, of necessity, upon sound principles of learning.

Corey (1957), stressed the relationship of inservice education to a goal, indicating that inservice education cannot be judged good or bad until its effects are related to the original goal set for the program. Lewis, Berg, Biddick, Doll, Hall, Hudson and Teel (1957) contended that the group should be the basis for inservice education and that the group should identify needs, develop goals and a plan to meet these goals. Further, Lewis et al. stated that by focusing on a group, as opposed to an individual, much of the tension generated by individual focusing is greatly reduced. In particular, there must be a climate for growth available in inservice education.

Goodlad (1957) addressed the question of the consultant in inservice education and contended that the consultant must understand the basic principles of group work, stressing honesty concerning conflicts and recommending a follow up relationship. Edelfelt and Johnson (1975), stressed that various components of the educational community have responsibility for inservice education, including institutions of higher education and professional organizations.

Harris (1980) addressed the issue of new staff members and indicated that without the proper orientation new staff members tend to adopt survival tactics, which may in the long run discourage rather than encourage new skills and competencies. Harris also contended that people are capable of learning anything if the time, conditions and

motivations are adequate; and that people learn best those things they perceive to be meaningful, purposeful and satisfying.

Harris (1980) identified four expandable methods or basic activities for inservice education sessions: brainstorming, buzz sessions, discussions and role playing. Without the use of these basic techniques, Harris indicated, the sessions involving groups will be less productive than might otherwise be the case. These four creative activities have been especially stimulating and adaptable ways of working with groups, regardless of the purpose.

In addition, Harris (1980) emphasized the importance of physical arrangements and how it can directly affect and influence a group, the importance of offering positive incentives for attendance and the necessity for goals and objectives. Harris also indicated that the most effective learning time would be in excess of 30 minutes, but not exceed four hours in length, concluding that every group will have requirements for continued inservice programs over the years.

Jalbert (1980), writing about staff development in institutions of higher education, indicated that the current emphasis is on inservice education for faculty at senior colleges and universities. Rubin and Hansen (1980) indicated that systematic planning following a needs assessment can lead to successful education change. Waterman, Andrews, Houston, Bryant, and Pankratz (1979), on the basis of testing, found that "participants rated . . . higher when more interaction and instruction were employed" (p. 37). Wood, Thompson

and Russell (1981) called for pre and post assessments for any inservice education project.

Various inservice activities for educators have been in place for many years with the emphasis shifting over that period of time from an individual to a group standpoint with a greater degree of human relations activities involved in the sessions. College and university faculties are now becoming involved in inservice education although it does not appear to be to as great a degree as has been true of the secondary and elementary systems. Administrators are also becoming involved in inservice activities directed for administrators. Boards of trustees for colleges and universities, however, with the recent exception of orientation programs for new trustees, have not been heavily involved in inservice activities to improve the effectiveness of trustee groups. There appears to be greater activity in this area as indicated by the number of institutions participating in the AGB Board-Mentor Program.

Inservice Education Programs for Trustees.

Although inservice education programs are utilized to assist trustees in understanding their role and responsibilities, a limited amount of research has been conducted in this area. Herron (1965) studied a sample of boards of private institutions and concluded that inservice education programs can provide the background information necessary to make the type of decisions leading to excellence in institutions. In his book which followed, Herron (1969) developed

twenty-eight guidelines for trustee inservice education, recommending retreats and workshops as effective formats for such programs.

Fox (1967) studied community college inservice education needs as determined by presidents and trustees and compared these perceived needs with the extent and nature of inservice methods. He concluded that inservice education should be convenient to those involved and that the programs offered should be developed from the needs, problems, and interests of those involved.

Claxton (1972) found major differences in the perceived need for inservice education between presidents and trustees. Trustees, in his study, did not perceive significant inservice needs whereas presidents responded that trustees had need of inservice education programs. This study also found that trustees were not willing to expend more than three hours per week on duties relating to trusteeship including regular board meetings, implying that sessions should be directed to trustees and be well organized within a limited time frame.

A more recent study on "The In-Service Education Needs of Mississippi Public Junior College Trustees" by Young (1981) provided additional information on trustee inservice education. Young concluded that:

1. Needs of the new trustees vary substantially from those of the more experienced trustees. Therefore, inservice activities should be addressed to differing groups within the boards to best meet educational needs.

2. Experienced trustees have relatively few inservice needs according to board chairmen. Therefore, experienced trustees should receive less consideration in the inservice program.

3. The college president bears major responsibility for trustee inservice activities.

4. Sponsors must design inservice programs to use limited time of trustees in the most efficient and effective manner.

5. The trustees' inservice education needs are continually changing. Hence, the inservice education program . . . must be evaluated periodically to keep it congruent with current needs. (p. 12)

A study conducted in 1974 for AGB found that only one third of all institutions, public or private, had systematic orientation for new trustees, and only 46% provided workshops and retreats on various topics for all trustees. As an attempt to address the need in this area the AGB has designed publications and services to assist trustee boards in orientation and inservice education programs.

Several writers have developed some questions as a brief test of assessment for trustees and their improvement. Davis (1957), in particular, asked whether the staff and faculty wanted an active board of trustees, whether the trustees--old and new--were sufficiently informed to make decisions based on facts, and did trustees have specific responsibilities suited to their experiences. Pray (1963) asked:

1. Have the trustees of the institution clearly defined its mission in understandable and cognitive terms in writing, and do they know where they wish to take it and why?

2. Is the board in its composition of skills and abilities and resources and strengths matched to the needs of the institution?

3. Are the trustees aware of generally accepted criteria for good educational management, and have they created a strong management team of administrators to wrestle with the problem of their particular institution in this particular stage of its progress . . . ?

4. Are members of the board individually committed to
    the development program of their institution as
    workers and givers? (p. 16)

These tests only scratch the surface to evaluate inservice programs for

boards of trustees.

Frantzreb (1981) stated:

> Governing boards need retreats to renew their
> convictions and commitments, to update their position of
> advocacy, to become acquainted with one another, to
> avoid the meeting clock, and to absorb the spirit of
> humaneness of the institution they serve. (p. 34)

A well defined program, according to Frantzreb, will involve thought

provoking discussion, will be set in a congenial and inspirational

environment, will mix business with pleasure, and will involve outside

personnel to bring in new ideas.

Various accounts of institutional level workshops and retreats

have appeared in such publications as Case Currents published by

the Council for Advancement and Support of Education and "AGB

Reports" published by the Association of Governing Boards for

Universities and Colleges. Flint (1981) noted that following a two day

orientation for the trustees at Lycoming College, more effective

participation of trustees occurred in a number of areas including

student recruitment, public relations and fundraising. Spencer (1979)

recounted a two day workshop for the board at Davidson College in

North Carolina. The program included spouses of trustees and utilized

various inservice methods including simulation exercises. Various

similar sessions have been conducted at Virginia Polytechnic Institute

and State University (1981), Georgetown University (1980) and George

Peabody College for Teachers (1975) to name only a few. The level of
activity in this area is unknown since few results are published.

The AGB Board-Mentor Program.

It was in recognition of a need for trustee inservice education pro-
grams to promote trustee effectiveness that the Association of Governing
Boards approached the Lilly Endowment, Inc. in 1974 with a proposal to
provide a special inservice education program for trustees. The
program was designed to educate trustees to their responsibilities and
to assist boards in self assessment and improvement. The program was
unique in that the services of the association would be taken directly to
the trustees. A key part of this proposal was the "AGB on Campus,"
subsequently named the Board-Mentor Program. Specifically, the grant
proposal stated that the program would

> assist college and university trustees in their need for
> better understanding of their proper role and
> responsibilities, give them adequate background
> information in areas in which they must set policy such
> as tenure, new curricula, collective bargaining and
> others, and provide them with the means to assess their
> performance. (AGB Proposal, 1974, p. 8)

The proposal called for a meeting of prominent education
consultants to assist in designing this program followed by the training
of mentors who would actually work with the individual trustee boards.
The grant proposal was approved by the Lilly Endowment, Inc. in
November of 1974. Funding was provided for the first three years of
the program after which it was anticipated that the program would be
self sufficient (AGB Proposal, 1974).

Following grant approval, the program was developed with the assistance of a number of consultants and experienced trustees and administrators. After the completion of training sessions for mentors, field tests were conducted in 1977 with ten institutions participating. Following field testing, the program was offered to AGB member institutions. Negotiations occurred each year to arrive at a suitable schedule and mentor for institutions to participate in the program.

Although the association recognized that each trustee board might have specific needs that require an individually designed program, the project designers anticipated that seven objectives could be accomplished through the program:

1. Greater understanding of the board's roles and responsibilities.

2. Renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose.

3. Better understanding of the institution's strengths and needs.

4. Improved president board relationships.

5. A set of priorities for strengthening board organization and by laws.

6. Ideas for improving two way communication with the board's various constituencies.

7. Greater camaraderie among board members. (AGB, 1982)

According to an association brochure describing the program (AGB, 1982), prior to the establishment of an agenda for a board mentor workshop the board was asked to conduct a self study program

using forms provided by the association. The forms were designed to address institutional organizational differences. The self study, along with various other materials, was sent to the institution's selected mentor who designed a program responsive to the assessed needs of the board. Generally, it was recommended that the president of the institution be the only administrator present. The program was scheduled for one or two days, depending on the time available, and a noncampus location was suggested. Following the program, trustees were asked to complete a program evaluation form and return to AGB; the mentor also completed a similar form. Aside from expected questions, both the trustees and the mentor were asked to state what steps the board agreed upon to increase board effectiveness.

An evaluation study was conducted by Carr and Kelly (1979) for AGB in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Board-Mentor Program. The report generally concluded that although some refinements could be made, the program's purposes were being achieved. To what degree these purposes were achieved and what changes may have resulted from participation in the program were not determined by the study.

Chapter 3

METHODS

The purpose of this study was the evaluation of the AGB Board-Mentor Program through examination of the relationship of the purposes for conducting the program with the perceived importance of these purposes by presidents and trustees, by identification of the extent and nature of changes that may be attributed to participation in the program, and by determination of the overall value of the program to participating institutions. The researcher sought to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent were the purposes of the Board-Mentor Program, as described by the association, perceived important by presidents and trustees of participating institutions?

2. To what extent did participation in the Board-Mentor Program aid institutions in the realization of program goals?

3. To what degree is there a relationship between the extent to which presidents and trustees perceive the value (helpfulness) of the program and the stated purposes for which the program was initiated?

4. What general changes to the board or campus organization can be attributed to participation in the Board-Mentor Program, and are these changes perceived positive by presidents and trustees?

5. What changes to make the Board-Mentor Program more

   effective can be identified by presidents and trustees who

   participated in the program?

To answer the five research questions, survey research
techniques were utilized to obtain respondents' perception of the
effectiveness of various aspects of the Board-Mentor Program.

Population of Study

This study was limited to institutions where the AGB Board-Mentor
Program was conducted for the period 1979-1981. To include programs
conducted more recently than 1981 would not allow sufficient time for
changes resulting from the program to be evident. Fifty-nine existing
institutions participated in the program during this time period, and
twenty-one presidents of those institutions agreed to become involved in
this study (see Table 1).

From the participating institutions, the response rate from eligible
trustees (61%) and presidents (81%) to this national study was
favorable. Two hundred trustees out of 307, representing 21
institutions responded to the survey. Of the 200 trustee responses,
twelve trustee responses indicated that: they had not participated in
the program (10), were no longer on the board (1), or returned the
uncompleted questionnaire without an identifying number (1). One
hundred eighty-eight questionnaires were included in the data analysis.

Of the 21 institutions participating, four presidents were not
eligible to participate in the study since they were not president of that

Table 1

Participants in the Board-Mentor Evaluation

| | Initial Survey | | Nonrespondent Survey |
	Trustees	Presidents	Presidents
questionnaires mailed	307	21	14[b]
usable responses	188[a]	17[b]	13
% usable responses	61.23	80.95	92.85

[a] only trustees who participated in program were eligible

[b] only presidents who were president of respective institutions
at time of program were eligible

Notes:

Figures in data analysis in Chapter 4 may vary because
of partially completed questionnaires.

number existing institutions in program 1979-1982 - 59
number institutions participating in study   - 21
number institutions in short follow up survey   - 38

particular institution at the time the Board-Mentor Program was conducted. Of the 17 presidents remaining, 15 completed usable questionnaires.

Survey Instrument

Working from the literature and with officials at AGB, a survey questionnaire was developed for trustees and presidents identified by the presidents as having participated in the Board-Mentor Program during the period covered by this study. The questionnaire was designed to gain basic information about trustees and presidents and information about their perceptions of the program needed to determine answers to the research questions. Prior to utilization, the questionnaire was reviewed for clarity and completeness by three college presidents who were not involved in the study and three previous trustees who had participated in the Board-Mentor Program but who were no longer serving as trustees of institutions involved in the study. No substantive suggestions for change were made by any reviewer, and the questionnaire was reviewed and approved by officials from AGB. The final questionnaires are shown in Appendices A and B.

Survey Procedure

Early in 1984, an introductory letter signed by Robert Gale, President of the Association, was sent to all institutions that participated in the Board-Mentor Program during the years

1979, 1980, and 1981 (see Appendix C). This letter endorsed the study to evaluate the Board-Mentor Program. It indicated that the study would consist of a questionnaire for presidents and members of their boards and would be especially helpful to them and the association.

Three enclosures accompanied the letter. First, a form was included requesting the president's agreement to participate in the study and to provide initial information for the researcher (see Appendix D). Second, a list of trustees of record was included for the applicable institution according to the records at AGB. Presidents were asked to identify the names of trustees who participated in the board mentor workshop. Third, a sample letter to be sent to trustees to encourage their participation was enclosed for approval, duplication on institutional letterhead and the president's signature (see Appendix E).

On the first enclosure, the form indicating willingness to participate in the study, the presidents were asked whether the questionnaires should be sent directly to trustees or whether the questionnaires should be sent to the president to be forwarded to trustees. Four presidents indicated that the questionnaires should be sent to them and that they would forward them to their trustees. The remainder of the presidents participating in the study elected to have the questionnaire sent directly to their trustees from the researcher. A total of twenty-one presidents indicated they and their trustees would participate in the study.

In May, 1984, questionnaires with stamped return envelopes were mailed either to the presidents to mail directly to their respective board

members or directly to trustees who had been identified by their presidents as participants in the Board-Mentor Program. Approximately five weeks later, a followup mailing, enclosing all of the original material including the applicable questionnaire and stamped return envelope, was mailed to those who had not responded to the first request. The followup did not include institutions where presidents elected to mail the questionnaire to their own board members.

Survey Instrument for Nonparticipants

Because fewer than half (21 of 59) institutions participated in this study, the researcher attempted to determine the similarity of perception of presidents who participated in the study with those presidents who did not participate. The results of this comparison can be found in chapter four. All 38 of the nonparticipating and/or nonresponding presidents were contacted. From that group, twenty-four of the current presidents were not president of their respective institutions when their trustees participated in the Board-Mentor Program. Of the fourteen current presidents who were in office at the time their college participated in the program, thirteen returned a completed abbreviated questionnaire evaluating the program (see Appendix F). One eligible president returned the questionnaire but did not complete the questions. He wrote that the program was very good but the trustees at the institution had not been receptive to the sessions because of reasons unrelated to the program.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The population of this study consisted of current presidents and
trustees of institutions both public and private, who participated in
the Association of Governing Boards Board-Mentor Program during the
years 1979, 1980 and 1981. Of the 59 eligible institutions still in
operation that participated in that program during the years mentioned
above, presidents of 21 institutions agreed to participate in this
evaluation. The presidents of those institutions who were in office at
the time the Board-Mentor Program was conducted on their campuses but
who did not respond to the original request by AGB to participate in
this study did respond to a brief questionnaire designed to determine
the degree of similarity between this group and those who had
completed the longer questionnaire. The two groups, participants
and nonparticipants, were found to be no different in any important
way. A more detailed report of this comparison is found at the end
of this chapter.

The presidency had changed in four of the 21 participating
institutions since the Board-Mentor Program was conducted on their
campuses; therefore, only 17 presidents were asked to complete the
study questionnaire. The 21 institutions are located in 13 different
states. Seven institutions conducted the Board-Mentor Program

Table 2

Participating Institutions and Numbers of
Eligible and Participating Trustees and Presidents

Institution	Trustees/ Eligible Participating	Presidents Participating
1979		
Immaculate Conception Seminary, NJ (Private)	1[b] / 1	yes
Lebanon Valley College, PA (Private)	23 / 16	no[a]
*Mary Baldwin College, VA (Private)	20 / 10	yes
Oberlin College, OH (Private)	22 / 15	no[a]
Stephens College, MO (Private)	9 / 6	no[a]
University of Evansville, IN (Private)	18 / 16	no[c]
Westmar College, IA (Private)	8 / 3	no[a]
1980		
Bryant College, RI (Private)	16 / 9	yes
Monmouth College, NJ (Private)	13 / 7	yes
Suomi College, MI (Private)	32 / 15	yes
1981		
Aquinas College, MI (Private)	18 / 14	yes
Elizabethtown College, PA (Private)	18 / 5	yes
Fontbonne College, MO (Private)	9 / 5	yes
*Glassboro State College, NJ (Public)	12 / 4	yes
Hood College, MD (Private)	19 / 15	yes
Longwood College, VA (Public)	9 / 6	yes
*Molloy College, NY (Private)	10 / 5	yes
Old Dominion University, VA (Public)	8 / 3	yes
Randolph-Macon College, VA (Private)	16 / 12	yes
*Walla Walla College, WA (Private	15 / 14	yes
Woodbury University, CA (Private)	11 / 7	yes

* Presidents elected to distribute questionnaires to trustees.

[a] Presidents not included if not at institution at time of study.

[b] Only one trustee and president remain of original group.

[c] Was eligible but did not participate.

Table 3

Geographical Distribution of
Participating Institutions

States	#Institutions
1. California	1
2. Indiana	1
3. Iowa	1
4. Maryland	1
5. Michigan	2
6. Missouri	2
7. New Jersey	3
8. New York	1
9. Ohio	1
10. Pennsylvania	2
11. Rhode Island	1
12. Virginia	4
13. Washington	1
Total	21

during 1979, three during 1980, and eleven during 1981 (see Tables 2
and 3).

Questionnaires were mailed with self addressed, stamped return
envelopes to 307 trustees and 17 presidents from the participating 21
institutions. The 17 eligible presidents were chief executive officers
of their institution at the time the Board-Mentor Program was
conducted.

Of the 307 trustees eligible, 188 (61.23%) returned usable
questionnaires. Sixteen of the 17 eligible presidents responded, and
15 (88.23%) of their returns were usable for data analysis (see Table
1).

The questionnaire for trustees consisted of 16 questions,
eight of which provided general information about the Board-Mentor
Program and eight of which specifically addressed the research
questions. The questionnaire for presidents was the same with the
exception of the first four questions which focused on the president's
administrative experience and the decision to participate in the
Board-Mentor Program. The first four questions on the trustee
questionnaire served to identify the depth of experience of the
trustees participating in the study and whether they had served as
officers of their boards (see Appendix A and Appendix B).

President and Trustee Experience

Both presidents and trustees were experienced in their
respective roles. For presidents participating in this study, the

mean years of administrative experience was 20.6, with eight being
the minimum number of years of administrative experience and 26 the
maximum. The presidents also had considerable experience serving in
their current role. The mean number of years service as presidents
of their particular institutions was 9.6, with only two presidents, or
12.5% serving as few as four years. Six had ten or more years
experience, and one president had served 24 years at the same
institution.

Trustees also were experienced as members of nonprofit boards.
Half of the trustees indicated that they had served 24 years or more as
members of nonprofit boards, including service on the particular college
board involved in this study. Seventy percent indicated that they had
34 years of combined service as a nonprofit board member. The mean
number of years served as a trustee of the institutions involved in this
study was nearly 10. Approximately 80% of those trustees responding had
served at least 13 years as a member of their college board, and 51.1%
indicated they served as a member of a corporate or business board of
directors. Also, 16% of the trustees responding had served as a
chairperson or rector of their respective boards, 24.5% as an officer
other than the chairperson or rector, and 57.4% as chairperson of a
board committee.

It is clear that the presidents and trustees participating in the
study had extensive experience in their respective roles, and that
trustees responding were experienced not only as trustees, but also as
officers of their respective boards.

Frequency of Board Meetings

Frequency of board meetings varied from a low of two times a year to ten times yearly. The mean number of yearly board meetings was slightly over four.

Board-Mentor Participation

Presidents were asked who most influenced their boards' decisions to participate in the AGB Board-Mentor Program. Nearly one-fifth (18.8%) indicated that chairpersons were the primary influence in their boards' decision to participate, and 12.5% indicated another member of their board was the power behind the decision. Seventy-five percent of the presidents indicated that they were the primary influence in their boards' decision to participate in the program.

Board-Mentor Program

Both presidents and trustees were asked whether the Board-Mentor Program was held in conjunction with a regular board meeting. Seventy-five percent of the presidents indicated the session was held separate from a regular board meeting.

Of particular interest to the Association of Governing Boards was the location for the board-mentor sessions. Trustees and presidents were asked if the meeting were held as a part of a regular board meeting or whether it was an entirely separate session and whether the location of the board-mentor session was held in a retreat mode

(at a location away from the campus) or at a meeting place on the
campus.

A majority of the presidents (56.3%) indicated that the
Board-Mentor Program was conducted away from the campus and away from
the regular board meeting location. Only one indicated that the
Board-Mentor Program was conducted on the campus at the usual board
meeting location. Four indicated that the session was held on campus
but at a location different than that of regular board meetings (see
Table 4).

A majority of presidents indicated the Board-Mentor Program was a
separate session from regular board meetings. Also, a majority of the
presidents indicated the session was held away from the campus and away
from the regular trustee meeting site.

Attendance at Sessions

Presidents were also asked to indicate what individuals other than
themselves and their trustees had attended the board-mentor session.
Seven of the 15 presidents indicated that their development officers had
attended, and seven indicated other administrators also were present
for the sessions. Three of the presidents indicated that a nontrustee
faculty member or faculty representative was present. One president
indicated that a nontrustee student was present, and one president
indicated that spouses of trustees attended during the working
sessions.

Table 4

Location of Board-Mentor Sessions

	Number	Percent
The session was held in conjunction with a regular board meeting	4	(25.0)
The session was a separate meeting not connected with a regular board meeting	12	(17.0)
The session was held away from the campus and away from the regular meeting location	9	(56.3)
The session was held away from the campus but at usual site of board meetings	0	
The session was held on the campus at usual meeting location	1	(6.3)
The session was held on the campus but not at usual meeting location	4	(25.0)

In addition to the choices offered on the questionnaire, respondents were asked to list others who were present for the sessions, and only two groups were listed more than once by those completing this section of the questionnaire. AGB staff members and ACE fellows were each listed twice as being present. Other groups or individuals listed as being in attendance at the sessions were legal counsel, alumni representatives, foundation board members.

Mentor Evaluation/Contact

Presidents and trustees were asked on a four-point scale to respond to several questions concerning the mentor (see Tables 5 and 6). About two-thirds (68.8%) of the presidents indicated that the mentor was a good discussion leader and approximately half of the trustees concurred. Sixty-two and one-half percent of the presidents indicated that the mentor appeared to be well prepared, and 52.1% of the trustees responded similarly. When asked if the mentor was appropriate for the institution, 56.3% of the presidents and 46.3% of the trustees responded affirmatively. However, three trustees did not feel the mentor was a good discussion leader, two trustees did not feel that the mentor was well prepared for the session, and three trustees did not feel that the mentor was appropriate for the institution.

Both trustees and presidents were asked to indicate whether there had been any substantive followup contact with the mentor. Nearly

Table 5

Presidents' Perceptions of Mentors
n = 15

	Agree 1	2	3	Disagree 4	Mean
Mentor selected was a good discussion leader	11(68.8)	3(18.8)	1(6.3)	0	1.333
Mentor selected was well prepared	10(62.5)	4(25.0)	1(6.3)	0	1.400
Mentor selected was appropriate for the institution	9(56.3)	5(31.3)	1(6.3)	0	1.467

Note: Figures in ( ) are percentages.

Table 6

Trustees' Perceptions of Mentors
n = 188,

	Agree 1	2	3	Disagree 4	Mean
Mentor selected was a good discussion leader	92(48.9)	47(25.0)	5(2.7)	3(1.6)	1.499
Mentor selected was well prepared	98(52.1)	39(20.7)	7(3.7)	2(1.1)	1.404
Mentor selected was appropriate for the institution	87(46.3)	47(25.0)	10(5.3)	3(1.6)	1.517

Note: Figures in ( ) are percentages.

three-fourths (73.3%) of the trustees indicated there had not been any followup of which they were aware, and 81.3% of the presidents indicated there had been no additional contact with the mentor following the board mentor session. Both trustees and presidents were asked to describe the results of any contact that may have occurred and most responses indicated that post-session contact with mentors was minimal.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question #1

To what extent are the purposes of the Board-Mentor Program, as described by the association, perceived important by presidents and trustees of participating institutions?

Seven goals of the Board-Mentor Program were identified by AGB, and presidents and trustees were asked to indicate their view of the importance of each goal on a four point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 (very important) to 4 (of no importance). Mean responses of 2 or less were considered important and 3 or more as unimportant.

When the goals were rated by presidents, three goals had a mean response of 2 or less, indicating that these program goals were perceived important by the presidents (see Table 7).
These three were:
(A) to provide guidance regarding the board's role and
responsibilities. A limited number of presidents reacted to this

Table 7

Mean Responses of Presidents and Trustees
on Importance of Goals of Board-Mentor Program

	Goal	Presidents	Trustees	t-value
A.	Provided the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	1.333	1.429	0.27
B.	Provided the board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	1.400	1.867	2.11*
C.	Provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	2.600	1.699	4.03*
D.	Improved the relationship of the board with the president	1.800	2.538	2.68*
E.	Helped the board develop priorities for strengthening the board's organization and bylaws	3.000	2.831	0.78
F.	Helped identify ideas to improve communication between the board and the various constituencies with which the board must work	2.600	2.171	1.71
G.	Helped develop better relationships among board members	2.800	2.377	1.67

*$p < .05$

goal and comments indicated that presidents could not respond for trustees.

(B) to clarify the mission and purpose of the institution

(D) To improve the board president relationship

The only program goal receiving a mean response by presidents of 3 or greater, indicating lack of importance as perceived by the presidents, was to update and revise the board's organizational structure, including bylaws.

Trustee responses (see Table 7), gave considerable importance to two of the same goals perceived important by presidents but, in addition, goal (C) was rated important to very important as well. None of the seven goals received a mean response of 3 or greater, indicating a perceived lack of importance by trustees.

The following goals had a mean of 2 or less, indicating perceived importance by trustees:

(A) to provide guidance regarding a board's role and responsibilities

(C) to assess the board's strengths and weaknesses

(B) to clarify the mission and purpose of the institution

When the mean responses of presidents and trustees were compared using independent t-Tests, responses to three goals were of significant difference (see Table 7). Goal (B), to clarify the mission and purpose of the institution (t-value of 2.11), and goal (D) to improve the board president relationship (t-value of 2.68) were perceived by presidents as more important than by trustees. Trustees perceived goal (C), to assess

the board's strengths and weaknesses (t-value of 4.03), to be more important than presidents.

Research Question #2

To what extent did participation in the Board-Mentor Program aid institutions in the realization of program goals?

Both trustees and presidents were asked to indicate on a four-point scale from 1 (very helpful) to 4 (of no assistance) whether the stated goals of the program were facilitated as a result of participation in this program (see Tables 8 and 9). More than 50% of the presidents rated goals (B), (C), (D) and (E) as helpful or very helpful.

Over 50% or more of the trustees agreed with the presidents on goals (B) and (C), but 50% or more of the trustees also rated as helpful or very helpful goals (A), (F), and (G), indicating that trustees felt that the goal of providing the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities, improved communication with its various constituencies and better relationships among board members were perceived more important by trustees than by presidents. Presidents, by rating (D) and (E) above trustee respondents, perceived those goals as more important than did the trustees.

Table 8

Presidents' Perceptions of Helpfulness of
Participation in the Board-Mentor Program to
the Facilitation of Each Goal

Goal	Very Helpful 1	2	3	No Help 4	$\bar{x}/n$
Provided board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	2 (12.5)	1 (6.3)	0	0	1.333/3
Provided board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	9 (56.3)	5 (31.3)	2 (12.5)	0	1.563/16
Provided board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	5 (31.3)	6 (37.5)	3 (18.8)	1 (6.3)	2.000/15
Improved relationship of board with president	6 (37.5)	6 (37.5)	3 (18.8)	0	1.800/15
Helped board develop priorities for strengthening board's organization and bylaws	3 (18.8)	6 (37.5)	5 (31.3)	1 (6.3)	2.267/15
Helped identify ideas to improve communication between board and various constituencies with which board must work	4 (25.0)	3 (18.8)	5 (31.3)	3 (18.8)	2.467/15
Helped develop better relationships among board members	3 (18.8)	5 (31.3)	5 (31.3)	3 (12.5)	2.400/15

Note: Figures in ( ) are percentages.

Table 9

Trustees' Perceptions of Helpfulness of
Participation in the Board-Mentor Program to
the Facilitation of Each Goal

Goal	Very Helpful 1	2	3	No Help 4	$\bar{x}/n$
Provided board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	62 (33.0)	68 (36.2)	12 (6.4)	0	1.664/143
Provided board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	52 (27.7)	69 (36.7)	22 (11.7)	5 (2.7)	1.865/148
Provided board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	51 (27.1)	66 (35.1)	23 (13.3)	7 (3.7)	1.919/147
Improved relationship of board with president	30 (16.0)	44 (23.4)	49 (26.1)	20 (10.6)	2.413/143
Helped board develop priorities for strengthening board's organization and bylaws	19 (10.1)	37 (19.7)	61 (32.4)	30 (16.0)	2.694/147
Helped identify ideas to improve communication between board and various constituencies with which board must work	29 (16.4)	67 (35.6)	34 (18.1)	16 (8.5)	2.253/146
Helped develop better relationships among board members	33 (17.6)	62 (33.0)	33 (17.6)	19 (10.1)	2.259/147

Note: Figures in ( ) are percentages.

Table 10

Comparison of Mean Responses of Presidents and Trustees on
Their Perceptions of Helpfulness of Participation in the
Board-Mentor Program in the Realization of Specific Program Goals

Goal	Presidents	Trustees	t-value
(A) Provided the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	1.333	1.664	0.86
(B) Provided the board with a- renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	1.563	1.865	1.47
(C) Provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	2.000	1.919	0.35
(D) Improved the relationship of the board with the president	1.800	2.413	2.36*
(E) Helped the board develop priorities for strengthening the board's organization and bylaws	2.267	2.694	1.68
(F) Helped identify ideas to improve communication between the board and the various constituencies with which the board must work	2.467	2.253	0.85
(G) Helped develop better relationships among board members	2.400	2.259	0.55

* $p < .05$

Mean responses of the presidents and trustees were less than 2 on three goals, indicating that these goals were perceived as helpful by both groups in the realization of program goals:

(A) provided the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities

(B) provided the board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose

(C) provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses

When independent t-tests were conducted comparing the responses of the two groups, presidents and trustees, only one goal was found to have a significantly different response between the two groups (see Table 10). Goal (D), indicating whether the program improved the relationship of the board with the president, had a t-value of 2.360, p less than .05. Presidents perceived that participation in the program had facilitated realization of that goal to a greater extent than did trustees.

Research Question #3

To what degree is there a relationship between the extent to which presidents and trustees perceive the value (helpfulness) of the program and the stated purposes for which the program was initiated?

The literature of the association, verified by the association, indicates seven goals of the Board-Mentor Program:

(A) to provide guidance regarding the board's role and responsibilities

(B) to clarify the mission and purpose of the institution

(C) to assess the board's strengths and weaknesses

(D) to improve the board president relationship

(E) to update and revise the board's organizational structure, including bylaws

(F) to gain ideas regarding communication between the board and various constituency groups

(G) to improve relationships among members of the board

Both presidents and trustees were asked to indicate on a four-point scale of 1 (very important) to 4 (of no importance) the degree of importance they placed on each of the goals of the program. In addition, both presidents and trustees were asked to indicate whether participation in the program had aided their institution in the realization of the program goals by responding on a four-point scale of 1 (very helpful) to 4 (of no assistance). The mean responses for the presidents and trustees for questionnaire item #7 and questionnaire item #8 are shown in Tables 7 (importance) and 10 (value/helpfulness).

Presidents placed the most importance in the program's ability to provide guidance regarding the board's role and responsibilities (Goal A). To update and revise the board's organizational structure, including bylaws was ranked least important by the president (see Table 7). After the conclusion of the program, Goal (A) was still perceived most helpful by presidents while improved communication between the board and the various constituencies with which the board must work

was perceived of least value. Since the mean was less than 2.5, that goal could be considered more helpful than not (see Table 10).

Trustees also perceived the goal of providing guidance regarding the board's role and responsibility as most important in determining to participate in the Board-Mentor Program. This same goal was perceived the most helpful following the completion of the program. To update and revise the board's organizational structure including bylaws, was perceived of lesser importance to the trustees in determining to participate in the program and least helpful following the program.

To determine if a relationship exists between the two response patterns of presidents and trustees on goals of the program and what was perceived helpfulness as a result of participation in the program, a test of correlation, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Test, was conducted for both groups, presidents and trustees, to questionnaire items #7 and #8 (see Table 11).

In examining the Pearson correlation coefficients of the presidents' responses on questionnaire items #7 and #8, four areas were found to have a positive correlation. For presidents, a strong correlation ($r = .7921$, $p < .05$) was found for (D), improving the board president relationship. An even stronger correlation was found on (F), gaining ideas regarding communication between the board and various constituency groups, (with $r = .9450$, $p < .05$). Also, a strong correlation, ($r = .7284$, $p < .05$) was found on improving relationships among members of the board, (G). A moderate correlation was found in

Table 11

The Correlation Between Perceived Importance of the
Goals of the Board-Mentor Program and the
Perceived Value (Helpfulness) of the Program
by Presidents and Trustees

Importance/Helpfulness of Program Goals	Presidents	Trustees
Provide/Provided the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	.5000 n=3	.4843* n=138
Provide/Provided the board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	.1516 n=15	.4261* n=143
Provide/Provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	.4900* n=14	.6088* n=144
Improve/Improved the relationship of the board with the president	.7921* n=14	.5744* n=138
Help/Helped the board develop priorities for strengthening the board's organization and bylaws	.2303 n=14	.5965* n=141
Help/Helped identify ideas to improve communication between the board and the various constituencies with which *the board must work*	.9450* n=14	.6229* n=141
Help/Helped develop better relation- ships among board members	.7284* n=14	.7551* n=142

* $p < .05$

(C) , assessing the board's strengths and weaknesses (r=.4900, $p <$ .05).

When the same test of correlation was conducted with data from trustee responses, a positive correlation occurred in all seven areas (A-G) in items #7 and #8 on the trustee questionnaire responses. Strong correlation occurred on (C), assessing the board's strengths and weaknesses (r=.6088, $p < .05$); (F), ideas regarding communication between the board's various constituency groups (r=.6229, $p < .05$); and (G), improving relationships among members of the board (r=.7551, $p < .05$). Fair to strong correlation existed with (A), improving guidance regarding the board's role and responsibilities (r=.4843, $p < .05$); (B), clarifying the mission and purpose of the institution (r=.4261, $p < .05$); (D), improving the board president relationship (r=.5744, $p < .05$); (E), updating and revising the board's organizational structure, including bylaws (r=.5965, $p < .05$).

A listing follows of program goals by strength of correlation of responses of presidents between the importance of goals and the helpfulness of the program toward the realization of the goals:

 (F) gaining ideas regarding communication between the board and various constituency groups;

 (D) improving the board president relationship;

 (G) improving relationships among members of the board

 (C) assessing the board's strengths and weaknesses

A listing follows of program goals by strength of correlation of responses of trustees between the importance of goals and the helpfulness of the program toward the realization of the goals:

(G) improving relationship among members of the board;

(F) gaining ideas regarding communication between the board and various constituency groups;

(C) assessing the board's strengths and weaknesses

(E) updating and revising the board's organizational structure, including bylaws;

(D) improving the board president relationship

(A) providing guidance regarding the board's role and responsibilities

(B) clarifying the mission and purpose of the institution

In summary, the degree of strength of the correlation of the responses of each group (presidents, trustees) indicated that there was evidence of a positive relationship between the perceived importance of each specific goal of the program and the perception of each group as to the helpfulness of program participation in realizing that goal. Generally, goals with low and high correlations were shared by both groups.

In addition, presidents and trustees were asked to indicate the extent the program helped individual trustees to become more effective and the extent that the program assisted the total board, as a unit, to operate more effectively. Both presidents and trustees were asked to

respond on a four-point scale whether the program in these two areas was "of great assistance" (1) to "of no assistance" (4). Presidents ($\bar{x}$=.1.475) and trustees ($\bar{x}$=2.020) both perceived the Board-Mentor Program helpful to individual trustee effectiveness. Both groups also perceived ($\bar{x}$=2.000 and $\bar{x}$=2.102 respectively) that the program tended to help the total board (as a unit) to operate more effectively.

Both groups were asked to respond if they would recommend this program to their respective peers. All presidents indicated that they would recommend the program to other presidents; and over 86% of the trustees indicated they would recommend the program to other trustees. Only three institutions indicated that the program was of no assistance (4) in helping individual trustees to become more effective or helping the board as a unit to operate more effectively.

In addition, trustee representatives from eleven institutions indicated that they would not recommend this program to other trustees, with the largest concentration of trustees from one board being three and the smallest, one. In no case did this represent a majority of the trustees responding from any individual institution.

Of the eleven colleges that had trustees who would not recommend the Board-Mentor Program to other trustees, four had been served by one mentor, and three had been served by another. Two of the mentors had served at seven of the institutions with dissatisfied trustees.

The mentor who worked with four of the institutions with dissatisfied trustees worked only with a total of five institutions during the three years covered by this study. Likewise, the mentor

who worked with three of the institutions with trustees who would not recommend the program had worked with only one other institution.

In summary, the perceptions of presidents and trustees are positive regarding the purposes for which the program was initiated and the helpfulness of program participation in the realization of program goals.

Research Question #4

What general changes to the board or campus organization can be attributed to participation in the Board-Mentor Program and are these changes perceived positive by presidents and trustees?

From the literature and from discussions with the association, a list of areas of possible change was identified; and presidents and trustees were asked to indicate whether change in these areas did occuras a result of the Board-Mentor Program (see Table 12). If change did occur, both groups were asked to indicate whether the impact of the change on the board/institution was perceived as positive or negative (see Table 13). The respondents were asked to indicate a positive or negative response on a four point scale with 1 - positive and 4 - negative. The areas of possible change identified are listed in Table 12.

Table 12

Proportion of Changes Identified by Presidents and
Trustees as Resulting from Board-Mentor Program Participation
on the Proportion of Each Group Identifying the Changes

Area of Change	Presidents	Trustees
1. Board Size	12.5%	20.2%
2. Orientation of New Trustees	56.3%	50.5%
3. Officers of the Board	31.3%	9.6%
4. Board Committee Structure	43.8%	29.8%
5. Regular Board Self Evaluation	31.3%	30.3%
6. Frequency of Meetings	18.8%	10.6%
7. Bylaws	50.0%	15.4%
8. Statement of Institutional Mission	12.5%	42.6%
9. Long Term Planning	68.8%	58.0%
10. Fundraising	62.5%	42.6%
11. Accountability	62.5%	33.0%
12. Understanding Board's Legal Responsibility	37.5%	28.2%
13. Personnel Changes in Administration	12.5%	12.2%
14. Administration Reorganization	12.5%	11.2%

The following areas were identified by 50% or more of the presidents responding as a change that occurred as a result of the Board-Mentor Program (see Table 12):

2. orientation of new trustees

7. bylaws

9. long term planning

10. fundraising

11. accountability

Fifty percent or more of the trustees identified the following areas as being areas that changed as a result of the Board-Mentor Program:

2. orientation of new trustees

9. long term planning

Of those areas identified as having changed as a result of the Board-Mentor Program, the respondents, both presidents and trustees, were asked to indicate on a four point scale (1 - positive to 4 - negative) whether the impact of change on the board/institution tended to be positive or negative. The following is a listing of the areas identified by presidents as having changed including the mean response on a four point scale, evaluating the positive/negative impact of the change on the board/institution (see Table 13):

2. orientation of new trustees ($\bar{x}=1.375$)

7. bylaws ($\bar{x}=1.714$)

9. long term planning ($\bar{x}=1.400$)

61

Table 13

Impact of Identified Changes (Positive/Negative) on Institution
as Perceived by Presidents and Trustees - Mean Responses

Area of Change	Presidents $\bar{x}$	Trustees $\bar{x}$
1. Board Size	1.000	1.447
2. Orientation of New Trustees	1.375	1.584
3. Officers of the Board	1.333	1.688
4. Board Committee Structure	1.167	1.600
5. Regular Board Self Evaluation	1.750	1.722
6. Frequency of Meetings	1.000	1.684
7. Bylaws	1.714	1.667
8. Statement of Institutional Mission	1.500	1.581
9. Long Term Planning	1.400	1.436
10. Fundraising	1.667	1.569
11. Accountability	1.600	1.660
12. Understanding Board's Legal Responsibility	1.167	1.636
13. Personnel Changes in Administration	2.500	1.762
14. Administration Reorganization	1.500	1.500

Note: 1 = positive, 4 = negative

10. fundraising ($\bar{x}=1.667$)

11. accountability ($\bar{x}=1.600$)

Those areas of change identified by 50% or more of the trustees and the mean response indicating the negative or positive impact of the change on the board/institution are as follows:

2. orientation of new trustees ($\bar{x}=1.584$)

9. long term planning ($\bar{x}=1.436$)

Of the 14 areas of change identified on the questionnaires, 50% or more of the presidents identified five as being areas where change occurred, with mean responses indicating that the change was perceived more positive than negative at their institutions. Fifty percent or more of the trustees, however, identified only two areas of change as having occurred as a result of the Board-Mentor Program, and the mean responses by trustees for these two areas also indicated that the change on the institution was considered positive.

Two of the same changes were identified by both presidents and trustees. The two were as follows:

2. orientation of new trustees

9. long term planning

In summary, five areas were identified as having changed by either presidents or trustees as a result of participation in the Board-Mentor Program, with only two of those areas being selected by 50% or more of both presidents and trustees. All five areas of change were perceived positive by both groups.

The questionnaires also provided an opportunity for trustees to indicate where change had taken place other than the anticipated changes listed. Twenty-six trustees and one president responded to this opportunity. Eight of the respondents reiterated changes already included on the questionnaire and to which they had already replied. However, twelve respondents indicated that one of the changes of the program had been to improve the relationship among board members, creating an esprit de corps. One respondent indicated an improved relationship with the board's constituency groups, and two respondents indicated that a change had occurred in the meetings of the executive committee and the preparations of the board agenda. One indicated that a tenure policy had resulted, one that an academic program had changed, and one that spouses were now involved in the trustee meeting activity. Of those respondents *adding areas of possible change, the one area that seems to be* repeated throughout this portion of the study was the improved communications among board members and the opportunities that the Board Mentor Program provided for these members to get to know each another better.

Also, presidents and trustees were asked to indicate from the list of areas of possible change (Question #10) one or more areas of change which were particularly successful. Eleven presidents and 85 trustees responded to this portion of the questionnaire. Twenty-five of those responses indicated that understanding the function (role) of trusteeship was a positive change which had occurred because of the

program. Other positive changes indicated by these respondents and
the number of times these changes were listed were: long-term
planning (16), increased fundraising activity (16), the development of
a strong committee system which provided opportunities for leadership
(12), better communications among board members (11), a revised
mission statement (8), and new trustee orientation sessions (7).
There were a number of other responses provided by one or two
trustees, but none of these seemed to provide any pattern and
generally covered many of the changes listed in Question #9.

Also, presidents and trustees were asked to indicate from
the possible areas of change listed which one or more areas of change
resulting from the Board-Mentor Program did not work as well as
anticipated. Four presidents and 50 trustees responded to this
question. One third (18) of the respondents indicated that none of the
changes listed in Question #9 had not worked out as well as
anticipated; however, twenty-one respondents indicated that there
had been a lack of follow through on the decisions and discussions of
the board-mentor sessions. This lack of follow through involved
various areas, including board committee structure changes, board
self evaluation, changes in board membership, fundraising,
communications and in general, a lack of follow through on actions
and plans that were developed. Four respondents felt that the new
trustee orientation program had not provided as positive a change as
had been hoped for. The remainder of the responses to this question

were singular in nature and covered various areas, no one of which stood out other than those indicated above.

Research Question #5

What changes to make the Board-Mentor Program more effective can be identified by presidents and trustees who participated in the program?

Both presidents and trustees were given opportunities on their respective questionnaires to provide additional information about the Board-Mentor Program and what changes might make this program more effective; however, only 4 presidents and 40 trustees responsed to this opportunity. A number of these responses were general in nature and did not relate to Research Question #5; however, those responses which did relate, fell into three categories: suggestions relating to postsession activities, suggestions relating to the mentor and suggestions relating to trustees.

Postsession Activities: Ten of the respondents wrote of the need to follow through with discussions and decisions that were made during the board mentor session. For example, several respondents indicated that it would be helpful to follow up with the mentor at some later time. Seven written responses indicated that the decisions which were made needed to be reviewed following the session and that a plan of action should be drafted to see that the decisions for action

were actually carried out in the institution. One respondent suggested assigning followup responsibilities to various members of the board, and several respondents indicated the need for evaluation following the program. There seemed to be a desire to follow up or continue the discussions and decisions which were made during the board mentor session rather than allow the progress made during the session to end with that special session.

Mentor: Suggestions were made about the mentor and the impact the mentor had on this program. The responses indicated that the mentor was key to the program, and it was suggested that the mentor should always visit the campus prior to the board mentor session to become familiar with the institution. Not being familiar with the institution apparently gives the impression that the mentor lacked interest in the institution. The matching of mentor to institution/board seemed to be pivotal to the program with responses indicating that the mentor must be respected by the trustees with whom that mentor works.

Trustees: Several trustees suggested that the program not be scheduled until the entire board is available to attend. The responses indicate that the Board-Mentor Program provided an excellent orientation for trustees, particularly those new to institutional trusteeship. The respondents also indicated that the Board-Mentor Program provided a welcome opportunity for trustees to interact among themselves, the result of which seemed to be that

board members who know one another well were better able to work together. Some responses indicated it was very advantageous to hold the session away from the campus, and one respondent indicated the weaker the board, the more helpful the program to the institution. Several respondents indicated the program was fine as is.

The written responses by trustees and presidents also verified the need for followup activities as a result of the program. The responses indicated that a number of decisions or plans had been made as a result of program participation, and yet, no followup activities had occurred relating to such decisions or plans. Generally, both trustees and presidents who responded to Question 16 of the questionnaire agreed the program served a useful purpose, yet suggesting the mentor, post- session activities and trustee interaction were very important to the program.

Result of Short Survey for Nonrespondents

Following analysis of the data from participating institutions, thirty-eight nonresponding/nonparticipating institutions were contacted again. Of that group, twenty-four presidents were not at the respective institutions when the Board-Mentor Program was conducted. The remaining 14 responded to an abbreviated questionnaire, and 13 of their responses were usable for analysis (see Table 14).

The responses of eligible presidents whose institutions did not participate in the long survey generally mirrored the responses of presidents who did participate. All but one of the responding presidents in this group perceived the program to be valuable (except as noted on Table 14).

Further, the mentor was perceived as a good discussion leader ($\bar{x}$ = 1.77), well prepared ($\bar{x}$ = 1.62) and appropriate for the institution ($\bar{x}$ = 1.62). All of the eligible presidents in this group would recommend the program to other presidents.

Table 14

Mean Perceptions of Presidents of Nonparticipating Institutions
to the Value (Usefulness) of the Board-Mentor Program

Goal	Short Survey Mean	Long Survey Mean	t-value
A. Provided the board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities	1.62	1.33	.53
B. Provided the board with a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose	2.23	1.56	.73
C. Provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses	2.15	2.00	1.14
D. Improved the relationship of the board with the president	2.46*	1.80	1.58
E. Helped the board develop priorities for strengthening the board's organization and bylaws	2.62*	2.27	.23
F. Helped identify ideas to improve communication between the board and the various constituencies with which the board must work	2.46	2.47	.19
G. Helped develop better relationships among board members	2.00	2.40	.76

* Two respondents rated this goal high (4) because that aspect
of their board was already accomplished in their perception;
and therefore, the program had not contributed favorably to
this aspect.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

During the past nine years, AGB has provided a member-exclusive service to colleges and universities to assist boards through a program designed to enhance trustee effectiveness. This study evaluated through survey research the AGB Board-Mentor Program utilizing responses of presidents and trustees who participated in the program during 1979, 1980 and 1981. The data collected were analyzed to determine changes that occurred as a result of participation in the program and to determine if the program met the purposes and goals for which it was established. Of the 59 existing institutions that participated in the program during 1979, 1980 and 1981, twenty-one institutions, located in different states, participated in this evaluation.

The study addressed five research questions:

1. To what extent are the purposes of the Board-Mentor Program as described by the association perceived important by presidents and trustees of participating institutions?

2. To what extent did participation in the Board-Mentor Program aid institutions in the realization of program goals?

3. To what degree is there a relationship between the extent to which presidents and trustees perceived the value (helpfulness) of the program and the stated purposes for which the program was initiated?

4. What general changes to the board or campus organization can be attributed to participation in the Board-Mentor Program, and are these changes perceived positive by presidents and trustees?

70

5. What changes to make the Board-Mentor Program
    more effective can be identified by presidents and
    trustees who participated in the program?

The findings of this study were presented by analyzing the
responses to the trustee and president questionnaires, and that
analysis, including tables and figures relating to the data are
located in detail in Chapter 4.

Findings

1. Trustees and presidents agreed that the goals of the
Board-Mentor Program were important. Presidents clearly identified as
most important the goals of clarifying the mission and purpose of the
institution, and the improvement of president-trustee relations.
Trustees assigned the greatest importance to the goal of providing
guidance regarding the board's role and responsibility, followed by
assessing the board's strengths and weaknesses.

2. Presidents and trustees agreed that participation in the
Board-Mentor Program was helpful in the realization of program goals
for participating institutions. In particular, three goals stood out by
both groups as being very helpful: providing the board with a better
understanding of its role and responsibilities, providing the board with
a renewed sense of institutional mission and purpose, and providing the
board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses.

3. One of the major goals of the Board-Mentor Program was to
provide guidance concerning the board's role and responsibility, and
the responses indicated both presidents and trustees placed

considerable importance on the program's helpfulness to provide guidance in this area. Generally speaking, all of the goals of the program were perceived more positive than negative in regard to the helpfulness of the program toward achieving the stated purposes for which the program was initiated. The majority of the participants in the program perceived the program to be very successful, with only a handful (11) of institutional responses indicating dissatisfaction with the program. These respondents seemed to place dissatisfaction with the mentor, not the program in general, even though the mentor is clearly important to the success of the program.

4. Presidents identified five areas where a positive change occurred: orientation of new trustees, bylaws, long term planning, fundraising and accountability. Trustees, on the other hand, identified two areas where positive change had occurred: orientation of new trustees and long term planning. Change did occur as a result of participation in the program, primarily in orientation of new trustees and long term planning with some indication that fundraising activities had changed. In the questionnaire responses , it was clear that in addition to these areas, trustees perceived that the goal of understanding the function and role of trusteeship had indeed changed, and this change was considered positive.

5. Both presidents and trustees indicated the need for a strengthening of post-session activities involving a monitoring of plans and discussions made during the board mentor session. There was some indication that followup contact with the mentor could be of assistance.

The importance of the role of the mentor was emphasized, and it was clear that the mentor is key to the success of the program. The respondents to this study indicated the mentor had performed reasonably well, although the matching of mentor with dissatisfied institutional representatives indicated several mentors had elicited a negative response from more than one institution, giving even greater credence to the importance of the mentor in the overall AGB Board-Mentor Program. The responses also indicated the program provided a needed impetus for trustees to get to know one another better.

Conclusions

Literature cited in this study clearly indicated that trustees need assistance to better understand their roles and responsibilities. Nason (1975, 1981, 1982), Rauh (1959, 1969), Martorana (1963), Herron (1969), Baldridge et al (1978), Angell (1978), Carson (1979), and Gale (1980) indicated that trustees do need assistance if they are to better understand their role and responsibilities and hence, become more effective trustees. In addition, these authors called for inservice education to assist trustees in this area. The results of this study would indicate that trustees and presidents perceived a need for inservice education for trustees. One of the primary goals of the AGB Board-Mentor Program is to provide guidance regarding the board's goal and responsibility. The respondents to this study clearly recognized the importance of this

goal, not only in deciding to participate in the Board-Mentor Program,
but also in indicating that the program was helpful to them in providing
guidance and understanding of the board's role and responsibilities.
Herron (1965) concluded that inservice education can provide the
necessary background for trustees to make better decisions. Flint
(1981) concluded that trustees were more effective following inservice
education sessions. The respondents to this study perceived that they,
too, were more effective as a result of participation in the AGB
Board-Mentor Program.

Corey (1957) contended that a program is not good or bad until
the effects of the program are related to the goals of the program.
Kinnick et al. (1957) indicated the evaluation of a good program should
be done by the evidence that occurs as a result of the program. The
AGB Board-Mentor Program does provide evidence for evaluation, and
such evaluation could determine the effectiveness of mentors. In
particular, the program was perceived by respondents to create change
as a result of participation in the program; and change that resulted
from participation was perceived as positive by presidents and trustees.
Nason (1982) cited the importance of long range planning, and a
majority of respondents to this study indicated that long range planning
had indeed changed as a result of participation. In addition, Pocock
(1980) cited the importance of fundraising for trustees, and a majority
of presidents and approximately 45% of trustees (42.6%) indicated a
positive change had occurred in the fundraising area as a result of
participation in the program. Also, a majority of both presidents and

trustees indicated the orientation of new trustees had been a positive change. A 1974 Association of Governing Boards study indicated little orientation was being done for new trustees. The Board-Mentor Program appears to be achieving positive change in this area; and while the program does create positive change in participating institutions, both presidents and trustees alike indicated the need for follow up activities relating to the plans which were developed during the program. Further, a majority of respondents to the program would overwhelmingly recommend the program to other presidents and trustees of nonparticipating institutions, including eligible presidents of institutions who were in the sample group but whose institution did not participate in this study.

Harris (1980) emphasized the importance of the physical arrangements for inservice education, as well as the importance of attendance and length of time. Frantzreb (1981) concluded that governing boards need retreats to become more familiar with one another and with the board's role and responsibilities. A majority of the respondents to this study indicated the program was in a retreat setting away from the site of regular board meetings. The literature cited would indicate a possible connection of the location with program success.

Claxton (1972), Young (1981) and Ness (1981) all concluded that presidents have a responsibility for the inservice education of trustees. The results of this study indicated presidents were instrumental in making the decision for the board to participate in the Board-Mentor

Program. The chairman of the board or rector was the most influential trustee in making this decision and generally the trustee most in contact with the president.

Pocock (1980) cited the increasing importance of fundraising for trustees, and development officers were frequently in attendance at the board mentor sessions. Fundraising was perceived as a positive change as a result of program participation.

Goodlad (1957) and Harris (1980) cited the importance of the consultant in working effectively with groups. As substantiated by the literature, there was general feeling by the respondents to this study that the mentor was key to the program and had been perceived as a suitable match for the institutions participating, a good discussion leader, and well prepared and appropriate for the various institutions.

Finally, respondents concluded that the AGB Board-Mentor Program provided an opportunity to become acquainted with their fellow trustees, enabling them to establish an esprit de corps and strength of purpose as a result of program participation.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the researcher as a result of this study:

1. that based on the positive evaluation of the Board-Mentor Program by participants in this study, the association continue to provide this program to its members;

2. that evaluations of mentors occur on a more thorough and timely basis to ensure positive and effective participation by mentors with institutions;

3. that the association encourage followup activities relating to decisions made or discussed at an appropriate time after the conclusion of each program;

4. that future evaluations of the Board-Mentor Program include comparisons with other board development efforts to determine the relative value of this program vis a vis a variety of possible trustee development efforts;

5. that all major program participants, including mentors, be included in future evaluations of this program; and

6. that, rather than rely on the perceptions of program participants, future studies should include in-depth case analysis to identify changes that occur as a result of program participation.

REFERENCES

Angell, G. W. (1978). <u>Trustees and collective bargaining.</u>
   <u>Monograph of the Academic Collective Bargaining Information</u>
   <u>Service</u> (No. 5).

Arends, R., Hersh, R. & Turner, J. (1980). <u>Conditions for</u>
   <u>promoting effective staff development.</u> Washington, DC:
   Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
   (1979). <u>A guide for new trustees.</u> Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
   (1974). <u>AGB to the campus: Proposal to the Lilly</u>
   <u>Endowment, Inc.:</u> Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
   (1980). <u>Building a more effective board.</u> Washington, DC:
   Author, 1980.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
   (1976). <u>AGB summary report of the Board-Mentor Institute.</u>
   Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
   (1982). <u>AGB: The board-mentor program.</u> Washington, DC:
   Author.

Baldridge, J. V. (Ed.). (1971). <u>Academic governance.</u>
   Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Baldridge, J., Curtis, D., Eckey, G. & Riley, G. (1978).
   <u>Policy making and effective leadership.</u> San Francisco:
   Jossey-Bass.

Burns, G. P. (1966). <u>Trustees in higher education: Their</u>
   <u>functions and coordination.</u> Independent College Funds of
   America.

Carey, L. M. & Marsh, D. D. (Eds.). (1980). <u>University roles</u>
   <u>in in-service education: Planning for change.</u> Washington,
   DC: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher
   Education.

Carr, R. K., Kelly, T. (1979). <u>Evaluation report:</u>
   <u>Board-Mentor Program.</u> Washington, DC: Association of
   Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

78

Carson, J. J. (1979) Boards vs. superboards. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 21(2), 20-22.

Claxton, C. S. (1972). In-Service education of Florida community college trustees. (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University). Dissertation Abstract International, 33/10A, 5509.

Corey, S. M. (1957). Introduction. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), In-Service Education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education (pp. 1-10). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Davis, P. H. (1957). The world stands aside. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 43, 269-273.

Dillon-Peterson, B. (Ed.). (1981). Staff development/organization development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Edelfelt, R. A. & Johnson, M. (Eds.). (1975). Rethinking in-service education. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Flint, G. P. (1981, April). In the beginning was orientation. CASE Currents, 7(4), 30-31.

Fox, G. C. (1967). The need of in-service education for community college trustees as perceived by presidents and trustees of community colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University).

Frantzreb, A. C. (1981). Training the board for action. In A. C. Frantzreb (Ed.), New directions for institutional advancement (pp.29-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gale, R. L. (1980). Selecting and deploying trustees. In R. T. Ingram (Ed.), Handbook of college and university trusteeship (pp.47-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1957). The consultant and in-service education. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), In-Service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 174-193). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hanlon, B. (1977). In boards we trust. Volunteer Action Leadership. Winter, 19-21.

Harris, B. M., Bessent, W., & McIntyre, K. (1969). In-service education: A Guide to better practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Harris, B. M. (1980). Improving staff performance through in-service education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Heilbron, L. H. (1973). The college and university trustee. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Herron, O. R. (1965). A study of in-service education programs for boards of trustees in selected colleges and universities in the United States. Unpublished Manuscript, Michigan State University.

Herron, O. R. (1969). The role of the trustee. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.

Higher education in the states. (1979). Education Commission of the States, 7.

Houston, W. R. & Pankratz, R. (Eds.). (1980). Staff development and educational change. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Ingram, R. T. (1980a). Assuring trustee orientation and development. In R. T. Ingram (Ed.), Handbook of college and university trusteeship (pp.87-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ingram, R. T. (1980b). Trustee orientation and development program. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

In-Service programs for educational administrators and supervisors. (1974). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Jalbert, E. (1980). Staff development in institutions of higher education. In W. R. Houston & R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff development and educational change (pp. 53-74). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Johnson, D. J. (1971). Teachers in-service education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kauffman, J. F. (1980). At the pleasure of the board.
    Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Kinnick, B. J., Boney, V., Huntington, E., Rasmussen, R.,
    Simon, S., Tacinas, N., & Zimmerman, E. (1957). The
    teachers and the in-service education program. In N. B.
    Henry (Ed.), In-Service education for teachers, supervisors,
    and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook of the National
    Society for the Study of Education (pp. 131-152). Chicago:
    The University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, A. J., Berg, S., Biddick, M., Doll, R., Hall, J., Hudson,
    J., & Teel, D. (1957). The role of the administrator in
    in-service education. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), In-Service
    education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The
    fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the study of
    education (pp. 153-173). Chicago: The University of Chicago
    Press.

McLeod, M. W. (1979). Patterns of responsibility. Washington,
    DC: Association of Community College Trustees.

Martorana, S. V. (1963). College boards of trustees. New
    York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

Nason, J. W. (1975). The future of trusteeship. Washington,
    DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
    Colleges.

Nason, J. W. (1980). Trustee responsibilities. Washington, DC:
    Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Nason, J. W. (1982). The nature of trusteeship. Washington,
    DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
    Colleges.

Ness, F. W. (1981). The board as an organization: Its roles
    and responsibilities. Paper presented at Association of
    Governing Boards conference on trusteeship, New Orleans.

Parker, J. C. (1957). Guidelines for in-service education. In N.
    B. Henry (Ed.), In-Service education for teachers,
    supervisors, and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook
    of the National Society for the Study of Education
    (pp. 103-128). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Peterson, C. S. (1980). Trustees and presidents: Common cause. ACCT Trustee Quarterly, 6(4), 25-28.

Peterson, M. L. (1980). Horizon: 2000. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 22(2), 14.

Pocock, J. W. (1980). Making fund-raising fun. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 22(5), 15.

Potter, G. E. (1976). The law and the board. Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness: New directions for community colleges, Winter (15).

Pray, F. (1963). The new trusteemanship. College and University Journal, 2(2), 9-16.

Rauh, M. A. (1959). College and university trusteeship. Antioch, OH: The Antioch Press.

Rauh, M. A. (1969). The trusteeship of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ritchey, H. G. (1957). Growth of the modern conception of in-service education. In N. B. Henry (Ed.), In-Service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators: The fifty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 35-66). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rubin, L. & Hansen, J. (1980). Assessing needs and prioritizing goals. In W. R. Houston & R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff development and educational change (pp. 105-124). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Sandin, R. T. (1981). President plus board equals plan. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 23(5), 26.

Spangler, M. R. (1979). Pardon me, I'm new here. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 21(3), 41.

Spencer, S. R. (1979). Recipe for a retreat. Association of Governing Boards Reports, 21(3), 31.

Waterman, F. T., Andrews, T., Houston, W., Bryant, B., & Pankratz, R. (1979). Designing short-term instructional programs. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

Weeks, K. M. (1980). Trustees and preventive law. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.

Williams, G. D. (1977). And who's on the statewide board? Association of Governing Boards Reports, 19(6), 27.

Wood, F. H., Thompson, S., & Russell, F. (1981). Designing effective staff development programs. In B. Dillon-Peterson (Ed.), Staff development/organization development (pp. 59-91). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Young, O. W. (1981). The inservice education needs of Mississippi public junior college trustees. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi). Dissertation Abstract International, 42/07A, 3037.

Zwingle, J. L. (1979). Effective trusteeship. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.

APPENDIX A:

Presidents' Questionnaire

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Dear President:

In 1977, the Lilly Endowment, Inc. provided a grant to the Association of Governing Boards to develop a member service called the Board-Mentor Program.

You and your Board participated in this program. I am asking all presidents and trustees who participated in this program since 1979 to help evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this program. In this way, you and your fellow trustees can help AGB provide the best possible program for trustees and presidents.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only so that I can check your name off of our mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this evaluation will be made available to the Association of Governing Boards. Only through your assistance can the assocation make this program as useful to other trustees and presidents as possible.

Please do not hesitate to contact me either in writing or by telephone (   ) with any questions you may have. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J. Joe Mitchell
Researcher
315 Burruss Hall

JJM/jl

Please mark your answers in the space provided. Should you need additional space for your answers, use the back of the questionnaire or attach an extra sheet to the questionnaire and return all in the envelope provided. Please do not sign your name.

Thank you.

AGB BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM EVALUATION STUDY

Questionnaire for Presidents

1. _____ Number of years you have served as president of this institution.

2. _____ Total years of higher education administrative experience.

3. _____ Number of times your full board meets yearly.

4. Who most influenced the board's decision to participate in the AGB Board-Mentor program?

   _____ BOARD CHAIRPERSON

   _____ ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE BOARD

   _____ PRESIDENT

   _____ OTHER (Please indicate by title) _____

5. The AGB Board-Mentor Program was conducted
   (Please check all that apply)

   A.
   _____ IN CONJUNCTION WITH A REGULAR BOARD MEETING

   _____ SEPARATE MEETING NOT CONNECTED WITH A REGULAR BOARD MEETING

   B.
   _____ AWAY FROM THE CAMPUS AND AWAY FROM THE REGULAR MEETING LOCATION

   _____ AWAY FROM THE CAMPUS BUT AT USUAL SITE OF BOARD MEETINGS

   _____ ON THE CAMPUS AT USUAL MEETING LOCATION

   _____ ON THE CAMPUS BUT NOT AT USUAL MEETING LOCATION

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 2

6. Please check <u>all</u> that attended the Board-Mentor session.

_____ TRUSTEES

_____ PRESIDENT

_____ DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

_____ OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

_____ FACULTY OR FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE (NON-TRUSTEE)

_____ STUDENTS OR STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE (NON-TRUSTEE)

_____ MEDIA

_____ SPOUSES (IN WORKING SESSIONS)

_____ OTHER (PLEASE INDICATE)

_____

_____

7. How important to the trustees were each of the the following in deciding to participate in the AGB Board-Mentor Program? Please circle the appropriate response.

		VERY IMPORTANT		OF NO IMPORTANCE
A.	TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE REGARDING THE BOARD'S ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1	2	3 4
B.	TO CLARIFY THE MISSION AND PURPOSE OF THE INSTITUTION	1	2	3 4
C.	TO ASSESS THE BOARD'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	1	2	3 4
D.	TO IMPROVE THE BOARD-PRESIDENT RELATIONSHIP	1	2	3 4
E.	TO UPDATE AND REVISE THE BOARD'S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE INCLUDING BY-LAWS	1	2	3 4
F.	TO GAIN IDEAS REGARDING COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BOARD AND VARIOUS CONSTITUENCY GROUPS	1	2	3 4
G.	TO IMPROVE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MEMBERS OF THE BOARD	1	2	3 4

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 3

8. In retrospect, in the areas listed below, how helpful was the Board-
    Mentor program to your board? Please circle the appropriate response.

		VERY HELPFUL		OF NO ASSISTANCE	
A.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF ITS ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1	2	3	4
B.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A RENEWED SENSE OF INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND PURPOSE	1	2	3	4
C.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	1	2	3	4
D.	THE PROGRAM IMPROVED THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD WITH THE PRESIDENT	1	2	3	4
E.	THE PROGRAM HELPED THE BOARD DEVELOP PRIORITIES FOR STRENGTHENING THE BOARD'S ORGANIZATION AND BY-LAWS	1	2	3	4
F.	THE PROGRAM HELPED IDENTIFY IDEAS TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES WITH WHICH THE BOARD MUST WORK.	1	2	3	4
G.	THE PROGRAM HELPED DEVELOP BETTER RELATIONSHIPS AMONG BOARD MEMBERS.	1	2	3	4

MORE

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 4

9. Listed below are possible areas of change that may have occurred as a
    result of participation in the Board-Mentor Program. Please circle the
    appropriate response in Column A. If you circled YES in Column A, please
    mark the appropriate rating in Column B.

Area of Possible Change	Column A Did change occur as a result of the Board-Mentor Program?		Column B Impact of change on board/institution Positive			Negative
BOARD SIZE	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ORIENTATION OF NEW TRUSTEE(S)	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
OFFICERS OF THE BOARD	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
BOARD COMMITTEE STRUCTURE	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
REGULAR BOARD SELF-EVALUATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
BY-LAWS	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
STATEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL MISSION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
LONG-TERM PLANNING	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
FUND-RAISING	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ACCOUNTABILITY	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
UNDERSTANDING OF BOARD'S LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
PERSONNEL CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ADMINISTRATION REORGANIZATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4

OTHER CHANGES THAT OCCURRED AS A
RESULT OF THE BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM
(PLEASE LIST):

_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 5

10. From the various areas listed or added by you in Question 9, please
describe one or more of those areas of change resulting from the Board-
Mentor Program that was particularly successful.

MORE

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 6

11. From the various areas listed or added by you in Question 9, please describe one or more of those areas of change resulting from the Board-Mentor Program that did not work as well as anticipated.

12. Please circle the appropriate response regarding the Mentor selected to
    work with your board.

		AGREE			DISAGREE
A.	A GOOD DISCUSSION LEADER	1	2	3	4
B.	WAS WELL PREPARED FOR THE SESSION	1	2	3	4
C.	WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE INSTITUTION	1	2	3	4

13. Has there been any substantive follow-up contact with the Mentor who
    worked with your board?

    _____ YES   _____ NO

    If YES, please describe the nature of that contact.

    _____

    _____

14. Overall, please indicate:

		OF GREAT ASSISTANCE			OF NO ASSISTANCE
A.	THE EXTENT THAT THE PROGRAM HELPED INDIVIDUAL TRUSTEES TO BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE	1	2	3	4
B.	THE EXTENT THAT THE PROGRAM HELPED THE TOTAL BOARD (AS A UNIT) TO OPERATE MORE EFFECTIVELY	1	2	3	4

15. Would you recommend this program to other presidents?

    _____ YES   _____ NO

MORE

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 8

16. Please indicate below any aspects of the AGB Board-Mentor Program not already described in this questionnaire which should be considered in evaluating this program.

Questionnaire for Presidents
Page 9

Please mail in attached envelope to:
John J. Mitchell
315 Burruss Hall
VPI & SU
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Thank you for assisting in the evaluation of the AGB Board-Mentor Program.
Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated.

BOARD-MENTOR EVALUATION STUDY
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
315 Burruss Hall
Blacksburg, Virginia   24060

APPENDIX B:

Trustees' Questionnaire

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Dear Trustee:

In 1977, the Lilly Endowment, Inc. provided a grant to the Association of Governing Boards to develop a member service called the Board-Mentor Program.

You and your Board participated in this program. I am asking all presidents and trustees who participated in this program since 1979 to help evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of this program. In this way, you and your fellow trustees can help AGB provide the best possible program for trustees and presidents.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only so that I can check your name off of our mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this evaluation will be made available to the Association of Governing Boards. Only through your assistance can the assocation make this program as useful to other trustees and presidents as possible.

Please do not hesitate to contact me either in writing or by telephone (703-961-6981) with any questions you may have. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J. Joe Mitchell
Researcher
315 Burruss Hall

JJM/jl

Please mark your answers in the space pro-
vided. Should you need additional space for your
answers, use the back of the questionnaire or
attach an extra sheet to the questionnaire and
return all in the envelope provided. Please do
not sign your name.

Thank you.

AGB BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM EVALUATION STUDY

Questionnaire for Trustees

1. _____ Number of years you have served as trustee of this institution.

2. _____ Total number of years you have served as a member of non-profit boards including the years served on this board.

3. On this board, have you served as a:

   YES ____ NO ____ Chairperson or rector

   YES ____ NO ____ Officer other than chairperson or rector

   YES ____ NO ____ Committee chairperson

4. YES ____ NO ____ Have you served on a corporate or business Board of Directors?

5. The AGB Board-Mentor Program was conducted
   (Please check all that apply)

   A.
   _____ IN CONJUNCTION WITH A REGULAR BOARD MEETING

   _____ SEPARATE MEETING NOT CONNECTED WITH A REGULAR BOARD MEETING

   B.
   _____ AWAY FROM THE CAMPUS AND AWAY FROM THE REGULAR MEETING LOCATION

   _____ AWAY FROM THE CAMPUS BUT AT USUAL SITE OF BOARD MEETINGS

   _____ ON THE CAMPUS AT USUAL MEETING LOCATION

   _____ ON THE CAMPUS BUT NOT AT USUAL MEETING LOCATION

MORE

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 2

6. Please check <u>all</u> that attended the Board-Mentor session.

_____ TRUSTEES

_____ PRESIDENT

_____ DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

_____ OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

_____ FACULTY OR FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE (NON-TRUSTEE)

_____ STUDENTS OR STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE (NON-TRUSTEE)

_____ MEDIA

_____ SPOUSES (IN WORKING SESSIONS)

_____ OTHER (PLEASE INDICATE)

_____

_____

7. How important to the trustees were each of the following in deciding to participate in the AGB Board-Mentor Program? Please circle the appropriate response.

		VERY IMPORTANT		OF NO IMPORTANCE	
A.	TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE REGARDING THE BOARD'S ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1	2	3	4
B.	TO CLARIFY THE MISSION AND PURPOSE OF THE INSTITUTION	1	2	3	4
C.	TO ASSESS THE BOARD'S STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	1	2	3	4
D.	TO IMPROVE THE BOARD-PRESIDENT RELATIONSHIP	1	2	3	4
E.	TO UPDATE AND REVISE THE BOARD'S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE INCLUDING BY-LAWS	1	2	3	4
F.	TO GAIN IDEAS REGARDING COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BOARD AND VARIOUS CONSTITUENCY GROUPS	1	2	3	4
G.	TO IMPROVE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MEMBERS OF THE BOARD	1	2	3	4

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 3

8. In retrospect, inthe areas listed below, how helpful was the Board-
    Mentor program to your board? Please circle the appropriate response.

		VERY HELPFUL		OF NO ASSISTANCE	
A.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF ITS ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1	2	3	4
B.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A RENEWED SENSE OF INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND PURPOSE	1	2	3	4
C.	THE PROGRAM PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	1	2	3	4
D.	THE PROGRAM IMPROVED THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD WITH THE PRESIDENT	1	2	3	4
E.	THE PROGRAM HELPED THE BOARD DEVELOP PRIORITIES FOR STRENGTHENING THE BOARD'S ORGANIZATION AND BY-LAWS	1	2	3	4
F.	THE PROGRAM HELPED IDENTIFY IDEAS TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES WITH WHICH THE BOARD MUST WORK.	1	2	3	4
G.	THE PROGRAM HELPED DEVELOP BETTER RELATIONSHIPS AMONG BOARD MEMBERS.	1	2	3	4

MORE

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 4

9. Listed below are possible areas of change that may have occurred as a result of participation in the Board-Mentor Program. Please circle the appropriate response in Column A. If you circled <u>Yes</u> in Column A, please mark the appropriate rating in Column B.

Area of Possible Change	Column A Did change occur as a result of the Board-Mentor Program?		Column B Impact of change on board/institution			
			Positive		Negative	
BOARD SIZE	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ORIENTATION OF NEW TRUSTEE(S)	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
OFFICERS OF THE BOARD	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
BOARD COMMITTEE STRUCTURE	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
REGULAR BOARD SELF-EVALUATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
BY-LAWS	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
STATEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL MISSION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
LONG-TERM PLANNING	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
FUND-RAISING	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ACCOUNTABILITY	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
UNDERSTANDING OF BOARD'S LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
PERSONNEL CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
ADMINISTRATION REORGANIZATION	YES	NO	1	2	3	4

OTHER CHANGES THAT OCCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM (PLEASE LIST):

_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4
_____	YES	NO	1	2	3	4

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 5

10. From the various areas listed or added by you in Question 9, please
     describe one or more of those areas of change resulting from the Board-
     Mentor Program that was particularly successful.

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 6

11. From the various areas listed or added by you in Question 9, please
describe one or more of those areas of change resulting from the Board-
Mentor Program that did not work as well as anticipated.

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 7

12. Please circle the appropriate response regarding the Mentor selected to work with your board.

		AGREE			DISAGREE
A.	A GOOD DISCUSSION LEADER	1	2	3	4
B.	WAS WELL PREPARED FOR THE SESSION	1	2	3	4
C.	WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE INSTITUTION	1	2	3	4

13. Has there been any substantive follow-up contact with the Mentor who worked with your board?

_____ YES _____ NO

If YES, please describe the nature of that contact.

_____

_____

14. Overall, please indicate:

		OF GREAT ASSISTANCE			OF NO ASSISTANCE
A.	THE EXTENT THAT THE PROGRAM HELPED INDIVIDUAL TRUSTEES TO BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE	1	2	3	4
B.	THE EXTENT THAT THE PROGRAM HELPED THE TOTAL BOARD (AS A UNIT) TO OPERATE MORE EFFECTIVELY	1	2	3	4

15. Would you recommend this program to other trustees?

_____ YES _____ NO

MORE

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 8

16. Please indicate below any aspects of the AGB Board-Mentor Program not already described in this questionnaire which should be considered in evaluating this program.

Questionnaire for Trustees
Page 9

Please mail in attached envelope to:
John J. Mitchell
315 Burruss Hall
VPI & SU
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Thank you for assisting in the evaluation of the AGB Board-Mentor Program.
Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated.

BOARD-MENTOR EVALUATION STUDY
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
315 Burruss Hall
Blacksburg, Virginia   24060

APPENDIX C:

Introductory Letter

Association of Governing Boards of Universities & Colleges

One Dupont Circle   Suite 400   Washington, D.C. 20036   202/296-8400

January 16, 1984

In 1977 the Lilly Endowment, Inc. provided a grant to AGB for the development of the Board-Mentor Program. Participation in this program has grown each year with some thirty trustee boards expected to use this Association service during the current year.

While the Association has received informal feedback concerning the effectiveness of this program, no formal evaluation has been conducted since 1978. For this reason, AGB has approved a study proposal submitted by J. Joe Mitchell, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, to evaluate this program. As participants in the program, I encourage you and your board to take part in this study.

The study will consist of a brief questionnaire for you and members of your board. Following analysis of the survey data, individual trustee boards and presidents will be selected for follow-up interviews. The data from the study will be utilized to determine the program's effectiveness and to consider possible revisions, if needed, to make the program more useful to presidents and trustess.

Three enclosures accompany this letter:

1. A form which indicates your willingness to participate in this study and provides some necessary initial information to the researcher.

2. A listing of your trustees of record at AGB. Please circle the names of those trustees that participated in the Board-Mentor workshop.

3. A sample letter which will accompany the questionnaire to your trustees if Mr. Mitchell will be sending the trustee questionnaire directly to them. Please reproduce this letter on your letterhead, sign and return with items 1 and 2, if appropriate.

Please return to the researcher the forms described above in the envelope provided.

Upon receipt of the enclosed forms, Mr. Mitchell will forward to you or mail directly the appropriate questionnaires. From that point, until the end of this study, the Association will not be involved in any way with this evaluation.

I urge you and your board to be very candid about the effects of the Board-Mentor Program. Only through your assistance can we improve this program for the enhancement of future trustee boards that may use this Association service.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Gale
President

Enclosures
cc: J. J. Mitchell
    Virginia Polytechnic Institute
        and State University

APPENDIX D:

Participation Permission Form

AGB BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM EVALUATION STUDY

Please complete this form and return along with the listing of trustees in the attached envelope. Thank you for your attention to this study.

Name of Institution _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone Number _____

Name of President _____

YES___ NO___   President listed above was president of institution at time of AGB Board-Mentor workshop.

YES___ NO___   The board will participate in this study to evaluate the AGB Board-Mentor program.

      If Yes:

_____   Questionnaires may be sent directly to the trustees circled on the computer form. A signed letter is enclosed to be used when contacting our trustees.

_____   We prefer to send the trustee questionnaires to our trustees.

_____   Date of next meeting of full board.

      If No:

Any comments you would make about why you do not wish to participate in this study would be most helpful.

_____

_____

_____

Return to: (envelope attached)   Signed_____
   John J. Mitchell
   315 Burruss Hall   Title_____
   Virginia Polytechnic Institute
     & State University   Telephone No._____
   Blacksburg, Virginia   24061

APPENDIX E:

Presidents' Letter

AQUINAS COLLEGE

116

Dear Trustee:

We have been asked by the Association of Governing Boards to assist in
an evaluation of their Board-Mentor program. The data from this evaluation
will be utilized to determine the program's effectiveness and to consider
possible revisions, if needed, to make this program more useful to trustees
and presidents.

I feel we should participate in this study and asked that the researcher
send this study questionnaire directly to you, accompanied by this letter.
I-encourage you to be very candid about the effects of the Board-Mentor
program. Only through your assistance can this program be improved for
the enhancement of future trustee boards that may use the association service.

Sincerely yours,

Norbert J. Hruby
President

APPENDIX F:

Letter and Questionnaire to Institutions
That Did Not Respond to Original Questionnaire

DAVIS & ELKINS COLLEGE

November 20, 1985

Dear _____ :

In 1984, Bob Gale wrote all presidents of institutions that participated in the AGB Board-Mentor program in 1979, 1980 and 1981 to encourage their evaluation of this program (see enclosed letter). A number of presidents and trustees completed a comprehensive questionnaire as a part of this study. In order to complete my dissertation on this subject, brief additional information is needed from presidents who, for whatever reason, did not respond to the original letter from Mr. Gale. I am only gathering additional information from presidents whose institutions are not included in the study to date, and your response will remain confidential.

Would you please complete and return the enclosed brief questionnaire so this study can be completed? Please contact me at the address and telephone listed below if I can provide any additional information for you. The information requested is necessary to complete this study and to provide useful information to the association about the program.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

J. Joe Mitchell
Vice President for Development

jc

Enclosure

J. Joe Mitchell
Vice President for Development
Davis & Elkins College
Sycamore Street
Elkins, WV 26241
Telephone: (304) 636-1900 Ext. 340

ELKINS, WEST VIRGINIA 26241

AGB BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. Yes____ No____   I was president of this institution in _____ when the board participated in the Board-Mentor program. [If your response is NO, please return the form in the enclosed envelope. If your answer is YES, please complete questions 2-4].

2. In retrospect, in the areas listed below, how helpful was the Board-Mentor program to your board? Please circle the appropriate response.

	VERY HELPFUL			OF NO ASSISTANCE
A. The program provided the Board with a better understanding of its role and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
B. The program provided the board with a renewed sense of institutuional mission and purpose.	1	2	3	4
C. The program provided the board with a better understanding of its strengths and weaknesses.	1	2	3	4
D. The program improved the relationship of the board with the president.	1	2	3	4
E. The program helped the board develop priorities for strengthening the board's organization and by-laws.	1	2	3	4
F. The program helped identify ideas to improve communication between the board and the various constituencies with which the board must work.	1	2	3	4
G. The program helped develop better relationships among board members.	1	2	3	4

3. Please circle the appropriate response regarding the Mentor selected to work with your board.

	AGREE			DISAGREE
A. A good discussion leader.	1	2	3	4
B. Was well prepared for the session.	1	2	3	4
C. Was appropriate for the institution.	1	2	3	4

4. Would you recommend this program to other presidents?

Yes____   No____

Return to: J. Joe Mitchell
Vice President for Development
Davis & Elkins College
Elkins, WV 26241

EVALUATION OF THE BOARD-MENTOR PROGRAM OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS

OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

by

John Joe Mitchell

Committee Chairman: W. Robert Sullins

Educational Administration

(ABSTRACT)

In 1977 the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
Colleges developed a Board-Mentor Program to assist college and
university trustees to enhance the organization and performance of their
governing boards. This study evaluated through survey research this
program utilizing presidents and trustees who participated in the
program over a three-year period. The data were analyzed to determine
changes that occurred as a result of participation in the program and if
the program met the purposes and goals for which it was established.
Twenty-one institutions, public and private, located in thirteen
different states participated in this evaluation.

Presidents and trustees agreed that the goals of the program were
important and participation in the program was perceived helpful in the
realization of the program goals. A positive correlation existed
between the importance of the goals of the program and the helpfulness
of the program in the realization of the program goals.

Presidents and trustees identified several areas where change
occurred as a result of program participation, and suggestions for
program refinement and change were identified by respondents. The study
concluded with six recommendations including the need for additional
study of trustee development programs.