

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

School Board Conflict, Decision-Making Processes, and Professional Development: The Effect on Superintendent Turnover

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7wj0w0rd>

Author

Jutabha, Mark

Publication Date

2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

School Board Conflict, Decision-Making Processes, and Professional Development:
The Effect on Superintendent Turnover

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Mark Jutabha

2017

©Copyright by

Mark Jutabha

2017

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

School Board Conflict, Decision-Making Processes, and Professional Development:

The Effect on Superintendent Turnover

by

Mark Jutabha

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2017

Professor Christina A. Christie, Co-Chair

Professor Diane Durkin, Co-Chair

Within California, superintendents continue to experience a high rate of turnover, affecting over six million students in nearly 1,000 school districts. The literature cites conflict as a key indicator affecting superintendent tenure. Knowledge of roles and responsibilities and political interests are often highlighted as contributing to this conflict. School boards—typically comprising three, five, or seven individuals who are charged with managing the superintendent as well as determining local policies to ensure state and federal laws are followed—also play a role. Their ability to skillfully resolve conflict is essential.

While much of the existing research on this topic centers on identifying causal factors of turnover, this study sought to identify significant indicators that separate high and low turnover districts. I posited that turnover is associated with the level of training board members and superintendents receive. Moreover, findings from the literature show higher functioning districts have established protocols for decision making. Therefore, I wanted to compare decision-making processes between high and low turnover districts. I partnered with the California School Board

Association to conduct a survey of superintendents and school board members on these key issues.

The study found relationships between board members and superintendents and specific areas of governance to be key indicators of conflict. Further, these indicators were found to be primary reasons for board members or superintendents not returning to their roles the following year. Effective conflict resolution was also found to be associated with turnover. I found no association between high and low turnover districts and the use of decision-making protocols. However, I found a difference between high and low turnover districts in how board members and superintendents were trained in knowledge of roles and responsibilities and constituent and community interests. Furthermore, respondents had high interest in ongoing professional development with feedback.

Service providers such as consultants or county offices of education can use these findings to inform professional development delivery methods designed to address the turnover indicators. This is an important consideration given the challenges in scheduling training for board members who typically have other, competing professional responsibilities. A school board with a clearer understanding of roles and expectations and the ability to skillfully resolve conflict can not only improve superintendent turnover rates but also positively impact the education of California's student and teacher population.

The dissertation of Mark Jutabha has been approved.

Beverly P. Lynch

Rashmita S. Mistry

Christina A. Christie, Committee Co-Chair

Diane Durkin, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2017

To my Mom and Dad.

All that I am is because of you. All that I do is to honor you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
VITA	xi
CHAPTER 1: STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.....	1
Leadership Challenges and Solutions	2
Historical Context.....	2
School Board Professional Development	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Methods.....	7
Significance of the Study	8
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
The Problem: Superintendent Turnover.....	11
Theoretical Framework.....	11
School Boards	14
Role and Composition	14
Influences on School Boards	16
Criticisms of School Boards.....	17
School Board Effectiveness.....	19
Factors in Superintendent Turnover.....	20
Lack of School Board Training	20
Strained Relationships	21
Superintendent Role	23
The Centrality of Decision Making	24
Challenges of Training Board Members	26
Existing Training.....	27
Conclusion	28
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	30
Research Design.....	30
Site and Access	31
Selection and Recruitment of Survey Participants.....	32
Data Collection Methods	33
Development of Survey Instrument.....	33
Content of Survey Instrument	34
Data Analysis.....	35
The Turnover Variable	36
The NoReturn Variable	36
The Train Variable	37
Validity and Reliability.....	38

Role Management and Ethical Issues	38
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS	40
Research Question 1	40
Finding 1: There was no difference in high versus low turnover based on urban, suburban, or rural location, or on size of student population.....	40
Finding 2: Relationships, district infrastructure, and school board protocols were the primary reasons board members and superintendents said they might not return the following year.....	43
Research Question 2	46
Finding 3: Superintendent and board member relationships as well as school board governance issues are key indicators of conflict.....	46
Research Question 3	51
Finding 4: There is no difference between high and low turnover districts with respect to the presence of a decision-making process.....	51
Finding 5: Lower turnover districts experienced a higher degree of effective resolution....	52
Research Questions 4 and 5	54
Finding 6: There is no difference between high and low turnover districts trained in conflict resolution and decision-making processes.....	55
Finding 7: There is a difference between high and low turnover districts in terms of the effect of training received on roles and responsibilities and community relations.....	57
Finding 8: There is no difference in the amount of time spent on professional development between high and low turnover districts.....	60
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	63
Summary of Findings.....	63
Implications for Policy and Practice.....	66
Limitations of the Study.....	68
Sample	68
Survey.....	69
Conclusion	71
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	72
APPENDIX B: CROSS TABULATIONS BY TURNOVER VARIABLE.....	79
APPENDIX C: SURVEY RESPONSES—FREQUENCIES	104
REFERENCES.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Student Population by District Location Type.....	41
Table 3.2	District Location by Turnover.....	42
Table 3.3	Student Population by Turnover.....	42
Table 3.4	Demographic Information of Respondents by Intention to Return.....	43
Table 3.5	Impact of School Board Relationships on Unsure/Not Returning Respondents by Turnover.....	44
Table 3.6	Test Statistic (School Board Relationships)	45
Table 3.7	Impact of Infrastructure and Resources on Unsure/Not Returning Respondents by Turnover.....	45
Table 3.8	Test Statistic (Infrastructure and Resources)	45
Table 3.9	Impact of School Board Protocols and Procedures on Unsure/ Not Returning Respondents by Turnover.....	46
Table 3.10	Test Statistic (Protocols and Procedures)	46
Table 3.11	Frequency of School Board Member–Superintendent Conflict by Turnover.....	47
Table 3.12	Statistical Test Values of Conflict Indicators by Turnover.....	48
Table 3.13	Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Knowledge of an Issue by Turnover.....	49
Table 3.14	Test Statistic (Knowledge Level of an Issue)	49

Table 3.15	Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Knowledge of Board Member Roles and Responsibilities by Turnover.....	50
Table 3.16	Test Statistic (Knowledge of Board Member Roles and Responsibilities	50
Table 3.17	Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Constituent Interests of Board Members by Turnover.....	50
Table 3.18	Test Statistic (Constituent Interests of Board Members	51
Table 3.19	Current Decision-Making Processes by Turnover.....	52
Table 3.20	Primary Facilitator of Conflict Resolution Process by Turnover.....	53
Table 3.21	Extent of Successful Mediation by Turnover.....	54
Table 3.22	Test Statistic (Extent of Successful Mediation)	54
Table 3.23	Extent of Conflict Resolution Training by Turnover.....	55
Table 3.24	Extent of Decision-Making Training by Turnover.....	56
Table 3.25	Board Member Responsibility Improvement After Training.....	56
Table 3.26	Frequency of Conflict Resulting from Training.....	57
Table 3.27	Professional Development Provider by Turnover.....	58
Table 3.28	Extent of Training on Key Governance Areas by Turnover.....	59
Table 3.29	Test Statistic (Extent of Training on Key Governance Areas)	59
Table 3.30	Whole-Board Development by Turnover.....	60
Table 3.31	Total School Board Training Received by Turnover.....	61
Table 3.32	Factors Preventing School Board Training by Turnover.....	61
Table 3.33	Test Statistic (Factors Preventing School Board Training)	61

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The past three years have fundamentally changed my understanding of TK–16 education. The journey was possible because of the knowledge, love, and generosity of spirit of my incredible community of mentors, colleagues, friends, and family.

To my co-chairs, Dr. Tina Christie and Dr. Diane Durkin, thank you for always being a constant spring of motivation and pushback. Your patience and guidance strengthened my skills as a researcher and as a writer. I extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Mistry and Dr. Lynch for your support in the development and execution of my survey instrument. Special thanks and appreciation go to members of Cohort 22, whose diverse experiences, humor, and kind spirits made my journey possible.

A special acknowledgement and appreciation go to Julie Maxwell-Jolly, Mary Briggs, and Christopher Maricle from the California School Board Association. Your belief in and support of my efforts is what helped bring this study to fruition.

The culmination of my work would not have been possible were it not for the efforts of two key colleagues who provided much needed professional and personal support, no matter the time of day: Dr. Ian Guidera and Dr. Iish Ryaru. Special thanks go to my colleagues at WestEd, especially Robert Rosenfeld, whose support helped balance and integrate my educational goals with my professional commitments.

Lastly, my journey would not have been possible were it not for the immeasurable love and support of my family. To my children, Lucas and Torri: I hope my efforts serve as an example to you of the importance of education. To my wife, Dawn: Your love and support kept me pushing forward.

VITA

2011— Engagement and Services Lead
WestEd, San Francisco, California

2006–2011 Administrator, Teacher
KIPP Academy of Opportunity, Los Angeles, California

2005–2006 Corps Member Advisor
Teach For America, New York, New York

2005 M.S., Administration, Pepperdine University

2000 M.Ed., University of California, Los Angeles

1999–2006 Administrative Designee, Teacher
Culver City Unified School District, Culver City, California

1997 B.A., University of California, Los Angeles

CHAPTER 1:

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

A recent study of 215 California school superintendents revealed that 45% left within three to five years of their appointments, resulting in a lack of leadership continuity at the highest levels of a school district (Grissom & Andersen, 2012). Conflict between school boards and superintendents is often cited as a contributing reason for departure. In California, for example, there are over 1,000 school districts encompassing urban, suburban, and rural areas; in 2000, 25% of superintendents from the smaller districts cited board conflict as a reason for leaving (Glass, Björk, & Brunner, 2000). The literature also points more specifically to uncooperative board members as contributors to turnover (Parker, 1996; Richardson, 1998; Tallerico, 1991). Conversely, Grissom (2010) found that a positive school board–superintendent relationship predicted a 37% decrease in the odds that a superintendent would leave.

A review of the literature shows little research on how school board training and professional development impact conflict management and/or resolution skills. Investigating the relationship between school board members and superintendents through the lens of decision making can provide insight into how to improve school board–superintendent relationships and, in turn, superintendent turnover. Thus, I gathered school board data on what trainings already exist or are being used informally to minimize conflicts and improve decision making. I investigated which informal or formal trainings or processes resonate with board members and superintendents. Results from this study can be used to inform current school board and superintendent professional development programs at the local and/or state level.

Leadership Challenges and Solutions

Historical Context

As population growth in the United States increased in the 1800s and parents entered the workforce, the responsibility for educating children shifted away from families. Compulsory education laws required children to attend local schools (Finn & Petrilli, 2013). School boards first came into existence in Massachusetts in 1837 (Land, 2002) and were modeled after the corporate board structure to set policy and provide governance. They were conceptualized as educational trustees of a community.

Boards became responsible for the day-to-day administration of schooling—for example, hiring teachers, administering exams, or evaluating student progress (Institute for Educational Leadership, 1986). As the number of students grew, school boards empowered a chief executive—the superintendent—to handle daily administrative functions. School boards continued their governance responsibilities by approving budgets or instructional initiatives and evaluating the superintendent. This structure has remained largely unchanged since its inception, regardless of the population size of the rural, suburban, and urban districts served (Hess & Meeks, 2010; Land, 2002).

School board members are typically elected into office but are subjected to no formal performance evaluation measure. The general election process allows any U.S. citizen of voting age to be elected. Boards are perceived as dysfunctional bureaucratic entities due to the political and personal considerations of school board members—for example, their ties to unions and interest groups, their political ideologies, and the lack of accountability measures (Alsbury, 2004; Danzberger, 1994; Howell, 2005; Keller, 1997; “LAUSD moves forward,” 2013). The function of school boards has come under scrutiny over the past decade (Alsbury, 2008; Kirst &

Wirt, 2009; Shoher & Hartney, 2014), and some well-publicized cases have strengthened the call for reform. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) board approved a \$2.4 billion bond fund to build a learning complex on land that was later found to be environmentally dangerous (Keller, 1997). In Colorado, a school board proposed a change to an Advanced Placement (AP) history course de-emphasizing civil disobedience and emphasizing patriotism and citizenship (Lachman, 2014).

One possible reform measure is the removal of district governance from school boards in favor of mayoral control, as was done in Boston and Chicago (Danzberger, 1994; Kirst, 2003; Kirst & Bulkley, 2000). In these cases, the mayor has authority over fiscal, facility, human resource, and educational matters, and appoints individuals to leadership positions (including the superintendent), effectively eliminating the school board (Hess, 2008; Keegan & Finn, 2004). The Collaborative for Equity and Justice in Education found that the mayor-appointed school board for the city of Chicago was a poor steward of public resources and limited public input (Lipman, Gutstein, Gutierrez, & Blanche, 2015). Corporate executives were appointed to represent Chicago Public School families, 90% of whom were low-income. Under their direction, achievement of African American and Latino students in Chicago declined. Constituents staged hunger strikes and sit-ins to protest decisions to close schools and exclude community input. Since 2001, Chicago Public Schools have had five superintendents, three of whom have served terms fewer than three years (Chicago Reporter, 2016). Further research is needed to determine whether or not mayor-appointed boards are a viable governance solution.

Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) noted that it takes five years for implementation of reforms to return positive results, yet the average tenure of a superintendent is less than that (Byrd, Drews, & Johnson, 2006; Fixsen, Blase, Naom, & Wallace, 2009; Glass et al., 2000;

Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Simpson, 2013). Thus, they typically do not remain long enough within a district to effect sustainable changes in student achievement (Alsbury, 2008; Grady & Bryant, 1991; Grissom & Andersen, 2012). Moreover, due to election cycles and board member turnover, a superintendent could have an entirely different board within the span of two to four years, thus making it necessary to continually acclimate new board members.

Studies have shown that superintendents leave their districts due to conflicts with school boards and a lack of specified board roles—for example, what legal autonomy the board has to determine policy (Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Hess & Meeks, 2010; Kirst & Wirt, 2009; Tekniepe, 2015). Glass et al. (2000) conducted a study on superintendents and found that 30% said their boards were underqualified and did not understand their roles. Further, Grissom (2010), Mountford (2004), and Richardson (1998) all found that the political ideologies of school board members led to conflicts within the board itself. And in research on superintendents who left their positions in Nebraska and South Carolina, board conflict and/or interference were cited by more than half of the respondents as a main contributor to their departure (Grady & Bryant, 1991; Monteith & Hallums, 1989). Moreover, high-conflict school boards with poor superintendent relationships are more prevalent in low-income districts (Danzberger, 1994; Grissom, 2010; McCurdy, 1992).

The seminal Lighthouse Report describes research on high achieving school districts and the characteristics of the boards that provide governance (Rice et al., 2000). Districts with higher student achievement had school board members who understood their role and had established processes in place for decision making such as school board retreats initiated by the superintendent to educate members on key issues. Grissom (2010) and Rice et al. have therefore proposed establishing clear operating norms for school boards to improve governance—a less

drastic solution than board dissolution. The literature posits that a school board with defined roles, procedures, and expectations will govern more effectively and work better with the superintendent (Alsbury, 2008; Hess & Meeks, 2010; Kirst & Wirt, 2009). Likewise, given systemic turnover due to term limits or election cycles, Rice et al. suggested there must be a constant cycle of board member training or orientation. It would appear that this is not taking place: Hess and Meeks asked board presidents and superintendents, “How often does your board engage in whole-board development?” A full 82% of respondents said either never or only twice each year.

School Board Professional Development

The literature on school board training programs provides minimal evidence of school boards having established protocols to deal with challenges in decision making. For example, boards lack protocols on how to proceed when a member is non-cooperative; they also lack processes for acclimating newly elected board members. Further, school boards that have struggled have not had systems in place for decision making such as how to vote on agenda items when a quorum is routinely not met (Delagardelle, 2006; Rice et al., 2000). There is also minimal research on closed session board meetings, in part because researchers may not have access to these events.

There is some research on entities that provide training programs for board members and superintendents. The literature shows that professional associations—for example, the California School Boards Association (CSBA)—are the primary educators of school board members and superintendents on their roles and responsibilities (Glass et al., 2000; Hess & Meeks, 2010). California is one of 26 states that do not require school board training or development (National School Boards Association, 2001). Boards are offered training through the CSBA, most notably

through the Masters In Governance (MIG) program which started in the 1990s. According to their website, over 2,000 board members have received training and development on key content areas of school board governance including finance, education law, and community relations (“Master In Governance,” 2016). As I discuss in the next chapter, however, school board professional development related to decision making is not always comprehensive enough to be effective.

Purpose of the Study

Most studies of board and superintendent relationships have been qualitative in nature, consisting of case studies and data collected from interviews (Byrd et al., 2006; Grady & Bryant, 1991; Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Hess & Meeks, 2010). The literature shows few quantitative studies that address the problem of superintendent turnover. A quantitative study will more clearly identify how informal and formal decision-making systems such as strengths, weakness, opportunities, or threat (SWOT) analyses, or a concerns-based adoption model (CBAM), affect the relationship between school boards and superintendents when there is an impasse or conflict regarding a policy issue or action item.

Using survey data, I researched types of conflict experienced between superintendents and school boards, how school boards utilize protocols for decision making and inquiry, and how often they engage in professional development. In particular, I addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of turnover?
2. What kinds of conflicts do school board members and superintendents say they experience?

3. How does the decision-making process contribute to the conflict or lack of conflict between school board members and the superintendent?
4. What specific trainings do school board members and superintendents receive that are most related to conflict? What are the pros and cons of those trainings?
5. Do school boards and superintendents who have gone through training say they experience fewer instances of conflict?

Methods

Drawing from a database of CSBA members, I used a random controlled sample to collect quantitative data on school board decision-making processes and school board–superintendent relationship characteristics. A quantitative approach made sense because data from a large population sampling of school board members and superintendents could be collected and compared systematically, and the findings can therefore be extended to a larger population (Creswell, 2008). This quantitative study can provide the methodology for future studies of school boards focusing on decision-making processes and relationships.

The target population for the study included California school board members and superintendents who were also members of CSBA (membership in CSBA is not required). Using the CSBA population ensured an accurate representation of the 5,000 California board members (Fowler, 2014). CSBA has statewide access to members of rural, suburban, and urban school boards from districts ranging in size from 300 to over 25,000 students. They implement surveys to evaluate professional development sessions, such as their MIG trainings and annual conference workshops, which are attended by board members and superintendents.

Using Likert-scale and nominal-type questions, I used an online survey to collect data in four categories: demographics, conflict, decision making, and training. More specifically,

questions identified challenges for board members and superintendents in executing their responsibilities specific to their roles with regard to the relationships between and among board members and the superintendent, decision-making processes, and current professional development services and needs. The survey was disseminated to CSBA members using the organization's internal database. Respondents had six weeks to complete the survey.

Survey data were coded and reviewed by specific areas that board members and superintendents experienced in decision-making conflict or success, such as who mediates a disagreement. Variance between board members and superintendents was noted and categorized according to geographic and student population information as well as number of superintendent turnovers experienced over an eight-year period (2008–2016).

Significance of the Study

The findings from this study provide empirical data to inform current school board training opportunities like the MIG program as well as new trainings geared specifically toward conflict resolution and/or decision-making at the school board and superintendent level. Findings may be used to refine or develop course offerings for school board members and superintendents. Further, findings from the study can provide CSBA members with data for types of districts that are finding success with decision-making processes and superintendent retention as well as inform site-based professional development.

Other outlets include on-site training sessions or webinars through the CSBA website. Service organizations—for example, WestEd—might also draw on the findings to inform their service to districts. The findings can also be used externally, for example with the Comprehensive Schools Assistance Program, where WestEd provides services addressing

leadership capacity and strategic planning. Other potential external WestEd outlets include publications such as the *R&D Alert* and online content-specific webinars.

CHAPTER 2:

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A high rate of superintendent turnover is of growing concern within education. This turnover affects the implementation and continuity of district programs, student initiatives, and reforms, all of which can ultimately impact student achievement. There is a growing number of empirical studies showing that the quality of relationships between school board members and superintendents is a key factor in how long superintendents remain in a given district (Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Hess & Meeks, 2010; Myers, 2011; Rhim, Quarles, & Wong, 2013). Research also shows that political factors, such as community interests and school board elections, can lead to strained relationships between school boards and superintendents (Alsbury, 2003; Grissom & Andersen, 2012).

Though recent discussion has centered on characteristics that lead to superintendent turnover (e.g., training, relationships, socioeconomic factors), I focus on decision-making training for school boards and superintendents because the literature indicates that board member–superintendent relationships can be strengthened with training in this area. With this in mind, I first synthesize research highlighting the scale of superintendent turnover. Next, I present an overview of my theoretical framework. I then discuss school boards, including their history, role, and composition, as well as various factors that influence school board decision making. I also summarize the literature on school board effectiveness. Next, I turn my attention to factors that affect superintendent turnover, including lack of school board training, strained board–superintendent relationships, and lack of clarity about the board member role. I conclude the chapter by synthesizing research that recommends decision-making training to help minimize superintendent turnover.

The Problem: Superintendent Turnover

The research shows that U.S. school superintendents leave their positions every three to five years (Council of the Great City Schools, 2014; Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Johnson, Huffman, Madden, & Shope, 2011). An Institute of Education Sciences report on Kentucky superintendents, for example, found a 74% turnover rate in 174 districts surveyed between 1998 and 2008 (Johnson et al., 2011). According to state data, 61% of Kansas superintendents remained in their positions for less than five years (Myers, 2011). Similarly, the Council of Great City Schools (2014) surveyed 66 members of the largest national urban districts and found the average tenure of superintendents was 3.18 years. In California, Grissom and Anderson (2012) reported that 45% of 215 superintendents exited within three years of assuming district leadership.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) found that superintendents require five years to sustain large-scale reform efforts. Time is needed to establish relationships with board members and the superintendent. Fixsen et. al. (2009) further underscored the importance of time in implementing reforms or initiatives, stating an average of two to four years are needed before sustainable progress can be seen within an organization. A challenge for school districts, then, is how to ensure successful implementation and sustainment of reform initiatives, given this consistent turnover. As I will discuss in greater detail later in this chapter, school boards play a key role in this turnover. Before turning to a discussion of school boards and superintendents, I introduce a theoretical framework that is helpful for better understanding the issues at hand.

Theoretical Framework

Lutz and Iannaccone's (1986) dissatisfaction theory in American democracy and Bolman and Deal's (2008) political framework are useful in an analysis of decision making in the context

of the school board–superintendent relationship. First, dissatisfaction theory claims that turnover can result from a cycle of events characterized by periods of calm and volatility and unrest (Lutz & Iannaccone, 1986). Changes in socioeconomic or political circumstances within a community contribute to unrest—for example, changing demographics or the political imposition of standards based instruction. As political issues reach critical levels of dissatisfaction, the public invokes its right to enact change via general election. In the context of school boards, the public votes out incumbents with members who represent the dissatisfied community. Patterson, Koenigs, Mohn, and Rasmussen’s (2006) findings exemplify this condition—in their study, public dissatisfaction over the hiring of a new superintendent resulted in four new board members being elected.

The public leverages its power against superintendents by pressuring board members. Consider, for example, that former LAUSD Superintendent John Deasy resigned within three years of his appointment due to teacher union opposition to his position on teacher accountability and his technology initiative to provide each student with an electronic device (Pickert, 2014). This example of politically motivated turnover highlights the importance of understanding how public pressure influences decision making and superintendent turnover.

Bolman and Deal’s (2008) organizational frames provide a framework to analyze superintendent turnover. The frames provide a lens to analyze an organization’s leadership structure or strategic planning processes. Further, the frames provide insight on conditions that lead to organizational successes and challenges. The *structural* frame indicates how board members make policy decisions, and the *political* frame shows how positional power supersedes the other frames. Patterson and colleagues’ (2006) study demonstrates how political power affects the relationships among school board members, superintendents, and the community: The

board maintained power over the superintendent and superseded his authority by deciding to fire two popular middle school principals. The community, unhappy with the firings, exerted its power over the school board by replacing four seats in the following election.

Alsbury (2003) classified turnover as occurring for either political or apolitical reasons. Apolitical turnover is when board members or superintendents leave of their own decision and for personal (retirement or illness), financial, or moral reasons. Political turnover is defeat, for example incumbent school board members losing an election or firing superintendents. Public pressure, conflict with staff or board members, and union conflicts are all factors attributed to political defeat.

As described above, research shows political turnover affects organizational continuity. New superintendents are empowered by the school board to make organizational decisions as they come into districts. Grady and Bryant (1991) interviewed 80 superintendents in Nebraska and found that consistent superintendent turnover affected district policies and procedures. There is a clear threat to organizational stability when every three to five years a new superintendent assumes leadership of a district. For example, Johnson-Howard (1991) conducted a qualitative study of superintendents and found that after superintendent turnover occurred, decisions were made to change personnel, curricula, or programs.

Dissatisfaction theory (Alsbury, 2003) and Bolman and Deal's (2008) frames helped to inform the data collection and analysis of the study. The structural frame provided a lens through which to examine how board members and superintendents perceive their roles and responsibilities as well as well-established practices—such as how order is maintained during meetings—and how impasses are resolved. The political frame informed the construction of the survey instrument and addressed how decisions are influenced by relationships with other board

members, the superintendent, or constituents. The political frame and dissatisfaction theory informed the degree to which public opinion influenced both decision making and relationships at the school board level. Further, the frames and dissatisfaction theory informed the drafting of interview questions to collect data on conditions that lead to conflict such as education policies or district infrastructure.

School Boards

Role and Composition

A school board provides governance to a school district, and hires and empowers a superintendent to manage the day-to-day operation of the district. The board supports the superintendent by approving policy decisions and ensuring compliance with state and federal laws that address the needs of students. State laws provide board members with latitude in determining the scope of their authority and ability to implement these laws. In California for example, Education Code 35160 permits school boards to “carry on any program, activity, or...otherwise act in any manner which is not in conflict with or inconsistent with...the purposes for which school districts are established.”

Federal and state governments set laws to address the needs of students. For instance, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975 provide categorical funding to underserved student populations. School boards make decisions on classroom instructional materials, intervention programs for at-risk student populations, or teacher contracts. These decisions illustrate Bolman and Deal’s (2008) organizational frames, described above. Specifically, the process by which boards come to consensus on a policy as well as the laws and structures (e.g., state education code) that inform the roles and responsibilities of a school board exemplify the structural frame.

School board power lies in its collective decision-making ability. Their ability is both broad and limited. According to Maricle (2014), California school board power is broad in that the educational code allows the board to execute any powers delegated by law to it, discharge any duty imposed by law upon it, or delegate to an officer or employee of the district any of those powers or duties. Ultimate responsibility and duty remains with the board. However, there is a limited time that boards can act upon their autonomy. California education code dictates that boards can take action only at meetings open to the public, only on agenda items posted 72 hours in advance of a meeting, and only by a majority vote (see sections 35145, 54954.2, and 35163-4).

The recent passage of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act placed a majority of funding control at the local government level, where school boards are given responsibility with Local Control Funding Formulas and Local Control Accountability Plans. These plans eliminate categorical funding and give school districts greater autonomy to allocate state and federal funding to teacher and student improvement programs. As outlined in Alsbury's (2003) dissatisfaction theory and Bolman and Deal's (2008) frames, local level political issues such as student population, resources, or other constituent interests introduce the possibility of conflict in how funding is allocated, the election of board members, or the hiring of a superintendent.

The selection of board members is a political process, occurring through public election or local government appointment. Roberts and Sampson (2011) showed that common criteria for board member selection include that the candidate be a minimum age of 18 years, be a registered voter, and be a resident within the county of service. Data from the National School Board Association (NSBA, 2009) show a varied process across the nation. In states like New Hampshire, Texas, and California, board members are elected by popular vote. Illinois board members are elected, but in some counties, can be appointed by a governor or local mayor. Local

boards of elections ensure compliance with state and federal election laws. They also determine additional criteria addressing size of the board, length of service, and even educational requirements (GED or high school diploma). Hess and Meeks (2010) noted that a typical school board comprises three to seven members who serve a term of four to six years depending on school district bylaws.

Interestingly, a report from the Institute for Educational Leadership (1986) on nine districts showed that there was “strong support among community leaders, parents, local citizens, and educators for preserving school boards,” but at the same time there was “widespread public ignorance of their established roles and functions” (p. 10). Simply put, a voting public unaware of school board member responsibilities elects representatives who hire a single employee, entrusting him or her with the day-to-day management of a school district. According to Iannaccone and Lutz (1994) and Alsbury (2004), school boards and superintendents are not held accountable until public dissatisfaction reaches a tipping point. Then, the public enacts change by electing new board members or removing superintendents. (Critiques of school boards are discussed further in a later section.)

Influences on School Boards

By design, school board members are elected as individuals but serve on a collective board. Alsbury (2003) suggested newly elected board members might represent views that oppose those of the current school board and/or superintendent. Byrd et al. (2006) extended this notion and highlighted power conflicts within school boards due to recently elected members. This condition exemplifies the premise of dissatisfaction theory, where the public—dissatisfied with the current school board policies or practices—enacts change by electing new members. Further exemplifying Bolman and Deal’s (2008) structural frame, these members may not know

the established practices or processes associated with the board's role as a decision-making entity (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, 1992). These conditions can result in strained relationships between board members and superintendents (Fusarelli, 2006). In another example of dissatisfaction theory and Bolman and Deal's frames, Patterson and colleagues' (2006) study of a Midwestern school district further exemplifies how local politics influence school board elections. In 2003, the local electorate ousted two incumbent board members and elected two more to open seats after the board fired two popular principals. The superintendent resigned his position within five months of the election, two years into his tenure.

Individual board members must collectively address matters that may not pertain to the issues they were elected to represent. Further, Kirst (2010) argued, they are subject to influence from local interest groups and cannot control a collective board agenda. Indeed, for board members to maintain their positions on a board, they must become skillful at addressing multiple interest groups. The 2013 LAUSD board election provides an example of this condition (Ballotpedia, 2016). Antonio Sanchez won the primary election in March with support from both the union, United Teachers Los Angeles (UTLA), and the Coalition for School Reform, an interest group opposed to the interests of UTLA.

Criticisms of School Boards

The role and actions of school boards have come under criticism within the past several years (Campbell, 2010; Grissom, 2010; Howell, 2005; McBeath, 2011). Resnick (1999) argued that the public perceives school boards as relevant to the democratic process and as an example of representative government. However, the public perception of school board influence, specifically on what is taught in schools, shows a declining trend. A 2006 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll found that 58% of respondents believed local entities such as school boards

should have the greatest influence on what is taught in schools. In 2015, this percentage had decreased to 39% (Rose & Gallup, 2006; 2015).

Mayoral control of school districts—that is, removing local governance from school boards—has been proposed as a solution to address the challenges faced by school boards (Hess, 2008; Kirst & Bulkley, 2000; Kirst, 2010; Viteritti, 2008). Wong and Shen (2003) researched mayoral takeover in four urban cities and found test scores improved. However, a 2015 Collaborative for Justice and Equity in Education report provided evidence against the argument for removing governance from publicly elected individuals (Lipman et al., 2015). In Chicago, the mayoral appointment of school board members, a majority of whom were from the local business and finance sector, contributed to a widening of racial disparities, poorly managed fiscal resources, and limited public input. Since 2001, Chicago Public Schools have had five superintendents, three of whom have served terms fewer than three years (Chicago Reporter, 2016). The argument over who should control local school districts—mayors, appointed trustees, or publicly elected citizens—continues (Gold, Henig, & Simon, 2011; Lipman et al., 2015; Viteritti, 2008).

As described earlier in the chapter, Maricle (2014) stated that school board power is limited to open-session public meetings. It is therefore notable that, further supporting the criticism of school boards, Lee and Eadens (2014) used a survey instrument to analyze video recordings from 115 such meetings. Their study focused on board effectiveness and student achievement. They found that board meetings of low performing districts were less orderly, lacked respectful attention to speakers, and did not focus on policy issues affecting their respective districts. Although these findings provide important insights into school board activities, some of the researchers' questions did not yield sufficient detail. Specifically, some

were open-response items that allowed respondents to record evidence of behaviors—for example, they were provided space to describe how any board member stood out for taking a lot of time, yet there was no qualitative analysis of these responses. An analysis of thematic trends would further justify and provide specific training areas to their recommendations for “highly refined and target-enhanced school board training programs” (p. 9).

School Board Effectiveness

Land (2002) provided key characteristics evident in effective school boards. The main areas noted are setting goals and objectives, maintaining good relationships between the school board and superintendent, evaluating progress, and effective performance. Multiple researchers have cited these characteristics in their studies on school boards and superintendents (Alsbury, 2008; Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Plecki, McCleery, & Knapp, 2006; Rhim et al., 2013). Yet the superintendent turnover rate remains close to three to five years.

Several studies in the 1980s to early 2000s addressed school board effectiveness. The two major studies from that period were a report from the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL, 1986) and the Lighthouse Inquiry (Rice et al., 2000). The issues highlighted in both continue to challenge board members and superintendents. The IEL report described case studies from nine urban districts and surveys of 200 national board chairpersons. Two of the study’s 11 findings on board effectiveness are related to the current research—one regarding boards having difficulty delineating authority between the school board and the superintendent, and another concerning school boards’ understanding of the need for professional development. Professional development offerings at the time were noted as informational and episodic; as Fixsen and colleagues (2009) asserted, however, effective implementation takes time and practice.

The Lighthouse Inquiry (Rice et al., 2000) compared board practices from high and low performing districts using a case study analysis of six districts in Georgia and Iowa. Board members in high achieving districts attributed positive relationships to decision-making processes. Board members in low performing districts had limited knowledge of district initiatives and programs. The Lighthouse Inquiry, while comprehensive, has an important methodological weakness vis-à-vis the current study. The authors reported “fairly amicable relationships” among board members and superintendents and provided a quote—“We disagree without making it personal”—to support this claim (p. 39). They did not discuss, however, what constituted amicable relationships, nor did they describe the processes and norms used in decision making.

A similar problem exists in a study by Hess and Meeks (2010), which asked respondents to rate barriers to student improvement; lack of board support was a possible response, but this broad category was not clearly defined. The reader is left to wonder how board support is lacking, and what constitutes board conflict. Likewise, Glass et al. (2000) asked board members to rank the problems they faced, and one of the response items was internal board conflict. Unfortunately, the survey only allowed respondents to identify key issues, and no further descriptive information was gathered.

Factors in Superintendent Turnover

Lack of School Board Training

Because the criteria for running for or being appointed to a school board position are typically minimal, individuals without knowledge or experience in education-related matters may be elected and empowered to determine policy and action for four years or more (Roberts & Sampson, 2011). Although Hess and Meeks (2010) reported that 74% of board member

respondents had a bachelor's degree, there is potential for boards to be made up of individuals who lack experience working with groups, content-specific knowledge of finance or human resource matters, and/or standards-based instruction (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992). As a result, as Fuller, Campbell, Celio, Immerwahr, and Winger (2003) showed, superintendents must balance the time and attention they spend on school district management with time spent updating the school board.

But what are the processes for orienting new board members to their roles and responsibilities? Individual states determine the orientation process for new members or ongoing professional development for current members. A search of the National School Boards Association website shows inconsistent state requirements for training, if they are even mandated ("Mandated Training for School Board Members," 2012). Furthermore, time requirements among these states vary from eight to 40 hours per year according to the National School Boards Foundation (NSBF, 2001). California is not among these 23 states; it has no mandated training for new and continuing board members.

Strained Relationships

An important factor in school governance is the relationship between the school board and the superintendent (McAdams, 2006). In fact, the NSBA's (2015) *Key Work of School Boards* guidebook identifies relationships as one of six key drivers of student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative studies have identified how challenges in communication, political agendas, and roles and responsibilities can affect this key relationship, however. Rice et al. (2000) found that successful districts had collaborative relationships with their superintendents; they cooperatively established goals, objectives, and processes. Extending these findings, Land (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of extant research and found high achieving districts had clear

communication strategies between board members and superintendents. Land did not, however, provide details on those strategies.

Patterson et al. (2006) illustrated how divergent agendas can obstruct and harm relationships while also illustrating the premise of dissatisfaction theory and Bolman and Deal's (2008) frames. One example from their study detailed how district leaders held public focus groups to interview potential superintendent candidates. The move was well received by the public as it was a departure from the traditional hiring method. The board then hired the least recommended candidate because he/she embodied the previous superintendent's authoritarian management style. The new superintendent fired two popular principals despite a collective public effort to halt the decision. During the next election, four new board members were elected and the superintendent resigned two years later.

These findings are echoed in Lee and Eadens's (2014) study of board meetings. They researched the effectiveness of school boards using a survey tool to statistically analyze 117 online school board meetings from across the nation. They asked, "Did any member seem to advance their own agenda (like grandstanding and wanting to look good in public)?" Lee and Eadens found statistically significant data showing that struggling districts had school boards and superintendents with divergent agendas such as prioritizing facilities, discipline over student learning outcomes, or personal agendas.

Danzberger et al. (1992) conducted a survey of 266 school boards from 16 states and found the boards failed to develop communication and lasting relationships with superintendents. Quigley (2009) reported similar findings: In a parallel mixed methods study of 256 school board members, superintendents, and district personnel, she found school boards voted in factions and spent meetings discussing trivial matters. Likewise, Banicki and Pacha (2011) surveyed 286

Illinois superintendents and found 42% reported board members engaged in off-topic discussions during closed session meetings. As the Lighthouse Inquiry showed, a low performing district lacked established decision making structures (Rice et al., 2000).

Byrd et al. (2006) surveyed 141 Texas superintendents on their relationships with school board members and found that as the level of difficulty in working with school boards increased, the odds of turnover also increased. Alsbury (2003) and Tekniepe (2015) found similar results predicting turnover using political or “push” induced factors. The challenges related to board members’ relationships with superintendents have resulted in demands to remove governing authority (Finn & Petrilli, 2013; Hess, 2008).

Superintendent Role

Greenleaf, Covey, and Spears (2002) argued that superintendents have the unique role of being the authority on matters on which board members are not experts, such as instructional practices. Thus, the employee is tasked with leading his/her employer. Hess and Meeks (2010) exemplified this point and showed board members deferred to superintendents for information on district matters. Specifically, 89% of 881 board members stated they used the superintendent as the primary information source to make decisions.

Nevertheless, the relationship between the school board and the superintendent may be strained as board members impede on superintendent decision-making authority. In a qualitative study, Opfer and Denmark (2001) found that when board members superseded authority by directly acting on principal requests and not informing the superintendent, the power and role of the superintendent position was weakened. Principals in their study described the experiences of three former superintendents—one hired in an interim position, one newly appointed, and one in the last months of a non-renewed contract. The principals described how the board took time to

address a parent appeal over a single point that was eventually denied by the board. This misuse of time exemplifies the use of positional power outlined in Bolman and Deal's (2008) political frame.

Fuller et al. (2003) found similar results with micromanaging by school boards. When superintendents were asked to rate how much of challenge it was when school boards micromanaged the district and the superintendent, 61% stated they were a "moderate" to "major" challenge. In an interview, one superintendent stated, "The city board has totally micromanaged the school district. I mean totally. Principals went to board members before they would go to the superintendent" (p. 20). Fuller et al. also found that the structure of the superintendent position limited what they were hired to do. Superintendents described having to manage "highly complex bureaucracies and deal with teachers, unions, teachers, parents, and community organizations" (p. 11). They posited that authority to make decisions, time, and support of the board could increase superintendent capacity.

The Centrality of Decision Making

Findings from educational research continuously point to decision making as an area of need for school board member professional development (Land, 2002; Mestry & Hlongwane, 2009; Quigley, 2009). Anderson and Snyder (1980) and Newton and Sackney (2005) have suggested decision-making training is needed to improve board–superintendent relationships. The policy and programs officer of the CSBA has argued that decision-making training addresses the need for continuity and organizational norms at the district level (Maricle, 2014). Further, it can provide structure to address salient issues affecting outcomes for populations such as English language learners or special needs students.

Providing professional development related to decision making does not ensure positive results, however. Nitta, Wrobel, Howard, and Jimmerson-Eddings's (2009) case study of an Arkansas district reorganization showed the challenges of using Kotter's (1995) eight-step change management process. In this process, participants come together, create and communicate a vision for change, and empower individuals or teams to act. Lastly, they engage in a cycle of planning, implementation, and revision. The study found a breakdown in the communication process when school personnel were not supported at the site level. Nitta and colleagues suggested on-site support for supervisors (e.g., principals) to help communicate goals and objectives. In a meta-analysis of coaching and learning, Joyce and Showers (2002) supported Nitta's claim. They found 95% of teachers implemented new skills when provided with on-site continuous coaching. Providing similar training and development may provide a solution for low performing school boards.

High performing boards are intentional in how they structure decision-making processes. Land (2002) reported high performing school boards had processes for diffusing tension among members. McAdams (2006) argued that effective boards develop processes for goal setting. Quigley (2009) showed established trainings for board members did not emphasize decision making and suggested a training emphasis on how to gain consensus on critical district objectives. Providing low performing boards with continuous training and coaching on processes such as decision making would address time and financial challenges.

The Lighthouse Inquiry recommended board training to increase content knowledge of district issues, improve community communication with constituents, and develop systems to create and sustain reform efforts (Rice et al., 2000). Training might focus on norms and processes of decision making such as asking clarifying objective questions. Increased decision-

making capacity could strengthen board member–superintendent relationships, for example by lessening the time superintendents provide information to board members or time lost during closed session meetings that may include mostly off-topic conversations. Improved relationships would lessen superintendent turnover attributed to challenges with the school board.

Challenges of Training Board Members

Individual states determine whether or not to require an orientation process or ongoing professional development for school board members. As noted earlier, a search of the NSBA website shows inconsistent state requirements for training if it is even mandated. Time and financial considerations also present challenges in training board members, in part because they typically have other professional responsibilities. In Hess and Meeks’s (2010) research, 90% of survey respondents had full-time jobs, and limited time and financial resources hindered opportunities for board member professional development. Further, they surveyed 150 board chairpersons and found that, for the majority (59%), whole-board professional development occurred only one to two times per year; nearly a quarter (23.3%) reported no whole group development at all. Scheduling difficulties were the most common reason for this.

Training locations are another challenge to receiving professional development. Rhim, et al. (2013) reported development opportunities occurred in urban locations and required travel expenses and time away from work. The CSBA’s 10-day MIG program, for example, is divided into five two-day trainings in specific cities (“Masters In Governance,” 2016.). Districts incur considerable investment costs, as each course requires a \$250 fee plus travel and food expenses. Hess and Meeks (2010) reported that 62% percent of respondents received no compensation for their board service. And in a qualitative study of 18 school board members from 15 states, Rhim et al. (2013) found board members preferred self-directed learning to remain current in their

responsibilities. The researchers concluded it would be economically inefficient to continually budget for board professional development in high turnover districts.

Existing Training

Productive school board–superintendent relationships depend on key training elements (Goodman, Fulbright, & Zimmerman, 1997). Existing efforts primarily focuses on student achievement and processes to improve school board–superintendent relationships such as decision-making protocols (Rhim et al., 2013; Roberts & Sampson, 2011). Rhim et al. reported various approaches to school board training, ranging from single- or multi-day sessions with various service providers to multi-year coaching. They also reported several options for who should provide the training: the internal district, the state board association, third party consultants, or higher education institutions. Hess and Meeks (2010) noted several pathways to participation including state-level conferences, online courses, and videos.

Concerning topics, recommendations from Rhim et al.'s (2013) literature review on school board professional development focus on the key areas of school governance: finance matters, clarifying role expectations or strategic goal planning, and establishing collaborative relationships. An example can be found in the CSBA's MIG program, where training encompasses the high focus areas of finance, role responsibilities, communication systems, state and federal law, and student achievement. What is not included in these trainings at the school board level is development for internal communication practices or decision-making protocols such as Robert's Rules of Order (Griffin, 1951); strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analyses (Fine, 2009); or the concerns-based adoption model, or CBAM (Peck & Bown, 1968). Such protocols establish norms to ensure that meetings adhere to agenda items, prohibit side conversations, and strive to meet stated outcomes. They may also establish an operating

culture for the board where ideas are respectfully probed and challenged or conflicts are resolved. The research shows SWOT analyses and CBAM processes demonstrate results in change management in corporate sectors as well as the educational sector at school site level. (Khoboli & O'Toole, 2012; Roach, Kratochwill, & Frank, 2009; Salamati, Eghbali, & Zarghampour, 2014).

Few of the training resources I reviewed addressed the processes required for sustainability. Moreover, one- to two-day sporadic training sessions can present only a limited amount of information. Mountford (2004) interviewed 20 board members from rural to urban districts and found board members and superintendents needed dedicated time to examine the relationship impact from personal values and agendas. Land (2002) showed that the highest performing school districts had established processes to make decisions on key district matters. It is those processes that need to be addressed through trainings. However the time and money investment required of board members presents challenges. Further, board member turnover jeopardizes the continuity of the knowledge board members receive during their tenure.

Conclusion

In summary, the research shows that the relationship between the superintendent and school board members affects superintendent turnover. Undefined processes in information gathering and decision making contribute to school board members' difficulty discerning roles and responsibilities, and this can result in strained relationships with the superintendent. Although board members empower the superintendent to manage a school district, Opfer and Denmark (2001) showed the relationship is weakened when board members supersede or infringe upon superintendent authority. The micromanaging of superintendents by their board

members is common in the research, and it supports what superintendents state as to why they leave their positions.

Compounding these issues is the fact that many states, including California, do not mandate training for board members. Given the limited access to school board members, there is little research on the effects of training, specifically on decision-making processes, on superintendent turnover. The current study will inform professional development opportunities for board members and superintendents by providing insight into what factors influence the decision-making process as well as highlight conditions that lead to successes and challenges.

CHAPTER 3:

METHODS

This study was designed to contribute to our understanding of how decision-making factors and types of training affect relationships between superintendents and school board members. As described in the previous chapter, conflict between the two contributes to high rates of superintendent turnover (Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Tekniepe, 2015), which poses a threat to district stability and reform. Established processes for decision making can diffuse tension among school board members (Land, 2002) and this has the potential to improve superintendent turnover rates. Thus, the current study focused on how school boards' decision-making training affects board member–superintendent relationships and what types of training could improve these relationships. In particular, I addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of turnover?
2. What kinds of conflicts do school board members and superintendents say they experience?
3. How does the decision-making process contribute to the conflict or lack of conflict between school board members and the superintendent?
4. What specific trainings do school board members and superintendents receive that are most related to conflict? What are the pros and cons of those trainings?
5. Do school boards and superintendents who have gone through training say they experience fewer instances of conflict?

Research Design

I employed a quantitative design to identify the types of conflict experienced at the school board level and the types of that training board members and superintendents receive. In

particular, I focused on training in conflict resolution and decision making that might influence school board–superintendent relationships. To explore these issues, I administered a survey to CSBA members. Quantitative data, such as number of superintendents or board members a district has had in the past eight years, allowed me to determine the strength of correlation between having a decision-making process and the rate of superintendent turnover.

There are over 5,000 board members and 1,000 superintendents in California. School boards comprise multiple members with differing professional backgrounds and experiences who work with a superintendent. A quantitative approach therefore makes sense in order to generalize findings from a sample of board members and superintendents. In order to answer Research Questions 1 and 2, I needed to ask about the specific areas of superintendent and board member responsibilities where conflicts occur, such as financial solvency, labor contracts, or matters related to facilities. To address Research Question 3, I identified characteristics within the decision-making process that promote or inhibit the process, for example content knowledge of an issue, knowledge of role responsibilities, or who facilitates the resolution process. To address Research Question 4, I asked about the professional development board members and superintendents have received and the extent to which the training affected conflict. In order to answer Research Question 5, I identified the association between the board member training and superintendents and the level of superintendent turnover.

Site and Access

As described in the previous chapter, board members and superintendents are the primary decision-making entities for school district policies. As such, they provided data for the study. School district structures vary widely by state. To control for variability, the study was limited to

California school districts. California provides a rich population sample with over 1,000 school districts encompassing urban, suburban, and rural populations.

CSBA's Policy and Programs Division granted access to their member database, which includes board members and superintendents from diverse urban, suburban, and rural regions with varied enrollment sizes. Their members represent over 1,000 statewide education agencies and include 5,000 individuals. CSBA agreed to push out the survey to a randomly selected sample of board members and superintendents. Due to privacy protocols, CSBA implemented the survey through their internal web-based communications platform. This allowed CSBA to monitor survey completion and generate reminder emails every two weeks. At the completion of the six-week data collection period, CSBA exported the survey results to me for analysis.

Selection and Recruitment of Survey Participants

CSBA randomly selected 350 superintendents and 350 board members for a total possible sample size of 700—approximately 14% of CSBA's members. As Keppel and Wickens (2004) stated, a random sample ensures an equal representation and selection of the population. Data collection occurred over six weeks with reminders sent out to respondents every two weeks to encourage participation. First, the 700 members received an email notifying them of their selection to participate in the study. A survey link was provided to the selected participants. The initial page provided details of the study and measures to ensure for confidentiality. This sample allowed collected data to be disaggregated and analyzed by geographic region (Fowler, 2014).

In total, 200 survey responses were collected from the 700 possible respondents, for an overall response rate of 28.6%. The data collection yielded a response rate of 26.9% (N = 94) of the possible 350 board members, and 30.3% (N = 106) of the 350 superintendents and superintendents who also were a board member. The final sample included CSBA board

members and superintendents from rural, suburban, and urban regions of California.

Respondents represented various district sizes ranging from fewer than 1,000 students to more than 10,000.

Data Collection Methods

Development of Survey Instrument

I developed the survey and conducted several pilot tests for revisions. The initial design began in a survey research methods course. In the first iteration, I focused on identifying question and response types aligned to the research questions such as drop-down menus or text boxes. Survey items were based on key areas of decision making and training identified in the literature such as superintendent turnover, decision-making processes, and training received (Grissom & Andersen, 2012; Land, 2002; Hess & Meeks, 2010; Tekniepe, 2015).

The next phase of the design occurred in a research practicum course. Professors and fellow cohort members provided feedback that determined the order of questions by topic—for example, demographics, conflict, decision making, and training. The final phase of the design process involved four cognitive interviews with current and former school board members, superintendents, and service providers to revise survey questions and response options. These individuals shared similar characteristics and experiences to the research population and provided relevant insight into the survey instrument's development (Beatty & Willis, 2007; Collins, 2003).

Cognitive interviewing is a tool to evaluate how respondents understand and process a survey instrument (Beatty & Willis, 2007). Hurst et al. (2015) noted that studies that neglect pre-testing an instrument have an increased possibility of collecting invalid or incomplete data. Similarly, Knafl et al. (2007) argued that comparing the respondent's processing and answer to a

survey item to that intended by the researcher can improve the wording of questions and response items. The process ensured greater validity and reliability in the survey instrument as I probed each respondent with questions—for example, asking him or her to reword a question or explain a pause in answering a question—to determine understanding.

I revised the survey instrument after each of the four interviews. In the first interview, it was suggested that I use matrix questions to reduce the number of questions. This question type allows for respondents to apply the same measurement when answering several related questions. Based on feedback I also incorporated skip logic to shorten the survey. For example, asking whether the respondent was a board member or superintendent determined a specific path through the survey.

I conducted the second pilot test with a former superintendent. This resulted in moving the demographics section to the beginning of the survey because they are straightforward, low-risk questions. Following the third interview, I added section headings to introduce the purpose of those questions and present definitions to help focus responses. The final pilot test and interview yielded feedback that affirmed the suggestions of the previous respondents. The majority of comments focused on syntactical and grammatical edits for consistency throughout the survey.

Content of Survey Instrument

The survey used in this study can be found in Appendix A. Section 1 of the survey included questions about demographics. Here, participants recorded district demographic data such as district size, geographic location, and number of governing board members. I used ordinal questions to identify existing sociodemographic conditions, such as years of service or

political ideology. The final questions in this section collected data on issues that contribute to board members not seeking re-election or superintendents leaving the district.

Section 2 addressed conflict. Here, I used Likert-scale ratings to obtain data on the areas of board governance where conflict takes place (e.g., collective bargaining agreements or district finance matters). Section 3 focused on decision making and included nominal questions that identified the processes used by the districts. Further, this section included Likert-scale questions on the usefulness of decision-making processes in governance areas such as facilities and buildings matters. Data obtained through nominal and ordinal questions identified established decision-making protocols, the degree to which they were adhered to, and the individuals who facilitated the process. Finally, Section 4 addressed training. Nominal and ordinal survey questions gathered information on types of training received and service providers, as well as on the frequency with which the training occurs.

Data Analysis

Survey responses of the board member and superintendent sample were imported into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. I analyzed the differences between high and low turnover districts across demographics, types of conflict, decision making, and training. Data analysis began with a review of frequencies for all variables for each section of the survey. Hypotheses were generated with respect to the research questions. Next, statistical tests were applied to identify any significant differences between high and low turnover districts. Further, inductive qualitative analysis of open-response survey questions was conducted where applicable.

The Turnover Variable

The turnover variable was created to delineate between high and low turnover districts. The literature considers the average tenure of superintendents as approximately three to five years (Council of Great City Schools, 2014; Grissom & Anderson, 2012). For the purposes of this study, the turnover variable was based on the number of superintendent turnovers in a district within the past eight years. Eight years was selected based on the assumption that at least one or two school board election cycles had occurred. Question 6 asked board members, “In the past eight years, how many superintendents has your district had?” Question 10 asked superintendents, “How many years have you served as superintendent of the district that currently employs you?” Board members who stated they had three or more superintendents over the past eight years and superintendents who stated they had served their districts for four years or fewer were considered “High Turnover.” Board members who stated they had two or fewer superintendents in this time span and superintendents who stated they had served their district for five or more years were considered “Low Turnover.”

The NoReturn Variable

In the demographics section, respondents answered a series of questions specific to their experiences. Two sets of data for Questions 8 and 12, one for school board members and one for superintendents, were recorded separately. Respondents were asked, “To what extent do the following issues have an impact on your decision or pending decision to not seek re-election/return?” For analysis purposes, I recoded the separate board member and superintendent responses into a new variable so that their combined answers could be analyzed. The new variable was called “NoReturn_(CATEGORY),” where (CATEGORY) was replaced with a specific indicator, for example, collective bargaining agreements (noreturncba), finance/funding

matters (noreturnfin), or district infrastructure (noreturninfra). The indicators included key governance areas and were drawn from prior surveys based in the literature.

The Train Variable

Question 23 in the training section of the survey asked respondents to describe the training they had received in a range of specific areas. They were asked to indicate their level of training based on a Likert scale ranging from “Have not had training and do not want it” to “Have received sufficient training.” Prior to statistical testing, the fourth indicator, “Have had training and would like ongoing training and feedback” was removed from the scale and recoded to “missing.” This was to ensure the test was conducted only for training that had already occurred.

I used descriptive statistics to analyze quantitative responses to the four main areas of the survey (Alkin, 2010)—demographic characteristics, conflict, decision making, and training. I used descriptive statistical analyses to identify district characteristics, such as population or number of board members, as well as the degree at which certain characteristics of decision making are present—for example, superintendent turnover or the success of decision-making processes during times of conflict.

Chi-square tests were used to determine if there were significant associations between nominal variables such as high/low turnover and school district location (rural, suburban, or urban). I employed the Mann Whitney U test to determine statistical significance between the mean of the high and low turnover groups based on multiple Likert-scaled survey questions. As a non-parametric test, the Mann Whitney U test does not assume any properties regarding distribution and is a statistical comparison of a mean. Therefore, it is the preferred test because of the multiple ordinal survey questions. The test is based on three assumptions: random samples

from populations, independence within samples and mutual independence between samples, and an ordinal measurement scale.

I analyzed responses to open-ended, short answer questions through inductive data analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I organized the responses by themes and patterns. This provided insight into particular indicators not listed on the survey such as decision-making processes used by boards, reasons preventing board members from engaging in whole-group professional development, and reasons why the responsibilities of board members or superintendents did or did not improve after training.

Validity and Reliability

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to address threats to validity and reliability of the survey data. I analyzed for a normal distribution by analyzing frequency counts to ensure validity. For example, more respondents from urban districts would skew findings toward a particular region and introduce sample bias. The Mann Whitney U statistical test provided a critical value to determine statistical significance of the test conditions experienced between the high and low turnover groups.

Reactivity concerns were addressed via the cognitive interview process, as the survey was finalized to minimize bias and sensitivity of potential questions. CSBA ensured anonymity and confidentiality by randomly selecting a sample and pushing out the survey via their own internal communication platform. Further, specific names of school districts were not gathered. To further ensure confidentiality, I used coded notes and encrypted storage devices for all data.

Role Management and Ethical Issues

I took several measures to address potential ethical concerns in the study. First, my current role as a service provider with WestEd may have surfaced reactivity concerns from

survey respondents. In the introductory letter for the survey, I disclosed to participants my current role as a professional development provider. In order to address possible concerns, I restated the purpose of my study to identify conditions that led to or mitigated decision-making conflict and how responses could be used to improve professional practices through training.

CSBA maintains a database of its members that includes contact information. As noted earlier, CSBA granted me indirect access to this population database. The organization also conducts training for board members and superintendents through several delivery platforms such as online and via institutes and conferences. CSBA stated an interest in my study where I, as the primary researcher, would provide objective findings that could inform or enhance existing training modules for board members and superintendents on decision-making processes. Though I partnered with CSBA, I conducted an independent study. I was careful not to let CSBA's interests influence me, as findings from my study could potentially support or provide evidence contrary to CSBA organizational goals.

Data files were kept on an encrypted hard drive. Informed consent was arranged through the CSBA partnership. The introductory page of the survey explicitly detailed the goals and objectives of the study and steps to ensure confidentiality. Upon completion of the study, all hard copies of files were destroyed and digital copies deleted.

CHAPTER 4:

FINDINGS

The findings described in this chapter are based on analysis of survey data from a randomly selected sample of California school board members and superintendents listed in the CSBA database, as described in Chapter 3. Eight key findings are presented.

Research Question 1

To answer Research Question 1 concerning characteristics of turnover, I began with a descriptive analysis of demographic information. Of the 200 survey respondents, 106 identified as a current superintendent or former board member or president now serving as a superintendent. I refer to these respondents simply as superintendents. Slightly fewer (n = 94) identified themselves as a board member or board president. In this section I present findings on turnover rates in different types of districts, as well as reasons that participants gave for leaving their positions.

Finding 1: There was no difference in high versus low turnover based on urban, suburban, or rural location, or on size of student population.

In all, 83.5% of respondents reported having a school board consisting of four to five members. The majority of respondents (86%) indicated they were from rural or suburban districts (43% each); the remaining 14% were from urban districts. These findings are in line with the overall distribution of district populations in the state (“Fingertip Facts,” 2014). Furthermore, a Stanford website indicates 87% of California’s population reside in urban/suburban areas while 13% reside in rural areas (Stanford School of Medicine, 2010). As Table 3.1 indicates, most respondents (63.5%) came from districts with student populations below 5,000, and 23% had over 10,000 students. Simply put, there was a greater number of

districts in rural and suburban areas than in urban, even though urban districts educate a greater number of students.

Based on these findings, the following hypothesis for Research Question 1 was formed:

Superintendent turnover occurs more frequently in rural areas than urban or suburban areas.

Table 3.1

Student Population by District Location Type

		Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Students 1–999 in district	Number of districts	2	14	46	62
	% within student population 1–999	3.2%	22.6%	74.2%	100.0%
	% within demographic region	7.1%	16.3%	53.5%	31.0%
	% of total	1.0%	7.0%	23.0%	31.0%
1,000– 4,999	Number of districts	8	28	29	65
	% within student population 1000– 4,999	12.3%	43.1%	44.6%	100.0%
	% within demographic region	28.6%	32.6%	33.7%	32.5%
	% of total	4.0%	14.0%	14.5%	32.5%
5,000– 9,999	Number of districts	6	14	7	27
	% within student population 5000– 9,999	22.2%	51.9%	25.9%	100.0%
	% within demographic region	21.4%	16.3%	8.1%	13.5%
	% of total	3.0%	7.0%	3.5%	13.5%
10,000+	Number of districts	12	30	4	46
	% within student population 10,000+	26.1%	65.2%	8.7%	100.0%
	% within demographic region	42.9%	34.9%	4.7%	23.0%
	% of total	6.0%	15.0%	2.0%	23.0%
Total	Count	28	86	86	200
	% within student population of district	14.0%	43.0%	43.0%	100.0%
	% within location	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of total	14.0%	43.0%	43.0%	100.0%

A cross tabulation compared the turnover variable with district location and with student population. As seen in Tables 3.2 and 3.3, there were similar distributions of location type when I compared high turnover districts and low turnover districts. A chi-square test of independence ($p > .05$) indicated that the distribution of turnover was similar across urban, suburban, and rural districts. Further, the Mann Whitney U test ($p > .05$) for student population indicated a similar distribution of turnover. The data show that high turnover occurred just as frequently as low turnover across various district locations and student population size.

Table 3.2

District Location by Turnover

	Urban #	Suburban #	Rural #	Total #
High turnover	15	43	42	100
Low turnover	13	43	44	100
Total	28	86	86	200

Table 3.3

Student Population by Turnover

	1-999 #	1,000-4,999 #	5,000-9,999 #	10,000 + #	Total #
High turnover	34	27	13	26	100
Low turnover	28	38	14	20	100
Total	62	65	27	46	200

Finding 2: Relationships, district infrastructure, and school board protocols were the primary reasons board members and superintendents said they might not return the following year.

Board members and superintendents were asked if they intended to return to their positions the following year. Twenty-one percent of respondents said either “No” or “Unknown/Unsure.” These respondents were directed to a set of Likert-scaled questions that asked about the extent to which key issues had impacted their decisions. The responses were analyzed using the noreturn variable described in Chapter 3. Table 3.4 compares respondents who planned to return with those who did not or who were unsure. These findings are disaggregated by geographic region and district size. Twenty-one percent of respondents stated “Not Returning / Unknown / Unsure” as to their intent for the next year. Approximately 20% of respondents’ return is not certain with regard to both district location as well as district size.

Table 3.4

Demographic Information of Respondents by Intention to Return

	Returning #	Not Returning / Unknown / Unsure #	Total #
Role			
Board Member	61	33	94
Superintendent	96	10	106
District Location			
Rural	68	18	86
Suburban	66	20	86
Urban	23	5	28
District Size			
1–999	50	12	62
1,000–4,999	49	16	65
5,000–9,999	20	7	27
10,000+	38	8	46

Of the respondents who stated their return was questionable, “school board relationships” (noretreturnrelat) received the highest percentage (45.2%) of “moderate impact” and “high impact” ratings. Based on the descriptive statistics of the key areas, a hypothesis was generated:

Relationships are associated with the difference between high and low turnover districts.

A p-value of .013 indicates a significant difference in the mean for school board relationships in high turnover districts versus lower turnover districts (Table 3.5). Further, statistically significant values (Tables 3.7 and 3.9) were identified in additional governance areas, for example district infrastructure and resources (noretreturninfra) with $p < .05$ and school board protocols and procedures (noretreturnpro) with $p < .01$. Response patterns indicate that school board relationships and district protocols are significant indicators of why superintendents and board members may not return the following year.

Table 3.5

Impact of School Board Relationships on Unsure/Not Returning Respondents by Turnover

	No Impact #	Slight Impact #	Moderate Impact #	High Impact #	Total #
High turnover	3	4	3	8	18
Low turnover	12	4	5	3	24
Total	15	8	8	11	42

* $p < .05$.

Table 3.6

Test Statistic (School Board Relationships)

School Board Relationships	
Mann-Whitney U	122.500
Wilcoxon W	422.500
Z	-2.473
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.013

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Table 3.7

Impact of Infrastructure and Resources on Unsure/Not Returning Respondents by Turnover

	No Impact #	Slight Impact #	Moderate Impact #	High Impact #	Total #
High turnover	7	4	6	1	18
Low turnover	17	6	1	0	24
Total	24	10	7	1	42

*p < .05.

Table 3.8

Test Statistic (Infrastructure and Resources)

Infrastructure and Resources	
Mann-Whitney U	127.500
Wilcoxon W	427.500
Z	-2.522
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Table 3.9

Impact of School Board Protocols and Procedures on Unsure/Not Returning Respondents by Turnover

	No Impact #	Slight Impact #	Moderate Impact #	High Impact #	Total #
High turnover	6	7	3	2	18
Low turnover	18	3	3	0	24
Total	24	10	6	2	42

**p < .01.

Table 3.10

Test Statistic (Protocols and Procedures)

Protocols and Procedures	
Mann-Whitney U	126.000
Wilcoxon W	426.000
Z	-2.562
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.010

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Research Question 2

The data from the conflict section of the survey informed the findings for Research Question 2. Specifically, in this section I describe the types of conflicts that school board members and superintendents said they have experienced.

Finding 3: Superintendent and board member relationships as well as school board governance issues are key indicators of conflict.

Respondents were asked how often over the past eight years they had experienced conflict in key governance areas (i.e., collective bargaining agreements, facilities, finances,

recruitment of personnel) and relationships (board member–superintendent and board member–board member). Overall, 62.6% to 90.3% of respondents stated “never” or “rarely.” When the percentages for “sometimes” through “always” were summed, relationships between board members and the superintendent (37.4%) and among board members (48.7%) were the most selected indicators. Each indicator was compared using the turnover variable and informed the following hypothesis: *The distribution of [indicator] is not the same across the categories of turnover.*

A cross tabulation disaggregated the frequencies for each indicator by the turnover variable. Table 3.11 illustrates how often respondents said they had experienced conflict in school board member–superintendent relationships by district turnover. (See Appendix B for remaining cross tabulations.). The Mann Whitney U test showed significant differences ($p < .05$) for all indicators when analyzed by the Turnover variable. As shown in Table 3.12 highlights, there is a statistically significant mean difference between high and low turnover districts, such that high turnover districts appear to have experienced more conflict than low turnover districts in board member–superintendent relationships and key areas of governance.

Table 3.11

Frequency of School Board Member–Superintendent Conflict by Turnover

	Never #	Rarely #	Sometimes #	Often #	Always #	Total #
High turnover	18	29	31	13	1	92
Low turnover	39	31	22	3	0	95
Total	57	60	53	16	1	187

Table 3.12

Statistical test values of Conflict Indicators by Turnover

Variable	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Collective bargaining	3281.000	7746.000	-2.982	** .003
Facilities and buildings	3328.500	7888.500	-2.964	** .003
Finances/budget	2839.000	7304.000	-4.252	*** .000
School board member–superintendent relationship	2987.000	7547.000	-3.907	*** .000
Board member–board member relationship	3312.500	7872.500	-2.996	** .003
Student affairs (e.g., student expulsion)	3565.000	8030.000	-2.290	* .022
Recruitment and selection of personnel	2785.000	7250.000	-4.452	*** .000
Curriculum and instructional resources	3561.000	8121.500	-2.367	* .018

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The survey included an open-ended question about whether there were there other areas of conflict not represented in the question just discussed. Responses from 25 participants revealed additional themes of conflict such as understanding of role, superintendent evaluations, district personnel, and political issues such as conflict with unions or local government.

The literature states conflict can be attributed to a lack of knowledge and expectations about board members' roles and responsibilities (Kirst & Wirt, 2009). Thus, respondents were asked about the degree to which specific related issues caused conflict between board members and the superintendent. Descriptive statistics showed that knowledge level of an issue (50%), knowledge level of board member role and responsibilities (48.7%), and constituent interests such as educational programs or district performance (42.2%) had the highest percentages of summed “sometimes,” “often,” and “always” responses. A cross tabulation by district turnover led to the following hypothesis for each of the three indicators (Table 3.13–3.18): *The distribution is not the same across categories of turnover.*

The Mann Whitney U test ($*p < .05$) showed a statistically significant mean difference between high and low turnover districts. Tables 3.13 through 3.18 show that more respondents in high turnover districts attributed conflict to members' level of knowledge about an issue or knowledge of the board's role, and/or constituent interest. Consider that a core function of school boards is to decide policies regarding the district or school by whom they were elected or appointed to represent. Presuming a school board of five members, three are required for a voting majority, meaning one vote would break a tie. With this in mind, the importance of "knowledge of an issue" and "board role" is not surprising. Further discussion of this can be found in Chapter 5.

Table 3.13

Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Knowledge of an Issue by Turnover

	Never #	Rarely #	Sometimes #	Often #	Always #	Total #
High turnover	16	22	39	11	4	92
Low turnover	23	32	30	7	2	94
Total	39	54	69	18	6	186

* $p < .05$.

Table 3.14

Test Statistic (Knowledge Level of an Issue)

	Knowledge level of an issue
Mann-Whitney U	3530.500
Wilcoxon W	7995.500
Z	-2.260
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.024

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Table 3.15

Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Knowledge of Board Member Roles and Responsibilities by Turnover

	Never #	Rarely #	Sometimes #	Often #	Always #	Total #
High turnover	16	22	26	21	7	92
Low turnover	24	34	25	7	5	95
Total	40	56	51	28	12	187

**p < .01.

Table 3.16

Test Statistic (Knowledge of Board Member Roles and Responsibilities)

Knowledge of Board Member Roles and Responsibilities	
Mann-Whitney U	3349.000
Wilcoxon W	7909.000
Z	-2.847
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.004

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Table 3.17

Frequency of Conflict Stemming from Constituent Interests of Board Members by Turnover

	Never #	Rarely #	Sometimes #	Often #	Always #	Total #
High turnover	22	24	28	16	2	92
Low turnover	32	30	22	7	4	95
Total	54	54	50	23	6	187

*p < .05.

Table 3.18

Test Statistic (Constituent Interests of Board Members)

Constituent Interests of Board Members	
Mann-Whitney U	3630.000
Wilcoxon W	8190.000
Z	-2.073
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.038

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Research Question 3

A key goal of this study was to explore the processes school boards use in decision making. In particular, I sought to understand how the decision-making process may contribute to conflict (or a lack of conflict) between school board members and the superintendent. In this section, I address this issue, focusing attention on differences between high and low turnover districts.

Finding Four: There is no difference between high and low turnover districts with respect to the presence of a decision-making process.

When asked about the current and adopted decision-making systems/processes used by their school boards, respondents most often named consensus voting (39%) and Robert’s Rules of Order (38%). A cross tabulation with the turnover variable showed a similar distribution across decision-making systems (Table 3.19). A chi-square test of independence ($p > .05$) indicated high and low turnover districts did not differ based on the type of decision-making process used. Thematic analysis of “Other” responses ($n = 25$) showed some iteration of consensus voting. Simply put, school boards were using a voting majority to make decisions.

Table 3.19

Current Decision-Making Processes by Turnover

	Missing #	CBAM #	Consensus Voting #	Dynamic Facilita- tion #	Robert's Rules of Order #	SWOT #	Total #
High turnover	15	2	41	2	38	2	100
Low turnover	10	6	37	4	39	4	100
Total	25	8	78	6	77	6	200

Note. CBAM = concerns-based adoption model; SWOT = strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats.

Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of their adopted decision-making process to key governance areas. All indicators skewed toward “somewhat useful” and “extremely useful” (see Appendix C), though this was especially true for finance (63.2%) and facilities (57.1%). Indeed, the literature often cites these as two of the most important areas of school board governance (Rhim et al., 2013). The distribution of responses was analyzed using a cross tabulation of the indicators with the turnover variable and led to the following hypothesis for each indicator: *This distribution is not the same across categories of turnover.* With a significance test value of $p > .05$, I concluded there is no difference between high and low turnover districts given the presence of an adhered-to decision-making process.

Finding 5: Lower turnover districts experienced a higher degree of effective resolution.

Since decision-making processes were found to have no association with superintendent turnover, the question remained as to what may be the cause or factor that differentiates between high and low turnover districts. The survey asked who primarily resolves conflict and to what degree of effectiveness. Descriptive statistics showed superintendents (49.7%) and board presidents (36.6%) were the most selected individuals when participants were asked who primarily facilitates conflict resolution. As shown in Table 3.20, a chi-square test of

independence ($p > .05$) showed no difference in high and low turnover districts based on the category of who facilitates resolution.

Table 3.20

Primary Facilitator of Conflict Resolution Process by Turnover

	Other #	Board President #	Other Board Member #	Superintendent #	Total #
High turnover	3	33	8	43	87
Low turnover	10	31	3	44	88
Total	13	64	11	87	175

As a follow-up, respondents were asked, “To what extent has that person been successful in mediating a resolution?” A total of 83% stated “moderately effective” to “effective,” while 9.1% stated “moderately ineffective” to “ineffective.” The respondents were disaggregated by the turnover variable (Table 3.21) and the following hypothesis was generated: *The distribution of how successful a person has been in mediating a resolution is not the same across categories of turnover.* Prior to a significance test, respondents who indicated “I have not experienced this/I do not know” were recoded as missing. The test (** $p < .01$) indicated a significant difference between high and low turnover districts. Low turnover districts appeared to show greater ability to mediate a resolution.

Table 3.21

Extent of Successful Mediation by Turnover

	Ineffective #	Moderately ineffective #	Moderately effective #	Effective #	I have not experienced this/I do not know #	Total #
High turnover	2	10	23	47	5	87
Low turnover	2	2	15	61	9	89
Total	4	12	38	108	14	176

**p < .01.

Table 3.22

Test Statistic (Extent of Successful Mediation)

Extent of Successful Mediation by Turnover	
Mann-Whitney U	3045.500
Wilcoxon W	6873.500
Z	-2.807
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.005

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Research Questions 4 and 5

Having identified a significant difference in the ability to mediate a resolution, analysis moved to an exploration of the types of training that respondents had received (Research Question 4) and whether those who had gone through training said they experienced fewer instances of conflict (Research Question 5).

Finding 6: There is no difference between high and low turnover districts trained in conflict resolution and decision-making processes.

Respondents were asked to describe the training they had received in key governance areas. Tables 3.23 and 3.24 show a cross tabulation of the amount of training received by board members and superintendents on conflict resolution and decision-making processes. The “would like ongoing training and feedback” indicator was removed from the analysis to ensure the statistical test accounted for training that had already happened. The other indicators asked about “what you have had.” This item focused on “what you would like.” It was removed from the analysis as it is asking about “what would you like,” rather than “what you have done.” A non-parametric test showed no difference between high and low turnover districts ($p > .05$) based on the level of conflict resolution and decision-making training received. Recall from Finding 5 that districts with lower turnover reported a greater ability to mediate a resolution, even though we see here that there was no difference in the training received.

Table 3.23

Extent of Conflict Resolution Training by Turnover

	Have not had training and do not want it #	Have not had training but would like to have it #	Have had training but would like more #	Have had training and would like “ongoing” training and feedback #	Have received sufficient training #	Total #
High turnover	1	8	26	31	18	84
Low turnover	2	12	15	25	32	86
Total	3	20	41	56	50	170

Table 3.24

Extent of Decision-Making Training by Turnover

	Have not had training and do not want it #	Have not had training but would like to have it #	Have had training but would like more #	Have had training and would like “ongoing” training and feedback #	Have received sufficient training #	Total #
High turnover	0	6	25	29	24	84
Low turnover	3	9	13	26	36	87
Total	3	15	38	55	60	171

However, the perception of respondents showed improvement in roles and responsibilities after training. A majority (78.4%) of respondents indicated they had seen “slightly more” to “more” improvement in the responsibilities of board members and superintendents after they received professional development or training. Further, 65.3% of respondents said there had been “less” to “slightly less” conflict as a result of the training received. The descriptive findings follow a logical association that increased training would lead to improved role responsibilities (Table 3.25) and fewer conflicts (Table 3.26). The following hypothesis was formed: *The distribution is not the same across categories of turnover.*

Table 3.25

Board Member Responsibility Improvement After Training

	No improvement #	Slightly less improvement #	Same prior to #	Slightly more improvement #	More improvement #	Total #
High turnover	5	4	8	41	22	80
Low turnover	3	1	13	39	21	77
Total	8	5	21	80	43	157

Table 3.26

Frequency of Conflict Resulting from Training

	Fewer occurrences #	Slightly fewer occurrences #	Same amount #	Slightly more occurrence #	Total #
High turnover	27	22	22	6	77
Low turnover	35	14	22	2	73
Total	62	36	44	8	150

According to the p-values ($p > .05$) for Tables 3.25 and 3.26, there is no statistically significant difference between high and low turnover districts in relation to the roles of board members improving after training. Further, there is no significant difference in relation to fewer occurrences of conflict after receiving training.

Finding 7: There is a difference between high and low turnover districts in terms of the effect of training received on roles and responsibilities and community relations.

The final survey section focused on training providers, the content of training, and its effectiveness. The literature shows time and location impact participation in training (Hess & Meeks, 2010; Rhim et al., 2013) and these findings informed Research Question 4 concerning the specific training that school board members and superintendents receive that are most related to conflict. First, however, survey respondents were asked what organization(s) provided their training.

Descriptive statistics (Table 3.27) show that the top four training service providers in the previous 12 months were CSBA (71%), third-party independent vendors (51%), a district’s fellow members or personnel (43%), and regional service agencies (43%). A cross tabulation of the service providers using the turnover variable showed a similar distribution for high and low turnover districts—nearly the same number of high turnover districts used the same service

providers as low turnover districts. A similar distribution was present for training venues. The most common were local-level conferences/institutes (52%) and workshops, seminars, or trainings for individual and/or whole boards (39%).

Table 3.27

Professional Development Provider by Turnover

Provider	High turnover		Low turnover		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Third party vendors	62	31%	40	20%	102	51.0%
California School Boards Association	68	34%	74	37%	142	71.0%
Institutions of higher education	10	5%	13	6.5%	23	11.5%
National School Boards Association	4	2%	6	3%	10	5.0%
Other school board association	9	4.5%	19	9.5%	28	14.0%
Our own board and district personnel	37	18.5%	49	24.5%	86	43.0%
Regional service agency	40	20%	37	18.5%	77	38.5%
State Department of Education	8	4%	7	3.5%	15	7.5%
U.S. Department of Education	2	1%	1	0.5%	3	1.5%

Respondents were asked to rate the level of training they had received across key governance areas, from “have not had training and do not want it” to “have received sufficient training.” Consistently, 90% of respondents said they had had training and it was sufficient across all topic areas. Conversely, an average of 10% of respondents said they had not had training and did not want it. The governance areas were cross tabulated by the turnover variable and this informed the following hypothesis: *The mean difference is not the same across the categories of turnover.*

There was a significant difference (*p < .05) between high and low turnover districts with respect to training in board roles and responsibilities and community relations (Table 3.28). The statistically significant indicators correspond to the indicators of conflict highlighted in Finding 3

concerning knowledge level of governance issues, roles and responsibilities, and constituent interests.

Table 3.28

Extent of Training on Key Governance Areas by Turnover

Area of Training		Missing		Have not had		Have not had but would like		Have had but would like more		Have received sufficient		Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Board roles and responsibilities	High turnover	30	35.7	0	0	2	2.4	19	22.6	33	39.3	84
	Low turnover	26	29.9	1	1.1	2	2.3	7	8.0	51	58.6	87
Community relations	High turnover	24	28.6	2	2.4	10	8.4	24	28.6	24	28.6	84
	Low turnover	23	26.7	2	2.3	5	5.8	18	20.9	38	44.2	86

*p < .05.

Table 3.29

Test Statistic (Extent of Training on Key Governance Areas)

	Board roles and responsibilities	Community relations
Mann-Whitney U	1299.000	1487.000
Wilcoxon W	2784.000	3317.000
Z	-2.520	-2.238
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.025

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Finding 8: There is no difference in the amount of time spent on professional development between high and low turnover districts.

Descriptive statistics show 43.5% of respondents spent two to four days dedicated to individual or whole-board professional development. Roughly one third (34.7%) said they did this once per year, and slightly fewer (29.9%) said twice per year. Roughly one fourth (25.7%) indicated, “We do not partake in whole-board development or training.”

The most common reasons whole-board development did not occur were challenges in coordinating schedules (34%) and people’s willingness to participate (28%). Thematic analysis of open-ended responses showed a lack of awareness that whole-board professional development exists and a perceived lack of need for development. A cross tabulation of how often boards engaged in whole-board development by the turnover variable and a separate cross tabulation of reasons preventing training resulted in the following hypotheses:

H1: High and low turnover districts are independent when compared to how often board members receive training.

H2: High and low turnover districts are independent when compared to reasons that prohibit training.

Table 3.30

Whole-Board Development by Turnover

	Once per month #	Quarterly #	Twice per year #	Once per year #	Never #	Total #
High turnover	3	8	24	31	16	82
Low turnover	1	4	26	27	27	85
Total	4	12	50	58	43	167

Table 3.31

Total School Board Training Received by Turnover

	<1 day #	1 day #	2–4 days #	5–7 days #	8+ days #	Total #
High turnover	12	15	29	15	12	83
Low turnover	15	7	44	14	5	85
Total	27	22	73	29	17	168

Table 3.32

Factors Preventing School Board Training by Turnover

	Other #	Cost #	Schedules #	Too far to travel #	Willingness #	Total #
High turnover	4	9	24	2	20	59
Low turnover	18	8	15	2	12	55
Total	22	17	39	4	32	114

*p < 0.05.

Table 3.33

Test Statistic (Factors Preventing School Board Training)

	Value	df	Asympt. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.920 ^a	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	13.672	4	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.668	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	114		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.93.

A chi-square test for independence (Table 3.30) determined no relationship ($p > .05$) between district turnover and how often boards received whole-board training; there was no difference within the distribution. Furthermore, a mean distribution test (Table 3.31) determined

no significant difference by turnover ($p > .05$) for total time spent on board training. However, a chi-square test for independence (Table 3.32) determined an association ($*p < .05$) between turnover and the type of obstacle named as preventing training. Thematic analysis of the open-ended responses concerning why this type of training had not taken place indicated perceptions that there was a lack of need and that the district had never considered it. These findings both challenge and contribute to the extant literature, which shows distance and cost as primary obstacles (Hess & Meeks, 2010; Rhim et al., 2013).

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION

To address the problem of superintendent turnover, this study used survey research to explore key indicators of conflict within the board member–superintendent relationship and the types of training these individuals receive. The findings presented in the previous chapter both affirm and challenge trends in the literature. In this final chapter, I summarize these findings and propose several recommendations for future studies and for practice, particularly in the area of training for school board members and superintendents. I also outline the limitations of the current research.

Summary of Findings

There is no association between with high and low turnover based on size or location of a school district. The study did identify governance issues and relationships between board members and superintendents as indicators of conflict and reasons as to why superintendents or board members may not return the following year. Further, the study found no association between high and low turnover districts with an identified decision-making process. However, the study did find that when conflict exists, lower turnover districts experience a higher degree of conflict resolution. Lastly, the study found no difference in high and low turnover districts given the amount of time professional development occurs or training in conflict resolution and decision-making processes.

Earlier studies have posited that geography affects superintendent turnover. Byrd et al. (2006) stated that urban superintendents experience shorter tenure than other districts. In the current study, there was no difference in turnover when the data were analyzed for geography and size of district. As Tables 3.2 and 3.3 showed, the problem of turnover in the state of

California is not isolated by district size or geographic location; rather, it occurs at nearly the same frequency across various district sizes and geographic areas. The findings suggest board member–superintendent conflict resulting from level of understanding of roles and responsibilities is a stronger indicator of turnover. My findings also support earlier findings concerning other factors that contribute to turnover such as conflict caused from a lack of knowledge of issues and constituent interest (Glass et al., 2000; Tekniepe, 2015).

The findings challenge what the literature states on training. Rhim et al. (2013) found that distance was a key challenge to scheduling professional development; Hess and Meeks (2010) found that the ability to coordinate schedules was a key indicator for attending training opportunities. The current findings support the latter conclusion, but not the former. Specifically, they show that a perceived lack of willingness to attend trainings and difficulty coordinating schedules were more frequent indicators than distance (Table 3.32). This makes sense given the various professional responsibilities of board members. Nevertheless, the fact that nearly 10% (Table 3.28) of respondents stated they neither had nor wanted training in areas of governance may contribute to conflicts between board members and the superintendent.

Knowledge of board member roles and constituent interests were both shown to be key challenges for school board governance in this study. Both are factors in superintendents' decisions to leave their positions. Grissom (2010) and Mountford (2004) showed that political ideologies contribute to conflict. Moreover, they exemplify the conditions of dissatisfaction theory, where constituents elect into power someone who will address current practices or policies they are unhappy with.

In open-ended responses, participants described other areas of conflict, including political affiliations and conflict with other elected officials such as the mayor. Since board elections are

staggered by year, a superintendent could report to a new board with a different vision or goals to the one that originally hired him or her. This result can further be examined through Bolman and Deal's (2008) structural frame. New board members may not have sufficient knowledge of how boards function, for example how meetings run or the conditions of open meeting laws as explained in the Brown Act.

The factors identified here as potential causes of conflict—knowledge of roles and responsibilities, knowledge levels about particular issues, and constituent interests—are supported in the literature (Kirst, 2010; Kirst & Wirt, 2009) and are typically addressed in professional development trainings (Kirst & Wirt, 2009; Maricle, 2014; Rhim et al., 2013). These same issues were echoed in Finding 2 and 3 with regard to indicators of conflict and whether or not a board member or superintendent intended to return.

Low turnover districts in this study appear to experience a higher degree of effective conflict resolution than high turnover districts. The data support a training approach that focuses on structures and processes for improved conflict resolution between board members and superintendents. The study showed superintendents and board presidents are the primary facilitators for resolving conflict. Further, a high number of respondents would like ongoing training with feedback. Future training could include specialized coaching sessions for board presidents and superintendents that involve extended development beyond conferences or institutes. This is explored further in a later section.

Knowledge of roles and responsibilities were an indicator of conflict in superintendent–board member relationships. There was no significance between high and lower turnover districts in terms of the responsibilities of board members improving after training. However, the open-responses concerning why there was improvement after training surfaced key themes: a

better understanding of roles and responsibilities, improved relationships between board members and superintendents, and the perception of a better functioning board.

Implications for Policy and Practice

California continues to be one of 26 states that do not mandate school board training. Research indicates that such a policy would create challenges, particularly with respect to how much time should be required or funded (Petronis, 1996; Rice, 2014). In the current study, I found no difference in the amount of time spent on professional development between high and low turnover districts. Regardless, the literature shows higher performing districts display certain indicators and engage in practices that separate them from lower performing ones (Land, 2000; Rice et al., 2000), such as positive relationships and knowledge of roles and responsibilities. Local school boards decide for themselves the level of training members receive. A basic requirement for training board members and superintendents in key governance areas warrants consideration.

Conflict resolution, knowledge of roles and responsibilities, and community relations were all associated with turnover in the current study. The percentage of respondents who had not received training in key areas of governance was of particular interest. Several of these key areas were associated with conflict in high and low turnover districts. Further, it was interesting to find a consistent percentage (approximately 25% to 30%) of respondents who stated they received training on a particular indicator but would welcome ongoing training and feedback. Both conditions present an opportunity for service providers to provide new training models such as coaching, rather than the typical model of training, which includes conferences, institutes, or workshops. Joyce and Showers's (2002) meta-analysis of coaching and learning showed 95% of

teachers implemented new skills when on-site coaching was provided. Conversely, Nitta et al. (2009) found a breakdown in decision-making training due to a lack of support at the site level.

Time, cost, and delivery method must be considered in training initiatives. Participants reported that coordinating schedules was a challenge for whole-board development. Board members could receive individual coaching sessions—which would not violate California’s Brown Act—based upon their own personal schedules. Regular sessions that would allow for ongoing feedback. There is a time and cost challenge, however, as a service provider would need to travel to and from districts requesting services. Third-party service providers could take the form of online, web-based interaction via platforms such as Google chat or Skype. This would address concerns about distance highlighted by Rhim et al. (2013). Regardless, board members and superintendents would receive a consistent period of development where problems of practice could be addressed within the confidentiality of the service provider.

Since board members’ responsibilities include community relations and ensuring the district adheres to state and federal education laws, prospective candidates should develop background knowledge in key areas of governance—for example, finance and facilities or relevant state and federal laws. A proactive opportunity for large scale service providers such as county offices of education or CSBA would be to provide easily accessible resources for individuals interested in running for school board, in addition to sharing eligibility requirements and roles and responsibilities. These resources could forefront time commitments such as preparation for board meetings or dedicated time to attend whole-board training sessions. CSBA (2007) already provides a resource entitled *School Board Leadership*. Additional resources could include question-and-answer sessions that occur locally or through web-based platforms. A more informed candidate for school board could result in a higher functioning school board, because

less time would be lost to understanding district-specific issues or not being able to come to a decision.

Finally, even though the superintendent is only accountable to the school board, it may benefit him or her to proactively engage with the community in addition to the board members. Managing conflict at the community level may contribute to fewer instances of dissatisfaction, thereby reducing the number of board members who turn over due to the electoral process. Less time would be spent training board members on roles and responsibilities and more time could be focused on governance issues relevant to the district.

Limitations of the Study

Survey research presents several limitations related to two issues: sample and answers (Fowler, 2014). The first relates to how closely the sample represents a broader population—in this case, California school board members and superintendents. The second relates to how well the answers measure the characteristics in question—here, conflict, decision making, and training. These limitations affect what generalizations can be made from the findings. In this section I discuss the limitations of the sample and survey.

Sample

A more proportionate sampling of CSBA's 1,000 superintendents and 4,000 board members would increase statistical power. The survey response rate of 28.6% yielded a sample size of 700. An average survey response rate is 33% (Nulty, 2008). For a target response rate of 33% the survey would need to be completed by a sample of approximately 350 superintendents. Conversely, the sample of board members would need to be about 1,400 in order to meet the 33% target response rate. This larger response rate would allow further statistical tests to be performed, as long as there was an even distribution of respondents, demographic areas, and size

of district. In particular, data could be analyzed by subgroups using the indicators and various permutations of geographic location or size of district. For example, superintendent and board member groups from suburban areas or from districts serving less than 5,000 students could be more carefully examined. With the current sample size, statistical power would be affected with further disaggregation of the respondents.

Another limitation stems from the fact that superintendent responses could not be paired with responses from board members in the same district. This would have strengthened the analyses. Further, it is possible that more than one board member from a particular district responded to the survey, thereby affecting the turnover variable. A modification in the analysis would have identified only board presidents. However, only 27 respondents self-identified as board presidents in the survey.

Lastly, the study's findings tested for association and independence, not causality. Given the current data, logistical regression tests may be conducted to predict for turnover. The dependent variable would be turnover (yes/no) and the independent variables would be "knowledge of roles and responsibilities" or "community relations," among others. In future research, the turnover variable could be used as the outcome variable, while the indicators (e.g., effective conflict resolution) could be used to diagnose or predict for turnover. An extension of the study would begin with an initial diagnostic survey to districts based on the indicators, with a four-year follow-up to see if there was an effect on turnover.

Survey

If a similar iteration of the survey instrument was administered again, several considerations in the planning and implementation stage could improve the response rate (Punch, 2003, 2005). Fogelman and Combs (2007) suggested not implementing surveys during holidays

or breaks. However, contrary to Fogelman and Combs, the survey was conducted during the winter break. The hypothesis was the winter break would not affect board members (as they hold other jobs) and that superintendents would have more free time during the holiday. This appeared to be the case: Within the first week of data collection, 80 respondents (a response rate of 11.4%) finished or started the survey. In considering the day-to-day administrative responsibilities of superintendents, avoiding the beginning or ending months of the school year may improve the response rate.

As Fowler (2014) stated, using a quantitative approach may limit the amount of information that informs the data analysis. Here, the Likert-scale questions on the survey captured a range of potential responses for questions pertaining to conflict, decision making, and training. Answers to the open-response questions were intended to provide a deeper understanding of the types of conflict experienced by superintendents and board members. For example, open-response questions about why board members saw improvement after training provided a better understanding of roles, improved relationships, and a better functioning board. Nevertheless, further research could include a qualitative phase consisting of interviews with board members and superintendents.

Interview data would complement the survey findings and provide a deeper understanding of how relationships between board members and superintendents mitigate, contribute to, or resolve conflict in key areas of school district governance. Creswell (2014) noted that interviews provide data for participants and events that cannot be directly observed, such as board meetings that are held in closed sessions. Future iterations of the survey could use voluntary contact information to identify respondents willing to participate in follow-up

interviews. Questions would probe for responses that deepen the understanding of conditions that influence the decision-making process or implementation of training efforts.

Conclusion

The problem of high superintendent turnover is an actionable problem that can be proactively addressed through the development of a well-informed school board. The literature shows little research on how school board training impacts conflict management. My study shows that knowledge of school board roles and responsibilities, knowledge of key issues, and constituent interests are indicators of conflict that can contribute to high turnover. Revising the delivery methods and focus of training to address these indicators warrants consideration.

The focus of the study was grounded by juried research on demographic findings and advocating for decision-making training. Several findings challenged the extant literature as well as my initial hypotheses regarding where does superintendent turnover occur, decision-making, and professional development. The study found professional development focus more on conflict resolution than decision-making processes. Furthermore, it was surprising to find respondents wanting on-going professional feedback as opposed to traditional delivery methods.

The role of superintendent as leader of a school district requires stability. Studies have shown that stability is impacted when there are high instances of superintendent turnover. Consider the impact of high superintendent turnover on California's six million students and their families, in addition to the thousands of teachers and school district personnel. Clarity concerning school board member roles and responsibilities and effective conflict resolution between board members and superintendents may have a positive impact on superintendent retention. This, in turn, will benefit the primary stakeholders—the students and their families.

APPENDIX A:

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Superintendent / Board Member Decision-making Survey

I. Survey Introduction

The survey is designed to collect data to understand how decision-making factors and types of training affect the superintendent and board member relationships. Research has shown established processes for decision-making diffuse tension among school board members. This study focuses on how board level decision-making processes affect the board member/superintendent relationship and the training needed to improve processes.

Your participation is voluntary. The information you provide will help guide efforts to improve professional development approaches in this area. This is an anonymous survey. The survey will not collect names of individuals, or school districts. It is designed so that participants cannot be identified from the data.

*At the end of the survey, an option will be provided for participants to be contacted for a VOLUNTARY interview to discuss survey findings similar to their geographic region and board composition. The results are for use for research purposes only. Data will be analyzed as part of a research study conducted by a graduate student working in partnership with the organization.

II. Demographics-District

1. What is the student population of your district?

- 1 - 999
- 1000 - 4999
- 5000 - 9999
- 10000 +

2. Please classify the location of your district.

Urban: Inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city. Sub-urban: Territory outside a principal city.
Rural: More than 25 miles from an urbanized area and is also more than 10 miles from an urban cluster.

- Urban
- Sub-urban
- Rural

3. How many members are on your school board?

- 1 to 3
- 4 to 5
- 7 or more

III. Demographics

4. Please select one.

I am a:

- Board member
- Board President
- Superintendent
- Superintendent and former Board member/President

IV. Demographics – Board member

5. How many years have you served on your district's school board?

- 0 to 2 years
- 3 to 5 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 11 or more years

6. In the past eight years, how many superintendents has your district had?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four or more

7. Do you plan on seeking re-election?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown / Unsure

V. Demographics – Board member re-election

8. To what extent have/would the following issues impact(ed) your decision or pending decision to not seek re-election? Please rate your response using the following indicator: No Impact; Slight Impact; Moderate Impact; High Impact

- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- School board relationships
- Community Opposition
- Finance / Funding Matters
- District bureaucracy / traditions / customs
- Planned retirement
- Geographic location
- District infrastructure and resources
- School board protocols and procedures

VI. Demographics – Superintendent

9. How many board members have been elected to the school board since you assumed your Superintendentcy?

- 0 to 1
- 2 to 4
- 5 to 7
- 8 or more

10. How many years have you served as Superintendent of the district that currently employs you? (include current year).

- 0 to 1 year
- 2 to 4 years
- 5 to 9 years
- 10 + years

11. Do you plan on serving as Superintendent of your district next year?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown / Unsure

VII. Demographics – Superintendent

12. To what extent have/would the following issues impact(ed) your decision or pending decision to not seek re-election? Please rate your response using the following indicator: No Impact; Slight Impact; Moderate Impact; High Impact

- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- School board relationships
- Community Opposition
- Finance / Funding Matters
- District bureaucracy / traditions / customs
- Planned retirement
- Geographic location
- District infrastructure and resources
- School board protocols and procedures

VIII. Types of Conflict

The following questions are related to your experience as a board member or superintendent specifically regarding conflict.

For the purpose of this study, conflict is defined as, "a prolonged disagreement or argument over an issue."

13. Over the past eight (8) years, indicate how often Board members and the superintendent(s) experience conflict in the following areas. (Never; Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always).

- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- Facilities and Buildings
- Finances / Budget
- School board member to Superintendent relationship
- Board member to Board Member relationship
- Student affairs (e.g. student expulsion)
- Recruitment and selection of personnel
- Curriculum and instructional resources

14. Please select from the dropdown menu your response to the following question:
Were there other areas of conflict not represented in the previous question?
If "yes," please provide the missing area(s) in the text box below, separated by a comma.

Yes

No

Other (please specify)

15. When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between...
Please rate according to the following indicators: Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Often; Always

Superintendent and a single Board member

Superintendent and more than one Board member

Individual Board member to another Board member

Individual Board member to more than one Board member

Between a coalition(s) of Board members

16. To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between Board member(s) and the Superintendent?

Please rate according to the following indicators: Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Often; Always

Knowledge level of an issue

Political party affiliation

Finance and funding considerations

Constituent interests of Board members

Knowledge level of Board member role and responsibilities

Board member to Board member relationship

Board member to Superintendent relationship

IX. Decision Making

A decision-making process is defined as an adopted system or protocol to arrive at a vote.

Please select from the dropdown choices your answer to the following question:

17. What is the current and adopted decision-making system/process used by the school board?
If your system/process is not listed, please select "Other" and use the text box to write in and/or briefly describe your school board's decision-making process.

Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

Consensus voting

Dynamic Facilitation

Political, Economical, Social, Technical Analysis (PEST)

Robert's Rules of Order

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT Analysis)

Other

You may provide a brief description of the process used.

18. To what extent is the decision-making process adhered to?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

19. For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision.

Please use the following indicators: Not Useful; Slightly Useful; Useful; Somewhat Useful; Extremely Useful; N/A

- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- Facilities and buildings
- Finance / funding matters
- Recruitment or selection of personnel
- Student affairs (e.g. student expulsion)

20. Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district. Select all that apply.

- Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)
- Consensus Process
- Political, Economical, Social, Technological Analysis (PEST)
- Robert's Rules of Order
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats Analysis (SWOT)
- Other (please specify)

21. When disagreement or conflict persists, who primarily facilitates the resolution process?

- Board President
- Other Board member
- Superintendent
- Other (please specify)

22. In your experience, to what extent has that person been successful in mediating a resolution?

- Ineffective
- Moderately ineffective
- Moderately effective
- Effective
- I have not experienced this / I do not know

X. Training

23. Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. Please use the following indicators to rate your response:

- Have not had training and do not want it.
- Have not had training but would like to have it.
- Have had training but would like more.
- Have had training and would like "On- going" training and feedback.
- Have received sufficient training.

- Board roles and responsibilities
- Community relations

Conflict resolution
Decision-Making processes
Facilities and/or maintenance
Finance and budget
Leadership skills
Legal and policy issues
Strategic planning
Goal / vision setting

24. What organizations provided your board development/training? Please select all that apply.

Consultants / 3rd party vendors
California School Boards Association
Institutions of Higher Education
National School Boards Association
Other school board association
Our own board and district personnel
Regional service agencies (e.g. County Office of Education)
State Department of Education
U.S. Department of Education

25. During the past twelve (12) months, in what types of board development / training have you participated?
Select all that apply.

Local-level conference / institute Online or Webinar(s)
National-level conference / institute
Regional-level conference / institute (multiple counties represented)
Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training(s) for the individual board member
Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training(s) for the whole board
I have not participated in any board development/training
Other (please specify)

26. During the past year, what was the total amount of time spent on board training?

Less than one day
1 day
2 to 4 days
5 to 7 days
8 or more days

27. How often does your board engage in whole-board development, with the entire board receiving training together?

Once per month
Quarterly
Twice per year
Once per year
We do not partake in whole board development or training

28. If your board does not engage in whole-board development, what is the primary reason preventing your board from doing so? (Please select only one response)

Cost
Coordinating schedules
Too far to travel

Willingness to participate
Other (please specify)

29. To what extent have the responsibilities of Board members and Superintendents improved as a result of receiving professional development? (Please select only one response)

No improvement
Slightly less improvement
Same prior to professional development
Slightly more improvement
More improvement

30. Please use the following text box to provide a reason(s) as to why you observed, "No improvement," "Slightly less improvement," or "Same prior to training."

31. Please use the following text box to provide a reason(s) as to why you observed, "Slightly more improvement" to "More improvement."

32. To what extent have there been fewer occurrences of conflict as a result of the training your board has received? (Please select only one response)

Less occurrence of conflict
Slightly less occurrence of conflict
Same amount of conflict
Slightly more occurrence of conflict

XI. Voluntary follow-up

Your experiences and insight would provide helpful context for the study. The following questions are optional and voluntary.

Would you be willing to participate in a 1-on-1, follow-up interview to further discuss topics on this survey related to your experiences and similar demographic information?

Yes
No

XII. Contact Information

Name
Area code and phone number
Personal email address

XIII. End of Survey

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your participation in the study. Please remember to click done to exit out of the survey.

APPENDIX B:

CROSS TABULATIONS BY TURNOVER VARIABLE

Q1: Turnover * What is the student population of your district?

		1-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000 +	
Turnover	High	34	27	13	26	100
	Low	28	38	14	20	100
Total		62	65	27	46	200

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .931

Q2: Turnover * Please classify the location of your district.

		Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Turnover	High	15	43	42	100
	Low	13	43	44	100
Total		28	86	86	200

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .910

Q3: Turnover * How many members are on your school board?

		1 to 3	4 to 5	7 or more	Total
Turnover	High	3	83	14	100
	Low	3	84	13	100
Total		6	167	27	200

Q4: Turnover * Please select one. I am a:

		Board member	Board President	Superintendent	Superintendent and former board member / President	Total
Turnover	High	25	12	60	3	100
	Low	42	15	43	0	100
Total		67	27	103	3	200

Q5: Turnover * How many years have you served on your district's school board?

Total

		0 to 2 years	3 to 5 years	6 to 10 years	11 or more years	
Turnover	High	6	13	11	7	37
	Low	16	9	13	19	57
Total		22	22	24	26	94

Q6: Turnover * In the past eight years, how many superintendents has your district had?

		One	Two	Three	Four or more	Total
Turnover	High	0	0	28	9	37
	Low	22	35	0	0	57
Total		22	35	28	9	94

Q7: Turnover * Do you plan on seeking re-election?

		Yes	No	Unknown / Unsure	Total
Turnover	High	23	6	8	37
	Low	38	6	13	57
Total		61	12	21	94

8. To what extent have/would the following issues impact(ed) your decision or pending decision to not seek re-election? Please rate your response from No Impact to High Impact.

Turnover * Collective Bargaining Agreements

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	6	4	2	2	14
	Low	13	3	1	1	18
Total		19	7	3	3	32

Turnover * School board relationships

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	3	3	3	5	14
	Low	10	3	3	2	18
Total		13	6	6	7	32

Turnover * Community Opposition

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total

Turnover	High	4	7	1	2	14
	Low	9	4	3	2	18
Total		13	11	4	4	32

Turnover * Finance / Funding matters

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	4	8	0	2	14
	Low	10	7	1	0	18
Total		14	15	1	2	32

Turnover * District bureaucracy / traditions / customs

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	8	1	2	3	14
	Low	11	4	1	2	18
Total		19	5	3	5	32

Turnover * Planned retirement

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	10	1	1	2	14
	Low	12	2	1	3	18
Total		22	3	2	5	32

Turnover * Geographic location

		No Impact	Slight Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	13	0	1	14
	Low	15	1	2	18
Total		28	1	3	32

Turnover * District infrastructure and resources

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	6	4	3	1	14
	Low	13	5	0	0	18
Total		19	9	3	1	32

Turnover * School board protocols and procedures

Total

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	
Turnover	High	6	6	2	14
	Low	14	2	2	18
Total		20	8	4	32

Test Statistics^a

	Collective Bargaining Agreements	School board relationships	Community Opposition	Finance / Funding matters	District bureaucracy / traditions / customs	Planned retirement
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.093	.038	.481	.110	.577	.799

Test Statistics^a

	Geographic location	District infrastructure and resources	School board protocols and procedures
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.447	.042	.077

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

b. Not corrected for ties.

Q9: Turnover * How many board members have been elected to the school board since you assumed your superintendency?

		0 to 1	2 to 4	5 to 7	8 or more	Total
Turnover	High	21	35	5	2	63
	Low	4	20	14	5	43
Total		25	55	19	7	106

Q10: Turnover * How many years have you served as superintendent of the district that currently employs you? (Include current year.)

		0 to 1 year	2 to 4 years	5 to 9 years	10 + years	Total
Turnover	High	19	44	0	0	63
	Low	0	0	32	11	43
Total		19	44	32	11	106

Q11: Turnover * Do you plan on serving as superintendent of your district next year?

		Yes	No	Unknown / Unsure	Total
Turnover	High	59	2	2	63
	Low	37	2	4	43
Total		96	4	6	106

To what extent do/would the following issues have an impact on your decision to no longer serve as Superintendent? Please rate your response from No Impact to High Impact.

Turnover * Collective Bargaining Agreements

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	Total
Turnover	High	1	2	1	4
	Low	3	1	2	6
Total		4	3	3	10

Turnover * School Board relationships

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	0	1	0	3	4
	Low	2	1	2	1	6
Total		2	2	2	4	10

Turnover * Community Opposition

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	2	0	1	1	4
	Low	3	3	0	0	6
Total		5	3	1	1	10

Turnover * Finance / Funding matters

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	Total
Turnover	High	1	1	2	4
	Low	3	1	2	6
Total		4	2	4	10

Turnover * District bureaucracy / traditions / customs

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
--	--	-----------	---------------	--------------------	-------------	-------

Turnover	High	1	0	1	2	4
	Low	4	1	1	0	6
Total		5	1	2	2	10

Turnover * Planned retirement

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	3	0	0	1	4
	Low	2	1	1	2	6
Total		5	1	1	3	10

Turnover * Geographic location

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	Total
Turnover	High	2	1	1	4
	Low	5	1	0	6
Total		7	2	1	10

Turnover * District infrastructure and resources

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	Total
Turnover	High	1	0	3	4
	Low	4	1	1	6
Total		5	1	4	10

Turnover * School board protocols and procedures

		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	0	1	1	2	4
	Low	4	1	1	0	6
Total		4	2	2	2	10

Test Statistics^a

	Collective Bargaining Agreements	School Board relationships	Community Opposition	Finance / Funding matters	District bureaucracy / traditions / customs	Planned retirement
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.735	.120	.489	.494	.086	.356

Test Statistics^a

	Geographic location	District infrastructure and resources	School board protocols and procedures
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.236	.126	.026

- a. Grouping Variable: Turnover
 b. Not corrected for ties.

Over the past eight (8) years, indicate how often board members and the superintendent(s) experience conflict in the following areas.

Turnover * Collective Bargaining Agreements

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	21	37	23	9	2	92
	Low	44	24	22	4	0	94
Total		65	61	45	13	2	186

Turnover * Facilities and Buildings

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	18	38	25	9	2	92
	Low	36	34	23	2	0	95
Total		54	72	48	11	2	187

Turnover * Finances / Budget

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	13	35	28	13	3	92
	Low	33	40	16	5	0	94
Total		46	75	44	18	3	186

Turnover * School Board member to Superintendent relationship

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	18	29	31	13	1	92
	Low	39	31	22	3	0	95
Total		57	60	53	16	1	187

Turnover * Board member to Board member relationship

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	12	28	31	15	6	92
	Low	20	36	35	4	0	95

Total	32	64	66	19	6	187
-------	----	----	----	----	---	-----

Turnover * Student affairs (e.g. student expulsion)

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Total
Turnover	High	37	38	14	3	92
	Low	46	47	1	0	94
Total		83	85	15	3	186

Turnover * Recruitment and selection of personnel

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Total
Turnover	High	17	37	28	10	92
	Low	38	42	13	1	94
Total		55	79	41	11	186

Turnover * Curriculum and instructional resources

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Total
Turnover	High	24	47	17	4	92
	Low	40	41	12	2	95
Total		64	88	29	6	187

Test Statistics^a

	Collective Bargaining Agreements	Facilities and Buildings	Finances / Budget	School Board member to Superintendent relationship	Board member to Board member relationship	Student affairs (e.g. student expulsion)
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.003	.000	.000	.003	.022

Test Statistics^a

	Recruitment and selection of personnel	Curriculum and instructional resources
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.018

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between...

Turnover * Superintendent and a single board member

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	14	30	29	15	3	91
	Low	17	44	23	8	2	94
Total		31	74	52	23	5	185

Turnover * Superintendent and more than one board member

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Total
Turnover	High	30	35	21	5	91
	Low	40	42	11	1	94
Total		70	77	32	6	185

Turnover * Individual board member to another board member

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	7	25	40	17	2	91
	Low	19	40	28	6	0	93
Total		26	65	68	23	2	184

Turnover * Individual board member to more than one board member

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	15	34	25	16	1	91
	Low	36	25	28	3	1	93
Total		51	59	53	19	2	184

Turnover * Between a coalition(s) of Board members

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Total
Turnover	High	40	20	26	5	91
	Low	60	24	7	3	94
Total		100	44	33	8	185

Test Statistics^a

	Superintendent and a single board member	Superintendent and more than one board member	Individual board member to another board member	Individual board member to more than one board member	Between a coalition(s) of board members
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.025	.000	.001	.001

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the Superintendent?

Turnover * Knowledge level of an issue

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	16	22	39	11	4	92
	Low	23	32	30	7	2	94
Total		39	54	69	18	6	186

Turnover * Political party affiliation

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	46	29	13	1	2	91
	Low	73	14	6	1	1	95
Total		119	43	19	2	3	186

Turnover * Finance and funding considerations

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	18	28	33	10	3	92
	Low	31	34	21	7	1	94
Total		49	62	54	17	4	186

Turnover * Constituent interests of board members

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	22	24	28	16	2	92
	Low	32	30	22	7	4	95
Total		54	54	50	23	6	187

Turnover * Knowledge level of board member role and responsibilities

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	16	22	26	21	7	92
	Low	24	34	25	7	5	95
Total		40	56	51	28	12	187

Turnover * Board member to board member relationship

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	15	29	31	13	3	91
	Low	31	35	23	4	2	95
Total		46	64	54	17	5	186

Turnover * Board member to superintendent relationship

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	22	31	31	8	0	92
	Low	41	36	13	3	2	95
Total		63	67	44	11	2	187

Test Statistics^a

	Knowledge level of an issue	Political party affiliation	Finance and funding considerations	Constituent interests of board members	Knowledge level of board member role and responsibilities	Board member to board member relationship
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.000	.006	.038	.004	.001

Test Statistics^a

	Board member to superintendent relationship
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Q17: Turnover * Please select from the dropdown choices your answer to the following question: What is the current and adopted decision-making system/process used by the school board? If your system/process is not listed, please select “Other” and use the text box to write in and/or briefly describe your school board’s decision-making process.

	Missing	Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)	Consensus voting	Dynamic Facilitation	Robert’s Rules of Order	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT Analysis)
Turnover High	15	2	41	2	38	2
Low	10	6	37	4	39	4
Total	25	8	78	6	77	6

Q17: Turnover * Please select from the dropdown choices your answer to the following question: What is the current and adopted decision-making system/process used by the school board? If your system/process is not listed, please select “Other” and use the text box to write in and/or briefly describe your school board’s decision-making process.

Total

Turnover	High	100
	Low	100
Total		200

Q18: Turnover * To what extent is the decision-making process adhered to?

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total
Turnover	High	0	1	3	38	47	89
	Low	1	0	4	31	55	91
Total		1	1	7	69	102	180

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .366

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision.

Turnover * Collective bargaining agreements

		.00	Not Useful	Slightly Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Extremely Useful	Total
Turnover	High	4	3	9	30	12	30	88
	Low	15	2	7	27	7	32	90
Total		19	5	16	57	19	62	178

Turnover * Facilities and buildings

		.00	Not Useful	Slightly Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Extremely Useful	Total
Turnover	High	1	2	5	29	17	34	88
	Low	3	1	7	28	9	41	89
Total		4	3	12	57	26	75	177

Turnover * Finance / funding matters

		Finance / funding matters						
		.00	Not Useful	Slightly Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Extremely Useful	Total
Turnover	High	1	2	2	27	17	39	88
	Low	1	0	8	24	13	43	89
Total		2	2	10	51	30	82	177

Turnover * Recruitment or selection of personnel

		.00	Not Useful	Slightly Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Extremely Useful	Total

Turnover High	3	5	11	26	15	28	88
Low	11	6	9	20	10	33	89
Total	14	11	20	46	25	61	177

Turnover * Student affairs

	.00	Not Useful	Slightly Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Extremely Useful	Total
Turnover High	2	2	10	27	13	34	88
Low	5	2	9	23	12	38	89
Total	7	4	19	50	25	72	177

Test Statistics^a

	Collective bargaining agreements	Facilities and buildings	Finance / funding matters	Recruitment or selection of personnel	Student affairs
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.361	.812	.919	.676	.814

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Q20: Turnover * Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district. Select all that apply.

	Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)	Consensus Process	Dynamic Facilitation	Political, Economical, Social, Technological Analysis (PEST)	Robert's Rules of Order	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)	Other
Turnover High	5	35	7	2	38	21	1
Low	3	44	8	1	38	17	9
Total	8	79	15	3	76	38	10

Q21: Turnover * When disagreement or conflict persists, who primarily facilitates the resolution process?

		Other (please specify)	Board President	Other Board member	Superintendent	Total
Turnover	High	3	33	8	43	87
	Low	10	31	3	44	88
Total		13	64	11	87	175

Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) .106

Q22: Turnover * In your experience, to what extent has that person been successful in mediating a resolution?

		Ineffective	Moderately ineffective	Moderately effective	Effective	I have not experienced this / I do not know	Total
Turnover	High	2	10	23	47	5	87
	Low	2	2	15	61	9	89
Total		4	12	38	108	14	176

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .005

Describe the training you have had in relation to each area.

Turnover * Board roles and responsibilities

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like "Ongoing" training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	0	2	19	30	33	84
	Low	1	2	7	26	51	87
Total		1	4	26	56	84	171

Turnover * Community relations

Total

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	
TurnoverHigh	2	10	24	24	24	84
Low	2	5	18	23	38	86
Total	4	15	42	47	62	170

Turnover * Conflict resolution

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	1	8	26	31	18	84
Low	2	12	15	25	32	86
Total	3	20	41	56	50	170

Turnover * Decision-Making processes

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	0	6	25	29	24	84
Low	3	9	13	26	36	87
Total	3	15	38	55	60	171

Turnover * Facilities and/or maintenance

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	2	14	19	30	19	84
Low	6	10	13	24	33	86
Total	8	24	32	54	52	170

Turnover * Finance and budget

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	1	3	27	31	22	84
Low	0	6	14	33	34	87
Total	1	9	41	64	56	171

Turnover * Leadership skills

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	3	2	14	39	26	84
Low	2	6	10	29	39	86
Total	5	8	24	68	65	170

Turnover * Legal and policy Issues

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total

TurnoverHigh	1	2	28	35	18	84
Low	2	5	14	36	29	86
Total	3	7	42	71	47	170

Turnover * Strategic planning

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	2	8	21	32	20	83
Low	3	7	16	30	30	86
Total	5	15	37	62	50	169

Turnover * Goal / vision setting

	Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	Have received sufficient training.	Total
TurnoverHigh	3	6	19	27	29	84
Low	2	2	17	32	33	86
Total	5	8	36	59	62	170

Test Statistics^a

	Board roles and responsibilities	Community relations	Conflict resolution	Decision-Making processes	Facilities and/or maintenance	Finance and budget
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.023	.152	.209	.125	.042

Test Statistics^a

	Leadership skills	Legal and policy Issues	Strategic planning	Goal / vision setting
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.162	.065	.184	.265

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Q24: Turnover * What organizations provided your board development/training? Please select all that apply.

		Consultants / 3rd party vendors	California School Boards Association	Institutions of Higher Education	National School Boards Association	Other school board association	Our own board and district personnel
Turnover	High	62	68	10	4	9	37
	Low	40	74	13	6	19	49
Total		102	142	23	10	28	86

Q24 cont: Turnover * What organizations provided your board development/training? Please select all that apply.

		Regional service agencies (e.g. County Office of Education)	State Department of Education	U.S. Department of Education
Turnover	High	40	8	2
	Low	37	7	1
Total		77	15	3

Q25: Turnover * During the past twelve (12) months, in what types of board development / training have you participated? Select all that apply.

		Local-level conference / institute	Online or Webinar(s)	National-level conference / institute	Regional-level conference / institute (multiple counties represented)	Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training for the individual board member	Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training for the whole board
Turnover	High	50	23	5	37	39	40
	Low	54	26	10	28	40	38
Total		104	49	15	65	79	78

Q25 cont: Turnover * During the past twelve (12) months, in what types of board development / training have you participated? Select all that apply.

		I have not participated in any board development/training	Other
Turnover	High	7	8
	Low	11	8
Total		18	16

Q26: Turnover * During the past year, what was the total amount of time spent on board training?

	Less than one day	1 day	2 to 4 days	5 to 7 days	8 or more days	Total
TurnoverHigh	12	15	29	15	12	83
Low	15	7	44	14	5	85
Total	27	22	73	29	17	168

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .503

Q27: Turnover * How often does your board engage in whole-board development, with the entire board receiving training together?

	Once per month	Quarterly	Twice per year	Once per year	We do not partake in whole board development or training	Total
TurnoverHigh	3	8	24	31	16	82
Low	1	4	26	27	27	85
Total	4	12	50	58	43	167

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .244

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.96.

Q28: Turnover * If your board does not engage in whole-board development, what is the primary reason preventing your board from doing so? (Please select only one response)

	Other (please specify)	Cost	Coordinating schedules	Too far to travel	Willingness to participate	Total
TurnoverHigh	4	9	24	2	20	59
Low	18	8	15	2	12	55
Total	22	17	39	4	32	114

Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) .012

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.93.

Q29: Turnover * To what extent have the responsibilities of Board members and Superintendents improved as a result of receiving professional development?

		No improvement	Slightly less improvement	Same prior to professional development	Slightly more improvement	More improvement	Total
Turnover	High	5	4	8	41	22	80
	Low	3	1	13	39	21	77
Total		8	5	21	80	43	157

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .954

Q32: Turnover * To what extent have there been fewer occurrences of conflict as a result of the training your board has received?

		Less occurrence of conflict	Slightly less occurrence of conflict	Same amount of conflict	Slightly more occurrence of conflict	Total
Turnover	High	27	22	22	6	77
	Low	35	14	22	2	73
Total		62	36	44	8	150

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .178

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Crosstabs for “noreturn” variable (school board members and superintendent not returning or unknown/unsure)

Turnover * noreturncba

		noreturncba				Total
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	
Turnover	High	7	6	3	2	18
	Low	16	4	3	1	24
Total		23	10	6	3	42

Turnover * noreturnrelat

		noreturnrelat				Total
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	
Turnover	High	3	4	3	8	18
	Low	12	4	5	3	24
Total		15	8	8	11	42

Turnover * noreturncom

		noreturncom				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	6	7	2	3	18
	Low	12	7	3	2	24
Total		18	14	5	5	42

Turnover * noreturnfin

		noreturnfin				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	5	9	2	2	18
	Low	13	8	3	0	24
Total		18	17	5	2	42

Turnover * noreturnbur

		noreturnbur				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	9	1	3	5	18
	Low	15	5	2	2	24
Total		24	6	5	7	42

Turnover * noreturnret

		noreturnret				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	13	1	1	3	18
	Low	14	3	2	5	24
Total		27	4	3	8	42

Turnover * noreturngeo

		noreturngeo				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	15	1	1	1	18
	Low	20	2	0	2	24
Total		35	3	1	3	42

Turnover * noreturninfra

		noreturninfra				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total

Turnover	High	7	4	6	1	18
	Low	17	6	1	0	24
Total		24	10	7	1	42

Turnover * noreturnpro

		noreturnpro				
		No Impact	Slight Impact	Moderate Impact	High Impact	Total
Turnover	High	6	7	3	2	18
	Low	18	3	3	0	24
Total		24	10	6	2	42

Test Statistics^a

	noreturncba	noreturnrelat	noreturncom	noreturnfin	noreturnbur	noreturnret	noreturngeo
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.095	.013	.297	.086	.183	.421	1.000

Test Statistics^a

	noreturninfra	noreturnpro
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.010

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

Crosstabs – Training received (not including “would like ongoing with feedback” indicator)

Turnover * trainboard

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	0	2	19	33	54
	Low	1	2	7	51	61
Total		1	4	26	84	115

Turnover * traincom

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	2	10	24	24	60
	Low	2	5	18	38	63
Total		4	15	42	62	123

Turnover * trainconflict

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	1	8	26	18	53
	Low	2	12	15	32	61
Total		3	20	41	50	114

Turnover * traindec

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	0	6	25	24	55
	Low	3	9	13	36	61
Total		3	15	38	60	116

Turnover * trainfac

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	2	14	19	19	54
	Low	6	10	13	33	62
Total		8	24	32	52	116

Turnover * trainfin

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	1	3	27	22	53
	Low	0	6	14	34	54
Total		1	9	41	56	107

Turnover * trainleader

Total

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	
Turnover	High	3	2	14	26	45
	Low	2	6	10	39	57
Total		5	8	24	65	102

Turnover * trainlegal

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	1	2	28	18	49
	Low	2	5	14	29	50
Total		3	7	42	47	99

Turnover * trainstratplan

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	2	8	21	20	51
	Low	3	7	16	30	56
Total		5	15	37	50	107

Turnover * trainggoal

		Have not had training and do not want it.	Have not had training but would like to have it.	Have had training but would like more.	Have received sufficient training.	Total
Turnover	High	3	6	19	29	57
	Low	2	2	17	33	54
Total		5	8	36	62	111

Test Statistics^a

	trainboard	traincom	trainconflict	traindec	trainfac	trainfin	trainleader
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.025	.265	.401	.190	.073	.374

Test Statistics^a

	trainlegal	trainstratplan	trainggoal
--	------------	----------------	------------

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.154	.237	.200
------------------------	------	------	------

a. Grouping Variable: Turnover

APPENDIX C:

SURVEY RESPONSES—FREQUENCIES

Question 1: What is the student population of your district?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1–999	62	31.0	31.0	31.0
	1000–4999	65	32.5	32.5	63.5
	5000–9999	27	13.5	13.5	77.0
	10000 +	46	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 2: Please classify the location of your district. Urban, Suburban, Rural.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Urban	28	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Suburban	86	43.0	43.0	57.0
	Rural	86	43.0	43.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 3: How many members are on your school board?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 3	6	3.0	3.0	3.0
	4 to 5	167	83.5	83.5	86.5
	7 or more	27	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 4: Please select one. I am a:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Board member	67	33.5	33.5	33.5
	Board president	27	13.5	13.5	47.0
	Superintendent	103	51.5	51.5	98.5
	Superintendent and former board member/president	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 5: How many years have you served on your district’s school board?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 to 2 years	22	11.0	23.4	23.4
	3 to 5 years	22	11.0	23.4	46.8

	6 to 10 years	24	12.0	25.5	72.3
	11 or more years	26	13.0	27.7	100.0
	Total	94	47.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	106	53.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 6: In the past eight years, how many superintendents has your district had?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	22	11.0	23.4	23.4
	Two	35	17.5	37.2	60.6
	Three	28	14.0	29.8	90.4
	Four or more	9	4.5	9.6	100.0
	Total	94	47.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	106	53.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 7: Do you plan on seeking re-election?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	61	30.5	64.9	64.9
	No	12	6.0	12.8	77.7
	Unknown / Unsure	21	10.5	22.3	100.0
	Total	94	47.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	106	53.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: Collective Bargaining Agreements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	19	9.5	59.4	59.4
	Slight Impact	7	3.5	21.9	81.3
	Moderate Impact	3	1.5	9.4	90.6
	High Impact	3	1.5	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: School board relationships

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	13	6.5	40.6	40.6
	Slight Impact	6	3.0	18.8	59.4
	Moderate Impact	6	3.0	18.8	78.1

	High Impact	7	3.5	21.9	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: Community Opposition

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	13	6.5	40.6	40.6
	Slight Impact	11	5.5	34.4	75.0
	Moderate Impact	4	2.0	12.5	87.5
	High Impact	4	2.0	12.5	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: Finance / Funding matters

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	14	7.0	43.8	43.8
	Slight Impact	15	7.5	46.9	90.6
	Moderate Impact	1	.5	3.1	93.8
	High Impact	2	1.0	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: District bureaucracy / traditions / customs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	19	9.5	59.4	59.4
	Slight Impact	5	2.5	15.6	75.0
	Moderate Impact	3	1.5	9.4	84.4
	High Impact	5	2.5	15.6	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: Planned retirement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	22	11.0	68.8	68.8
	Slight Impact	3	1.5	9.4	78.1
	Moderate Impact	2	1.0	6.3	84.4

	High Impact	5	2.5	15.6	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: Geographic location

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	28	14.0	87.5	87.5
	Slight Impact	1	.5	3.1	90.6
	High Impact	3	1.5	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: District infrastructure and resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	19	9.5	59.4	59.4
	Slight Impact	9	4.5	28.1	87.5
	Moderate Impact	3	1.5	9.4	96.9
	High Impact	1	.5	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 8: School board protocols and procedures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	20	10.0	62.5	62.5
	Slight Impact	8	4.0	25.0	87.5
	Moderate Impact	4	2.0	12.5	100.0
	Total	32	16.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	168	84.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 9: How many board members have been elected to the school board since you assumed your superintendency?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 to 1	25	12.5	23.6	23.6
	2 to 4	55	27.5	51.9	75.5
	5 to 7	19	9.5	17.9	93.4
	8 or more	7	3.5	6.6	100.0

	Total	106	53.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	94	47.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 10: How many years have you served as superintendent of the district that currently employs you? (include current year).

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 to 1 year	19	9.5	17.9	17.9
	2 to 4 years	44	22.0	41.5	59.4
	5 to 9 years	32	16.0	30.2	89.6
	10 + years	11	5.5	10.4	100.0
	Total	106	53.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	94	47.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 11: Do you plan on serving as superintendent of your district next year?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	96	48.0	90.6	90.6
	No	4	2.0	3.8	94.3
	Unknown / Unsure	6	3.0	5.7	100.0
	Total	106	53.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	94	47.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: Collective bargaining agreements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	4	2.0	40.0	40.0
	Slight Impact	3	1.5	30.0	70.0
	Moderate Impact	3	1.5	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: School board relationships

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	2	1.0	20.0	20.0
	Slight Impact	2	1.0	20.0	40.0
	Moderate Impact	2	1.0	20.0	60.0
	High Impact	4	2.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	

Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: Community opposition

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	5	2.5	50.0	50.0
	Slight Impact	3	1.5	30.0	80.0
	Moderate Impact	1	.5	10.0	90.0
	High Impact	1	.5	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: Finance / funding matters

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	4	2.0	40.0	40.0
	Slight Impact	2	1.0	20.0	60.0
	Moderate Impact	4	2.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: District bureaucracy / traditions / customs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	5	2.5	50.0	50.0
	Slight Impact	1	.5	10.0	60.0
	Moderate Impact	2	1.0	20.0	80.0
	High Impact	2	1.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: Planned retirement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	5	2.5	50.0	50.0
	Slight Impact	1	.5	10.0	60.0
	Moderate Impact	1	.5	10.0	70.0
	High Impact	3	1.5	30.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	

Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: Geographic location

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	7	3.5	70.0	70.0
	Slight Impact	2	1.0	20.0	90.0
	Moderate Impact	1	.5	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: District infrastructure and resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	5	2.5	50.0	50.0
	Slight Impact	1	.5	10.0	60.0
	Moderate Impact	4	2.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 12: School board protocols and procedures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	4	2.0	40.0	40.0
	Slight Impact	2	1.0	20.0	60.0
	Moderate Impact	2	1.0	20.0	80.0
	High Impact	2	1.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	5.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Collective bargaining agreements

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	65	32.5	34.9	34.9
	Rarely	61	30.5	32.8	67.7
	Sometimes	45	22.5	24.2	91.9
	Often	13	6.5	7.0	98.9
	Always	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	

Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Facilities and buildings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	54	27.0	28.9	28.9
	Rarely	72	36.0	38.5	67.4
	Sometimes	48	24.0	25.7	93.0
	Often	11	5.5	5.9	98.9
	Always	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Finances / budget

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	46	23.0	24.7	24.7
	Rarely	75	37.5	40.3	65.1
	Sometimes	44	22.0	23.7	88.7
	Often	18	9.0	9.7	98.4
	Always	3	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: School board member to superintendent relationship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	57	28.5	30.5	30.5
	Rarely	60	30.0	32.1	62.6
	Sometimes	53	26.5	28.3	90.9
	Often	16	8.0	8.6	99.5
	Always	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Board member to board member relationship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	32	16.0	17.1	17.1
	Rarely	64	32.0	34.2	51.3

	Sometimes	66	33.0	35.3	86.6
	Often	19	9.5	10.2	96.8
	Always	6	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Student affairs (e.g., student expulsion)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	83	41.5	44.6	44.6
	Rarely	85	42.5	45.7	90.3
	Sometimes	15	7.5	8.1	98.4
	Often	3	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Recruitment and selection of personnel

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	55	27.5	29.6	29.6
	Rarely	79	39.5	42.5	72.0
	Sometimes	41	20.5	22.0	94.1
	Often	11	5.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 13: Curriculum and instructional resources

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	64	32.0	34.2	34.2
	Rarely	88	44.0	47.1	81.3
	Sometimes	29	14.5	15.5	96.8
	Often	6	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 14: Please select from the dropdown menu your response to the following question: Were there other areas of conflict not represented in the previous question? If “yes,” please provide the missing area(s) in the text box below, separated by a comma.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	-999.00	35	17.5	17.5	17.5
	Yes	28	14.0	14.0	31.5
	No	137	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 15: When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between... superintendent and a single board member

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	31	15.5	16.8	16.8
	Rarely	74	37.0	40.0	56.8
	Sometimes	52	26.0	28.1	84.9
	Often	23	11.5	12.4	97.3
	Always	5	2.5	2.7	100.0
	Total	185	92.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	15	7.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 15: When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between... superintendent and more than one board member

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	70	35.0	37.8	37.8
	Rarely	77	38.5	41.6	79.5
	Sometimes	32	16.0	17.3	96.8
	Often	6	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	185	92.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	15	7.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 15: When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between... individual board member to another board member

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	26	13.0	14.1	14.1
	Rarely	65	32.5	35.3	49.5
	Sometimes	68	34.0	37.0	86.4
	Often	23	11.5	12.5	98.9
	Always	2	1.0	1.1	100.0

	Total	184	92.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	16	8.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 15: When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between... individual board member to more than one board member

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	51	25.5	27.7	27.7
	Rarely	59	29.5	32.1	59.8
	Sometimes	53	26.5	28.8	88.6
	Often	19	9.5	10.3	98.9
	Always	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	184	92.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	16	8.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 15: When a disagreement exists, to what extent does it occur between... a coalition(s) of board members

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	100	50.0	54.1	54.1
	Rarely	44	22.0	23.8	77.8
	Sometimes	33	16.5	17.8	95.7
	Often	8	4.0	4.3	100.0
	Total	185	92.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	15	7.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Knowledge level of an issue)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	39	19.5	21.0	21.0
	Rarely	54	27.0	29.0	50.0
	Sometimes	69	34.5	37.1	87.1
	Often	18	9.0	9.7	96.8
	Always	6	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Political party affiliation)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	119	59.5	64.0	64.0
	Rarely	43	21.5	23.1	87.1
	Sometimes	19	9.5	10.2	97.3
	Often	2	1.0	1.1	98.4
	Always	3	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Finance and funding considerations)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	49	24.5	26.3	26.3
	Rarely	62	31.0	33.3	59.7
	Sometimes	54	27.0	29.0	88.7
	Often	17	8.5	9.1	97.8
	Always	4	2.0	2.2	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Constituent interests of Board members)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	54	27.0	28.9	28.9
	Rarely	54	27.0	28.9	57.8
	Sometimes	50	25.0	26.7	84.5
	Often	23	11.5	12.3	96.8
	Always	6	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Knowledge level of board member role and responsibilities)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	40	20.0	21.4	21.4
	Rarely	56	28.0	29.9	51.3

	Sometimes	51	25.5	27.3	78.6
	Often	28	14.0	15.0	93.6
	Always	12	6.0	6.4	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Board member to board member relationship)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	46	23.0	24.7	24.7
	Rarely	64	32.0	34.4	59.1
	Sometimes	54	27.0	29.0	88.2
	Often	17	8.5	9.1	97.3
	Always	5	2.5	2.7	100.0
	Total	186	93.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	14	7.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 16: To what degree does each of the following initiate conflict between board member(s) and the superintendent? (Board member to superintendent relationship)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	63	31.5	33.7	33.7
	Rarely	67	33.5	35.8	69.5
	Sometimes	44	22.0	23.5	93.0
	Often	11	5.5	5.9	98.9
	Always	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	187	93.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	13	6.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 17: Please select from the dropdown choices your answer to the following question: What is the current and adopted decision-making system/process used by the school board? If your system/process is not listed, please select "Other" and use the text box to write in and/or briefly describe your school board's decision-making process.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	-999.00	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)	8	4.0	4.0	16.5
	Consensus voting	78	39.0	39.0	55.5
	Dynamic Facilitation	6	3.0	3.0	58.5

Robert's Rules of Order	77	38.5	38.5	97.0
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT Analysis)	6	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Question 18: To what extent is the decision-making process adhered to?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	.5	.6	.6
	Rarely	1	.5	.6	1.1
	Sometimes	7	3.5	3.9	5.0
	Often	69	34.5	38.3	43.3
	Always	102	51.0	56.7	100.0
	Total	180	90.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	20	10.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 19: For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision. (Collective bargaining agreements)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	19	9.5	10.7	10.7
	Not Useful	5	2.5	2.8	13.5
	Slightly Useful	16	8.0	9.0	22.5
	Useful	57	28.5	32.0	54.5
	Somewhat Useful	19	9.5	10.7	65.2
	Extremely Useful	62	31.0	34.8	100.0
	Total	178	89.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	22	11.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 19: For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision. (Facilities and buildings)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	4	2.0	2.3	2.3
	Not Useful	3	1.5	1.7	4.0
	Slightly Useful	12	6.0	6.8	10.7
	Useful	57	28.5	32.2	42.9
	Somewhat Useful	26	13.0	14.7	57.6
	Extremely Useful	75	37.5	42.4	100.0
	Total	177	88.5	100.0	

Missing	-999.00	23	11.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 19: For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision. (Finance/funding matters)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	2	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Not Useful	2	1.0	1.1	2.3
	Slightly Useful	10	5.0	5.6	7.9
	Useful	51	25.5	28.8	36.7
	Somewhat Useful	30	15.0	16.9	53.7
	Extremely Useful	82	41.0	46.3	100.0
	Total	177	88.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	23	11.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 19: For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision. (Recruitment or selection of personnel)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	14	7.0	7.9	7.9
	Not Useful	11	5.5	6.2	14.1
	Slightly Useful	20	10.0	11.3	25.4
	Useful	46	23.0	26.0	51.4
	Somewhat Useful	25	12.5	14.1	65.5
	Extremely Useful	61	30.5	34.5	100.0
	Total	177	88.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	23	11.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 19: For the following categories, please rate the usefulness of the decision-making process in determining a decision. (Student affairs)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	7	3.5	4.0	4.0
	Not Useful	4	2.0	2.3	6.2
	Slightly Useful	19	9.5	10.7	16.9
	Useful	50	25.0	28.2	45.2
	Somewhat Useful	25	12.5	14.1	59.3
	Extremely Useful	72	36.0	40.7	100.0
	Total	177	88.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	23	11.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM)	8	4.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	192	96.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Consensus Process	79	39.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	121	60.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dynamic Facilitation	15	7.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	185	92.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Political, Economical, Social, Technological Analysis (PEST)	3	1.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	197	98.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Robert's Rules of Order	76	38.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	124	62.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats Analysis (SWOT)	38	19.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	162	81.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 20: Within the past eight (8) years, what other decision-making processes have been used by your district? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other (please specify)	10	5.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 21: When disagreement or conflict persists, who primarily facilitates the resolution process?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other (please specify)	13	6.5	7.4	7.4
	Board president	64	32.0	36.6	44.0
	Other board member	11	5.5	6.3	50.3
	Superintendent	87	43.5	49.7	100.0
	Total	175	87.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	25	12.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 22: In your experience, to what extent has that person been successful in mediating a resolution?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Ineffective	4	2.0	2.3	2.3
	Moderately ineffective	12	6.0	6.8	9.1
	Moderately effective	38	19.0	21.6	30.7
	Effective	108	54.0	61.4	92.0
	I have not experienced this / I do not know	14	7.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	176	88.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	24	12.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Board roles and responsibilities)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	1	.5	.6	.6
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	4	2.0	2.3	2.9
	Have had training but would like more.	26	13.0	15.2	18.1
	Have had training and would like "Ongoing" training and fee	56	28.0	32.7	50.9
	Have received sufficient training.	84	42.0	49.1	100.0
	Total	171	85.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	29	14.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Community relations)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	4	2.0	2.4	2.4
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	8.8	11.2
	Have had training but would like more.	42	21.0	24.7	35.9

	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	47	23.5	27.6	63.5
	Have received sufficient training.	62	31.0	36.5	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Conflict resolution)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	1.8	1.8
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	20	10.0	11.8	13.5
	Have had training but would like more.	41	20.5	24.1	37.6
	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	56	28.0	32.9	70.6
	Have received sufficient training.	50	25.0	29.4	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area (Decision-making processes)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	1.8	1.8
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	8.8	10.5
	Have had training but would like more.	38	19.0	22.2	32.7
	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	55	27.5	32.2	64.9
	Have received sufficient training.	60	30.0	35.1	100.0
	Total	171	85.5	100.0	

Missing	-999.00	29	14.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Facilities and/or maintenance)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	8	4.0	4.7	4.7
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	24	12.0	14.1	18.8
	Have had training but would like more.	32	16.0	18.8	37.6
	Have had training and would like "Ongoing" training and fee	54	27.0	31.8	69.4
	Have received sufficient training.	52	26.0	30.6	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Finance and budget)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	1	.5	.6	.6
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	9	4.5	5.3	5.8
	Have had training but would like more.	41	20.5	24.0	29.8
	Have had training and would like "Ongoing" training and fee	64	32.0	37.4	67.3
	Have received sufficient training.	56	28.0	32.7	100.0
	Total	171	85.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	29	14.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Leadership skills)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	2.9	2.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	8	4.0	4.7	7.6
	Have had training but would like more.	24	12.0	14.1	21.8
	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	68	34.0	40.0	61.8
	Have received sufficient training.	65	32.5	38.2	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Legal and policy issues)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	1.8	1.8
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	7	3.5	4.1	5.9
	Have had training but would like more.	42	21.0	24.7	30.6
	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	71	35.5	41.8	72.4
	Have received sufficient training.	47	23.5	27.6	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Strategic planning)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	3.0	3.0
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	8.9	11.8
	Have had training but would like more.	37	18.5	21.9	33.7

	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	62	31.0	36.7	70.4
	Have received sufficient training.	50	25.0	29.6	100.0
	Total	169	84.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	31	15.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 23: Describe the training you have had in relation to each area. (Goal/vision setting)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	2.9	2.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	8	4.0	4.7	7.6
	Have had training but would like more.	36	18.0	21.2	28.8
	Have had training and would like “Ongoing” training and fee	59	29.5	34.7	63.5
	Have received sufficient training.	62	31.0	36.5	100.0
	Total	170	85.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	30	15.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 24: What organizations provided your board development/training? Please select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Consultants / 3rd party vendors	102	51.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	98	49.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	California School Boards Association	142	71.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	58	29.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Institutions of higher education	23	11.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	177	88.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	National School Boards Association	10	5.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	190	95.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other school board association	28	14.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	172	86.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Our own board and district personnel	86	43.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	114	57.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regional service agencies (e.g. county office of education)	77	38.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	123	61.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	State Department of Education	15	7.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	185	92.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	U.S. Department of Education	3	1.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	197	98.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 25: During the past twelve (12) months, in what types of board development/training have you participated? Select all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local-level conference / institute	104	52.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	96	48.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Online or webinar(s)	49	24.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	151	75.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	National-level conference / institute	15	7.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	185	92.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regional-level conference / institute (multiple counties rep	65	32.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	135	67.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training(s) for the individual b	79	39.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	121	60.5		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Workshop(s), seminar(s), or training(s) for the whole board	78	39.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	122	61.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I have not participated in any board development/training	18	9.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	182	91.0		
Total		200	100.0		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other (please specify)	16	8.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-999.00	184	92.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 26: During the past year, what was the total amount of time spent on board training?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than one day	27	13.5	16.1	16.1
	1 day	22	11.0	13.1	29.2
	2 to 4 days	73	36.5	43.5	72.6
	5 to 7 days	29	14.5	17.3	89.9
	8 or more days	17	8.5	10.1	100.0
	Total	168	84.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	32	16.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 27: How often does your board engage in whole-board development, with the entire board receiving training together?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Once per month	4	2.0	2.4	2.4
	Quarterly	12	6.0	7.2	9.6
	Twice per year	50	25.0	29.9	39.5
	Once per year	58	29.0	34.7	74.3

	We do not partake in whole board development or training	43	21.5	25.7	100.0
	Total	167	83.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	33	16.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 28: If your board does not engage in whole-board development, what is the primary reason preventing your board from doing so? (Please select only one response.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other (please specify)	22	11.0	19.3	19.3
	Cost	17	8.5	14.9	34.2
	Coordinating schedules	39	19.5	34.2	68.4
	Too far to travel	4	2.0	3.5	71.9
	Willingness to participate	32	16.0	28.1	100.0
	Total	114	57.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	86	43.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 29: To what extent have the responsibilities of board members and superintendents improved as a result of receiving professional development?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No improvement	8	4.0	5.1	5.1
	Slightly less improvement	5	2.5	3.2	8.3
	Same prior to professional development	21	10.5	13.4	21.7
	Slightly more improvement	80	40.0	51.0	72.6
	More improvement	43	21.5	27.4	100.0
	Total	157	78.5	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	43	21.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Question 32: To what extent have there been fewer occurrences of conflict as a result of the training your board has received?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less occurrence of conflict	62	31.0	41.3	41.3
	Slightly less occurrence of conflict	36	18.0	24.0	65.3

	Same amount of conflict	44	22.0	29.3	94.7
	Slightly more occurrence of conflict	8	4.0	5.3	100.0
	Total	150	75.0	100.0	
Missing	-999.00	50	25.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Collective Bargaining (noreturncba)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	23	11.5	54.8	54.8
	Slight Impact	10	5.0	23.8	78.6
	Moderate Impact	6	3.0	14.3	92.9
	High Impact	3	1.5	7.1	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Relationships (noreturnrelat)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	15	7.5	35.7	35.7
	Slight Impact	8	4.0	19.0	54.8
	Moderate Impact	8	4.0	19.0	73.8
	High Impact	11	5.5	26.2	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Community (noreturncom)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	18	9.0	42.9	42.9
	Slight Impact	14	7.0	33.3	76.2
	Moderate Impact	5	2.5	11.9	88.1
	High Impact	5	2.5	11.9	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Financial (noreturnfin)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	18	9.0	42.9	42.9
	Slight Impact	17	8.5	40.5	83.3
	Moderate Impact	5	2.5	11.9	95.2
	High Impact	2	1.0	4.8	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – District bureaucracy (noreturnbur)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	24	12.0	57.1	57.1
	Slight Impact	6	3.0	14.3	71.4
	Moderate Impact	5	2.5	11.9	83.3
	High Impact	7	3.5	16.7	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Retirement (noreturnret)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	27	13.5	64.3	64.3
	Slight Impact	4	2.0	9.5	73.8
	Moderate Impact	3	1.5	7.1	81.0
	High Impact	8	4.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – Geography (noreturngeo)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	35	17.5	83.3	83.3
	Slight Impact	3	1.5	7.1	90.5
	Moderate Impact	1	.5	2.4	92.9
	High Impact	3	1.5	7.1	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	

Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – District Infrastructure (noreturninfra)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	24	12.0	57.1	57.1
	Slight Impact	10	5.0	23.8	81.0
	Moderate Impact	7	3.5	16.7	97.6
	High Impact	1	.5	2.4	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Board member/superintendent not returning or unsure/unknown – School board protocols and procedures (noreturnpro)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Impact	24	12.0	57.1	57.1
	Slight Impact	10	5.0	23.8	81.0
	Moderate Impact	6	3.0	14.3	95.2
	High Impact	2	1.0	4.8	100.0
	Total	42	21.0	100.0	
Missing	System	158	79.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Board roles and responsibilities (trainboard)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	1	.5	.9	.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	4	2.0	3.5	4.3
	Have had training but would like more.	26	13.0	22.6	27.0
	Have received sufficient training.	84	42.0	73.0	100.0
	Total	115	57.5	100.0	
Missing	System	85	42.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Community relations (traincom)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	4	2.0	3.3	3.3
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	12.2	15.4
	Have had training but would like more.	42	21.0	34.1	49.6
	Have received sufficient training.	62	31.0	50.4	100.0
	Total	123	61.5	100.0	
Missing	System	77	38.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Conflict resolution (trainconflict)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	2.6	2.6
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	20	10.0	17.5	20.2
	Have had training but would like more.	41	20.5	36.0	56.1
	Have received sufficient training.	50	25.0	43.9	100.0
	Total	114	57.0	100.0	
Missing	System	86	43.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Decision-making processes (traindec)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	2.6	2.6
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	12.9	15.5
	Have had training but would like more.	38	19.0	32.8	48.3
	Have received sufficient training.	60	30.0	51.7	100.0
	Total	116	58.0	100.0	
Missing	System	84	42.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Facilities/maintenance (trainfac)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	8	4.0	6.9	6.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	24	12.0	20.7	27.6
	Have had training but would like more.	32	16.0	27.6	55.2
	Have received sufficient training.	52	26.0	44.8	100.0
	Total	116	58.0	100.0	
Missing	System	84	42.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Finance and budget (trainfin)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	1	.5	.9	.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	9	4.5	8.4	9.3
	Have had training but would like more.	41	20.5	38.3	47.7
	Have received sufficient training.	56	28.0	52.3	100.0
	Total	107	53.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	46.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Leadership skills (trainleader)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	4.9	4.9
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	8	4.0	7.8	12.7
	Have had training but would like more.	24	12.0	23.5	36.3
	Have received sufficient training.	65	32.5	63.7	100.0
	Total	102	51.0	100.0	
Missing	System	98	49.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Legal and policy issues (trainlegal)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	3	1.5	3.0	3.0
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	7	3.5	7.1	10.1
	Have had training but would like more.	42	21.0	42.4	52.5
	Have received sufficient training.	47	23.5	47.5	100.0
	Total	99	49.5	100.0	
Missing	System	101	50.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Strategic planning (trainstratplan)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	4.7	4.7
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	15	7.5	14.0	18.7
	Have had training but would like more.	37	18.5	34.6	53.3
	Have received sufficient training.	50	25.0	46.7	100.0
	Total	107	53.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	46.5		
Total		200	100.0		

Describe training – “Ongoing” excluded – Vision and goals (trainggoal)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have not had training and do not want it.	5	2.5	4.5	4.5
	Have not had training but would like to have it.	8	4.0	7.2	11.7
	Have had training but would like more.	36	18.0	32.4	44.1
	Have received sufficient training.	62	31.0	55.9	100.0
	Total	111	55.5	100.0	
Missing	System	89	44.5		
Total		200	100.0		

REFERENCES

- Alkin, M. C. (2010). *Evaluation essentials: From A to Z*. Guilford Press.
- Alsbury, T. L. (2003). Superintendent and school board member turnover: Political versus apolitical turnover as a critical variable in the application of the dissatisfaction theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(5), 667–698.
- Alsbury, T. L. (2004). Does school board turnover matter? Revisiting critical variables in the dissatisfaction theory of American democracy. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(4), 357–377.
- Alsbury, T. L. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the influence on student achievement: An application of the dissatisfaction theory. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, 7(2), 202–229. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15700760701748428>
- Anderson, R. H., & Snyder, K. J. (1980). Leadership training for the school board members: One approach. *Education*, 100(3), 227–34.
- Banicki, G., & Pacha, J. (2011). Illinois Board of Education closed sessions: Does the superintendent make a difference? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(4).
- Ballotpedia. (2016). *Los Angeles Unified School District elections (2013)*. Retrieved March 29, 2016, from [https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_Unified_School_District_elections_\(2013\)#District_6](https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_Unified_School_District_elections_(2013)#District_6)
- Beatty, P., & Willis, G. B. (2007). Research synthesis: The practice of cognitive interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71(2), 287–311.

- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Byrd, J. K., Drews, C., & Johnson, J. (2006). *Factors impacting superintendent turnover: Lessons from the field*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- California Department of Education. (2014). *Fingertip facts on education in California*. California Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp>
- California School Boards Association. (2007). *School board leadership*. West Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://d3jc3ahdjad7x7.cloudfront.net/HF4VeyvgvIqsWzD2HB6TPBKt1qCFqbhdZITvflda1sn9AU6O.pdf>
- California School Boards Association. (2016.). *Masters in Governance*. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <https://www.csba.org/>
- Campbell, D. W. (2010). Key players, key roles. Part of a special issue: The future of school boards, *American School Board Journal*, 197(4), 34–37.
- Carol, L. N., Kirst, M. W., McCloud, B. A., Usdan, M. D., Cunningham, L. L., & Danzberger, J. P. (1986). *School boards: Strengthening grass roots leadership*. Washington DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Chicago Reporter. (2016). *History of Chicago Public Schools*. Retrieved August 30, 2016, from <http://catalyst-chicago.org/cps-history/>
- Collins, D. (2003). Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. *Quality of Life Research*, 12(3), 229.

- Council of the Great City Schools. (2014). *Urban school superintendents: Characteristics, tenure, and salary*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Danzberger, J. P. (1994). Governing the nation's schools: The case for restructuring local school boards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 367–373.
- Danzberger, J. P., Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (1992). *Governing public schools: New times, new requirements* (No. 0-937846-56-2). Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Delagardelle, M. L. (2006). *Roles and responsibilities of local school board members in relation to student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Iowa.
- Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, 20 U.S.C. § 1177 et seq. Retrieved March 7, 2016, from <http://www.ed.gov/essa>
- Fine, L. G. (2009). The SWOT analysis: Using your strength to overcome weaknesses, using opportunities to overcome threats. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Finn, C. E., & Petrilli, M. J. (2013). The failures of U.S. education governance today. In *Education governance for the twenty-first century: Overcoming the structural barriers to school reform* (pp. 21–35). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2009). Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 19(5), 531–540.

- Fogelman, K. F., & Comber, C. (2007). Surveys and sampling. In A. R. J. Briggs & M. Coleman (Eds.), *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (pp. 125–141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fuller, H., Campbell, C., Celio, M. B., Immerwahr, J., & Winger, A. (2003). *An impossible job? The view from the urban superintendent's chair*. Seattle, WA: Center for Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.
- Fusarelli, B. C. (2006). School board and superintendent relations. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 9(1), 44–57. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1555458905285011>
- Glass, T. E., Björk, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Gold, E., Henig, J. R., & Simon, E. (2011). Calling the shots in public education: Parents, politicians, and educators clash. *Dissent*, 58(4), 34.
- Goodman, R. H., Fulbright, L., Zimmerman, W. G., Jr. (1997). *Getting there from here. School board–superintendent collaboration: Creating a school governance team capable of raising student achievement*. Marlborough, MA: New England School Development Council.
- Grady, M. L., & Bryant, M. T. (1991). School board turmoil and superintendent turnover: What pushes them to the brink? *School Administrator*, 48(2), 19–26.

- Greenleaf, R. K., Covey, S. R., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Paulist.
- Griffin, L. M. (1951). Robert's Rules of Order Revised (Book). *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 37(3), 387.
- Grissom, J. A. (2010). The determinants of conflict on governing boards in public organizations: The case of California school boards. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 20(3), 601–627. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup043>
- Grissom, J. A., & Andersen, S. (2012). Why superintendents turn over. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(6), 1146–1180.
- Hess, F. M. (2008). Looking for leadership: Assessing the case for mayoral control of urban school systems. *American Journal of Education*, 114(3), 219–245.
- Hess, F. M., & Meeks, O. (2010). *School boards circa 2010: Governance in the accountability era*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Howell, W. G. (2005). *Besieged: School boards and the future of education politics*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Hurst, S., Arulogun, O. S., Owolabi, M. O., Akinyemi, R., Uvere, E., Warth, S., & Ovbiagele, B. (2015). Pretesting qualitative data collection procedures to facilitate methodological adherence and team building in Nigeria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14, 53–64.
- Iannaccone, L., & Lutz, F. W. (1994). The crucible of democracy: The local arena. *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(5&6), 39–52.

- Institute for Educational Leadership. (1986). *School boards: Strengthening grass roots leadership* (No. 0-937846-89-9). Washington, DC: Author.
- Johnson, J., Huffman, T., Madden, K., & Shope, S. (2011). *Superintendent turnover in Kentucky: Issues & answers* (REL 2011-No. 113). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Johnson-Howard, D. (1991). *School board member values and school district policies*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 199.1
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Keegan, L. G., & Finn, C. E., Jr. (2004). Lost at sea. *Education Next*, 4(3), 15–17.
- Keller, B. (1997). L.A. to use loans to begin school construction. *Education Week*, 16, 9–9.
- Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D. (2004). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Khoboli, B., & O'Toole, J. (2012). The concerns-based adoption model: Teachers' participation in action research. *Systemic Practice & Action Research*, 25(2), 137–148.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-011-9214-8>
- Kirst, M. W. (2003). Mayoral influence, new regimes, and public school governance. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 102(1), 196–218.
- Kirst, M. W. (2010). *The political and policy dynamics of K–12 education reform from 1965 to 2010: Implications for changing postsecondary education*. Stanford, CA: Center for Education Policy Analysis.
- Kirst, M., & Bulkley, K. (2000). “New, improved” mayors take over city schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(7), 538–40; 540–46.

- Kirst, M. W., & Wirt, F. M. (2009). *The political dynamics of American education*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan .
- Knafel, K., Deatrick, J., Gallo, A., Holcombe, G., Bakitas, M., Dixon, J., & Grey, M. (2007). The analysis and interpretation of cognitive interviews for instrument development. *Research in Nursing & Health, 30*(2), 224–234. <http://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20195>
- Kotter, J. (1995, March–April). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review, 73*(2).
- Lachman, S. (2014, October 20). Colorado school board controversy turning frustrated republicans into democrats. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/10/20/colorado-school-board_n_6015818.html
- Land, D. (2002). Local school boards under review: Their role and effectiveness in relation to students' academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 229–278. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072002229>
- “LAUSD moves forward with caution on iPads; Plans laptop pilot.” (2013). *Electronic Education Report, 20*(23), 7–8.
- Lee, D. E., & Eadens, D. W. (2014). The problem: Low-achieving districts and low-performing boards. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership, 9*(3), 1–13.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lipman, P., Gutstein, E., Gutierrez, R. R., & Blanche, T. (2015). *Should Chicago have an elected representative school board? A new review of the evidence*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago, Collaborative for Equity & Justice in Education.

- Lutz, F. W., & Iannaccone, L. (1986). *The dissatisfaction theory of American democracy: A guide for politics in local school districts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, San Francisco, CA.
- Maricle, C. (2014). *Governing to achieve: A synthesis of research on school governance to support student achievement*. West Sacramento, CA: California School Boards Association.
- McAdams, D. R. (2006). *What school boards can do: Reform governance for urban schools*. Columbia, NY: Teachers College Press.
- McBeath, G. A. (2011). School boards in America: A flawed exercise in democracy. *Choice: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries*, 48(11), 2191–2191.
- McCurdy, J. (1992). *Building better board-administrator relations*. (AASA Critical Issues Report). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Mestry, R., & Hlongwane, S. (2009). Perspectives on the training of school governing bodies: Towards an effective and efficient financial management system. *Africa Education Review*, 6(2), 324–342.
- Monteith, D. S., & Hallums, M. B. (1989). *The exodus of South Carolina superintendents*. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED311531).
- Mountford, M. (2004). Motives and power of school board members: Implications for school board-superintendent relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 704–741.
- Myers, S. (2011). Superintendent length of tenure and student achievement. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research*, 1(2), 43–53.

- National School Boards Association. (2012). *Mandated Training for School Board Members*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nsba.org/sites/default/files/reports/MandatedTraining.pdf>
- National School Boards Association. (2015). *Key work of school boards* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National School Boards Foundation. (2001). *Improving school board decision-making: The data connection*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Newton, P. M., & Sackney, L. (2005). Group knowledge and group knowledge processes in school board decision making. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 434–457.
- Nitta, K. A., Wrobel, S. L., Howard, J. Y., & Jimmerson-Eddings, E. (2009). Leading change of a school district reorganization. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 32(3), 463–488.
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301–314.
- Opfer, V. D., & Denmark, V. (2001). Sorting out a sense of place: School and school board relationships in the midst of school-based decision making. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(2), 101–18.
- Parker, P. (1996). Superintendent vulnerability and mobility. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(2), 64–77.
- Patterson, J. A., Koenigs, A., Mohn, G., & Rasmussen, C. (2006). Working against ourselves: Decision making in a small rural school district. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(2), 142–158.

- Peck, R. F., & Bown, O. H. (1968). Research and development center for teacher education. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1(4), 106–126.
- Petronis, J. (1996). Mandated school board training: An idea whose time has come? Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED400625>
- Pickert, K. (2014, October 16). How the iPad helped bring down the Los Angeles schools chief. *Time.com*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/3514155/ipad-john-deasy-laUSD-superintendent-resigns/>
- Plecki, M. L., McCleery, J., & Knapp, M. S. (2006). *Redefining and improving school district governance*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Punch, K. F. (2003). *Survey research: The basics*. London: Sage.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Quigley, D. D. (2009). *Teaching school board members about reform governance: Evaluation of the Texas Institute for School Board Training*. Redondo Beach, CA: Evaluation & Research Services.
- Resnick, M. A. (1999). *Effective school governance: A look at today's practice and tomorrow's promise*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Rhim, L. M., Quarles, R., & Wong, K. (2013). *Moving beyond the killer b's: The role of school boards in school accountability and transformation*. Lincoln, IL: Academic Development Institute.
- Rice, P. (2014). *Vanishing school boards. Where school boards have gone, why we need them, and how we can bring them back*. Rowman and Littlefield Education, Lanham, MD.

- Rice, D., Delagardelle, M., Buckton, M., Jons, C., Lueders, W., Vens, M. J., ... Weathersby, J. (2000). *The lighthouse inquiry: School board/superintendent team behaviors in school districts with extreme differences in student achievement*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Association of School Boards.
- Richardson, L. M. (1998). *Stress in the superintendency: Implications for achieving excellence*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, St. Louis, MO.
- Roach, A. T., Kratochwill, T. R., & Frank, J. L. (2009). School-based consultants as change facilitators: Adaptation of the concerns-based adoption model (CBAM) to support the implementation of research-based practices. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 19*(4), 300–320. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10474410802463304>
- Roberts, K. L., & Sampson, P. M. (2011). School board member professional development and effects on student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Management, 25*(7), 701–713.
- Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2006). The 38th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(1), 41–56.
- Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (2015). The 47th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(1), 29–31.
- Salamati, P., ashraf Eghbali, A., & Zarghampour, M. (2014). SWOT analysis in Sina Trauma and Surgery Research Center. *Acta Medica Iranica, 52*(2), 130–136.
- Shober, A. F., & Hartney, M. T. (2014). Does school board leadership matter? *Education Week, 33*(27), 1–42.

- Simpson, J. (2013). Superintendent tenure and student achievement. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 9(4), 10–23.
- Stanford School of Medicine. (2010). *Rural California*. Stanford, CA: Stanford eCampus Rural Health.
- Tallerico, M. (1991). School board member development: Implications for policy and practice. *Planning and Changing*, 22(2), 94–107.
- Tekniepe, R. J. (2015). Identifying the factors that contribute to involuntary departures of school superintendents in rural America. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 30(1).
- Viteritti, J. P. (2008). *When mayors take charge: School governance in the city*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Wong, K., & Shen, F. X. (2003). Measuring the effectiveness of city and state takeover as a school reform strategy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(4), 89–119.