

1998

# Identification of Training Needs for School Board Members

David Jordan

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Jordan, David, "Identification of Training Needs for School Board Members" (1998). *Masters Theses*. 1705.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1705>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university or the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date 6/18/98

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Identification of Training Needs for School Board Members

By

David Jordan

Field Experience

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement

For the Degree of

Specialist in Education

In the Graduate School, Eastern Illinois University

Charleston, Illinois

April, 1998

I Hereby Recommend this Field Experience be Accepted as  
Fulfilling This Part of the Graduate Degree Cited Above

5-22-98

Date

May 22, 1998

Date

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the training topics offered to newly elected and incumbent school board members by state school boards associations. The researcher then evaluated the materials to determine which states have laws requiring board members to participate in training programs.

The study was designed to answer three research questions:

1. What are the topics offered by state school boards associations for school board member training?

2. What states have laws requiring individual school board members to participate in training programs, and what are those requirements?

3. What states have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members?

The study took place in the spring of 1998. The researcher sent letters to all 50 state school boards associations to request materials related to training topics presented to their members. Thirty-two state school boards associations (64%) responded with materials for consideration in this study.

The results indicated that state associations offer 17 different training topics. Respondents indicated that the most frequently presented training topic was school law (69%) followed by school finance (66%). Data collected from the respondents indicated that 10 states (31%) have laws

requiring board members to participate in a training program. Analysis of data showed that 4 of the 10 states with training requirements have an established training program for members to attend. The results of the study also indicated that 18 states have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members. Nine of those 18 states have laws requiring new board member training.

The researcher concluded that state school boards associations consider board training a key function of their organization. Another conclusion was that if school board members are to gain a better understanding of how school systems work, they need more than a voluntary training program.

The findings led to two recommendations being made to the state legislature and the Illinois Association of School Boards. The first recommendation would require board members to participate in a structured program during their tenure in office. There would be a three-level training process that requires eight hours of training at each training level. The second recommendation would require the entire board to participate in a state facilitated board self-evaluation program.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
List of Tables .....	vi
Chapter 1: Overview of the Problem .....	7
Background .....	7
Statement of the Problem .....	8
Research Questions .....	8
Assumptions .....	9
Limitation .....	9
Delimitations .....	9
Operational Definitions .....	10
Uniqueness of the Study .....	10
Chapter 2: Rationale, Related Literature, and Research....	11
Rationale .....	11
Review of Literature .....	11
Review of Research .....	15
Chapter 3: Design of the Study .....	18
General Design .....	18
Sample and Population .....	18
Data Collection and Instrumentation .....	19
Data Analysis .....	19
Chapter 4: Results of the Study .....	20
Overview .....	20
Results of Research Question 1 .....	20
Results of Research Question 2 .....	22
Results of Research Question 3 .....	29
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations .....	32

Summary .....	32
Conclusions .....	33
Recommendations .....	35
References .....	37
Appendix A: Materials Request Letter .....	40
Appendix B: Frequency Table.....	41

## List of Tables

Table 1: Topics Presented for School Board Member Training	
.....	21
Table 2: States With Laws Requiring Training and	
Requirements .....	23
Table 3: Topics Presented by States with Required Training	
Laws .....	30
Table 4: States with New School Board Member Training	
Programs .....	31



## Chapter 1

### Overview of the Problem

#### Background

In the researcher's opinion, the time has come for Illinois and the other states that do not require training of school board members to make training a legal requirement. The operation of school systems today is a very complex process. No matter how much prior experience a person has in public service or board service, when it comes to dealing with school problems, few new board members are ready to embark on their duties when they are seated on the board. After the 1995 election, a report issued by the Illinois Association of School Boards (Illinois Association of School Boards [IASB], 1991, p.1) showed that there were 1,370 newly elected school board members. Neither the Illinois School Code (West Publishing Company, 1996) nor the Illinois Association of School Boards has established any required training for school board members.

The Illinois Association of School Boards provides many voluntary workshops for veteran and newly elected board members. In the researcher's opinion, very few members attend these leadership training programs, because of political pressure, location, time, and expense. Mandatory training laws would eliminate these excuses.

The researcher believes that mandatory training would help board members to develop effective leadership skills, to broaden the creativity and vision of members, and to

increase their knowledge of basic school operation. The better school board members are informed about their jobs and responsibilities, the better they will be able to exercise effective leadership in public school governance on behalf of the community they represent.

The School Board of Waltonville Community Unit School District #1, where the researcher is the superintendent, does not participate in any activities or workshops sponsored by the Illinois Association of School Boards. While observing the dilemmas encountered by newly elected Waltonville Board Members, the researcher was encouraged to evaluate the board training programs and requirements of all state school boards associations.

#### Statement of the Problem

Neither the legislature of Illinois nor the Illinois Association of School Boards requires any training for an individual to be a member of the board of education. This led the researcher to address the specific problem of the study: What training is offered to newly elected and incumbent school board members by state school boards associations, and which programs are required by state law?

#### Research Questions

The following questions were addressed:

1. What are the topics offered by state school boards associations for school board member training?

2. What states have laws requiring individual school board members to participate in training programs, and what are those requirements?

3. What states have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members?

#### Assumptions

The following assumptions were made of state school boards associations participating in this study:

1. That state school boards associations have materials for school board member training programs.

2. That state school boards associations have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members.

#### Limitation

State school boards associations were the only reference group utilized. Other state organizations were not surveyed because of cost and time limitations (e.g., Illinois Association of School Administrators, Illinois Principals Association, and Illinois State Board of Education).

#### Delimitations

The following factors were placed outside the scope of this study:

1. Every school board member in Illinois was not surveyed because of the cost and time limitations.

2. Superintendents were not surveyed because of the

number of school districts, range of enrollment and different types of districts.

3. The National School Boards Association was not surveyed because it could not possibly meet all of the different needs of each state.

#### Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions are germane to understanding this field study.

Leadership training. A program designed to build upon the commitment and the desire of board members to enhance their leadership skills in order to lead their school districts.

Orientation. A procedure of familiarization and adoption to a situation or environment.

#### Uniqueness of the Study

Since Illinois does not have a law requiring leadership training of school board members, many new members are seated with no expectation of their roles or responsibilities. This study began the process of determining the need for a state law requiring board members in Illinois to undergo a training program.

## Chapter 2

### Rationale, Related Literature, and Research

#### Rationale

The Waltonville Community Unit School District #1 Board of Education has never gone through a professional training program at either the state or local level. Lack of leadership and knowledge of procedural requirements has led to many decisions being made that have not been in the best interest of the district. It is the opinion of the researcher that an ongoing training program required by the state would benefit the school board at Waltonville as well as other school boards throughout Illinois.

#### Review of Literature

The local school board is the key component of the educational community. School boards in school districts across America have a unique opportunity to strengthen education by utilizing effective leadership skills. Leadership is the ability to get people to do willingly what they might not do on their own. Individuals with leadership quality have a special effect on others. They command respect and admiration while motivating others to follow. Professional training of school board members not only enhances leadership skills but also enables members to understand their roles and responsibilities as school board members.

The combination of changes in election laws in Illinois and ever-growing pressures on board members has led to many

newly elected board members. In the past, one or two members came onto the board during an election year. Cassel (1995, p.2) reported that during the 1993 election, 9 out of 10 Illinois boards of education gained at least one new member. More than one in three boards received three or more new members. Fourteen percent acquired a new majority of four or more new members. Thirty-eight boards (3.6%) turned over almost completely in two years, receiving five, six, or seven new members. With this large number of new members, some form of orientation or training session is necessary to obtain a smooth transition between the old and new board.

Area Education Agency 4 in Sioux Center, Iowa, provides board training programs to 18 school districts in its area. Hayden (1992, p. 19) explained that the reason for board training was obvious--school board members serve better when they have a chance to build on their knowledge and skills. Board training, if done effectively, gives board members a better understanding of what they should and should not do. The Area 4 Agency provides new board members with basic orientation to board service in five areas: (a) preventing and resolving conflicts, (b) hiring a superintendent, (c) strategic planning, (d) evaluating the superintendent, and (e) distinguishing between policy and administration (Hayden, 1992, p. 20).

There are numerous agencies or associations to consult regarding board training. State school boards associations

usually provide these programs or they can recommend other agencies to consult. Whether school boards turn to an outside provider or develop their own board orientation activities, professional training is every bit as important for board members as it is for teachers and administrators (Hayden, 1992, p. 20).

The length of time it takes for a newly elected member to become effective varies among individuals. Funk and Funk (1992, p. 16) determined from superintendents and board members that new board members need between 6 and 12 months on the job before they can function effectively. In a study conducted by New York School Board members, Egelston and Egelston (1995, p. 4) revealed that the novice members' first year is spent learning what is happening while the second year marks the onset of understanding.

In their work for the Michigan Association of School Boards, Funk and Funk, who are former school board members, recommended an ongoing board training process that uses the expertise of school board veterans. Funk and Funk (1992, p. 17) suggested a three-level process to board orientation. First, they recommended a workshop for all interested candidates before the filing deadline. This session is used to update potential members on roles and responsibilities of board members. The second level occurs after the election to inform new members about goals, objectives, functions and a brief history of the school system. The last level should take place after the first or second meeting to review what

happened and determine what additional information new board members feel they need.

Defining the leadership role of school boards in the twenty-first century was a project undertaken by the California School Boards Association. A comprehensive curriculum for training school boards was to be developed using a detailed description of school board functions. The first phase of the project focused on defining the different jobs of a board member. Campbell and Greene (1994, p. 393) identified seven tasks: (a) setting the vision for the district and creating a climate for excellence, (b) appointing and evaluating the superintendent, (c) adopting the budget and ensuring fiscal accountability, (d) developing curriculum standards and ensuring program accountability, (e) governing through policy, (f) collective bargaining, and (g) advocating for students.

During the second phase of the California School Boards Association project, emphasis was given to basic characteristics of the effective board member. Campbell and Greene (1994, p. 395) identified those characteristics as: (a) understanding of their duties, (b) understanding teamwork, (c) exhibiting support for district programs, (d) respecting the role of each school staff member, (e) establishing an environment of trust within the board, (f) communicating openly and honestly with everyone, (g) showing a high level of professionalism, and (h) operating with fairness. The project revealed that it was unfair to expect



board members to step onto the board without a clear definition of their roles and training to understand the key issues of the educational system.

#### Review of Research

Should training be mandatory for school board members? That was the question surveyed by the Joint Conference of the Illinois Association of School Boards, Illinois Association of School Administrators, and the Illinois Association of School Business Officials. The report, authored by Pierson and Hall (1992, p. 29), disclosed that more than 54% of the delegates to the Illinois Association of School Boards Delegate Assembly felt there was a need for training of school board members. In the same report Pierson and Hall (1992, p. 29) referred to a survey at the National School Boards Association which showed that 77% favored mandatory training for school board members.

The results of a study conducted by Smoley (1996, p.9) for the National Center for Nonprofit Boards examined the resources and training that local school boards need to operate effectively. The study revealed that boards have a variety of voluntary sources to draw from for training and development. Local assistance ranges from informal discussion groups to workshops conducted by district superintendents. State associations offer the main source of training, especially for newly elected board members, centering on building knowledge and skills. The National Association offers a comprehensive four-day conference

focusing on the process of board functions. Smoley (1996, p. 11) also indicated that training activities for board members are lacking and current training does not meet the needs of newly elected board members.

The Illinois Reform Act of 1985 created the Illinois Administrators' Academy to help develop leadership skills for principals and superintendents. Administrators are required to attend the academy under penalty of forfeiture of their certificates. In a report on a study of Illinois superintendents as to their views on mandatory training for school board members, Petronis, Hall, and Pierson (1996, p. 5) showed that 61.5% of all superintendents favored some form of mandatory training. Superintendents of districts of less than 500 students and those in districts of 1,001-2,000 students showed the greatest support for required training of school board members.

In-service training should provide board members with skills necessary to become effective leaders. Petronis et al. (1996) stated that board in-service should focus on the following goal:

The primary goal of school board in-service training should be to increase school board members' awareness and understanding of the correlation of effective schools and their ability to determine whether or not their school demonstrates the characteristics of an effective school. They should gain knowledge of the role, policy, and practice as it pertains to the

support of instructional leadership within their districts. The intended outcome should be that the local board of education members would be equipped with knowledge and techniques that will allow them to develop policies and practices within their districts to support the instructional leadership role of their school district administrators. (p. 6)

## Chapter 3

### Design of the Study

#### General Design

This study surveyed the state school boards associations to obtain and review training topics presented to school board members. The dependent variable was the content offerings of state school boards associations regarding school board member training. There were no independent variables because state school boards associations were not divided into subgroups.

The study was designed to provide data to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the topics offered by state school boards associations for school board member training?

2. What states have laws requiring individual school board members to participate in training programs, and what are those requirements?

3. What states have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members?

#### Sample and Population

The population consisted of all 50 state school board associations in the United States. The sample included 32 associations who either responded by sending requested materials or associations who provided information on the internet. The representativeness of the survey cannot be guaranteed because not all associations surveyed responded.

All 50 state associations were asked to participate in the survey.

#### Data Collection and Instrumentation

Fifty state school boards associations were contacted by letter (see Appendix A) requesting information pertaining to school board training. Material was also requested regarding any legal requirements for training. Only 19 states supplied requested information from the initial request. Thirteen state associations not responding with material were located on the internet to obtain the necessary information. Information pertaining to board training was downloaded to allow for inclusion in the study. A total of 18 states did not respond, nor did they have addresses for home pages on the internet.

#### Data Analysis

The results were tabulated manually into a table (see Appendix B) by the researcher. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data collected for each specific research question. The analysis of the data was presented through tallies that represented responses by frequency and percentage and were arranged into tables that were accompanied by narratives.

## Chapter 4

### Results of the Study

#### Overview

The analyzed data for the three research questions are presented separately. Data are presented in tables referenced to a particular research question. The letter n represents the number of responses and the symbol % represents the percentage of those associations that responded.

#### Results for Research Question 1

Research question 1 was: What are the topics offered by state school boards associations for school board member training? There were 32 state associations used to compile the data in Table 1. Those states were: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia and Wisconsin. The topics presented at workshops, conventions, or seminars conducted by state school board associations are presented in Table 1. School law (69%) was the most frequently presented training program, followed by school finance as reported by 66% of the respondents. Fifty-six percent of the respondents showed that roles and responsibilities was an important topic for board member training programs. The data also revealed that

Table 1

Topics Presented for School Board Member Training

Topics	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u> of total Respondents (32)
School Law	22	69%
Finance	21	66%
Roles and Responsibilities	18	56%
Public Relations	16	50%
Policy Development	14	44%
Superintendent Relations	13	41%
Collective Bargaining	12	38%
School Board Self-Evaluation	11	34%
Instruction and Curriculum	11	34%
School Board Goal Setting	11	34%
Conducting Meetings	10	31%
Ethics	6	19%
Officers Training	6	19%
Candidates	6	19%
Personnel	6	19%
Strategic Planning	5	16%
Conflict Resolution	4	13%

Note. Percentage represents the number of associations that present that topic. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

50% of the state school boards associations presented training programs that dealt with public relations with staff and the community. Forty-four percent of the associations offer training in policy development. Superintendent relations were presented by 41% of the reporting associations. Of the associations reporting, 38% offer programs related to collective bargaining. There were three topics that were reported by 34% of the associations: (a) school board self-evaluation, (b) instruction and curriculum, and (c) school board goal setting. Only 31% of the associations included conducting meetings as part of their training programs. There were six additional topics that received percentages of less than 20%: ethics, officers training, candidates, personnel, strategic planning, and conflict resolution.

#### Results of Research Question 2

Research question 2 was: What states have laws requiring individual school board members to participate in training programs, and what are those requirements? An analysis of information received from the state associations showed that there are 10 states that have laws requiring school board members to receive some form of training. Table 2 shows the states with their respective requirements. The ten states with school board member training requirements are: Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.



Table 2

States With Laws Requiring Training and Requirements

State	Requirements
Georgia	<p>New board members must receive an orientation within one year after assuming office.</p> <p>New board members must receive 12 hours of training, six hours must be in finance.</p> <p>All local board members must participate in at least one day of training annually.</p>
Kentucky	<p>All local school board members shall complete an established number of hours of in-service training annually based on the number of years of experience.</p> <p>Board members with less than three years of experience must receive 12 hours of training.</p> <p>Board members with four to seven years of experience must complete eight hours of training.</p> <p>Board members with eight or more</p> <p>(<u>table continues</u>)</p>

State	Requirements
Mississippi	<p data-bbox="784 359 1414 453">years of experience must complete four hours of training.</p> <p data-bbox="784 487 1451 774">The State Board of Education at least twice a year shall prepare and conduct courses of training for basic and continuing education for local school board members.</p> <p data-bbox="784 808 1414 968">The basic course, <u>School Board Training Course</u>, shall consist of at least 12 hours of training.</p> <p data-bbox="784 1002 1451 1161">The <u>Continuing Education Course for School Board Members</u>, shall consist of at least six hours of training.</p>
North Carolina	<p data-bbox="784 1200 1414 1359">All members of local boards of education shall receive a minimum of 12 hours of training annually.</p> <p data-bbox="784 1393 1430 1617">The training shall include but not be limited to: (a) school law, (b) school finance, and (c) duties and responsibilities.</p>
Oklahoma	<p data-bbox="784 1655 1451 1815">New School Board Members must complete 12 hours of instruction on educational issues including:</p> <p data-bbox="1133 1849 1451 1876">(table continues)</p>

State	Requirements
South Carolina	<p>(a) school finance, (b) Oklahoma education laws and ethics, and (c) duties and responsibilities. Board members must complete the training program within 15 months following election.</p> <p>Incumbent board members must complete six hours of training in the following areas:</p> <p>(a) school finance, (b) Oklahoma education laws and ethics, and (c) duties and responsibilities. Board members must complete the training program within 15 months following election.</p> <p>Board members must complete the <u>Continuing Education</u> program of 15 hours to be eligible for re-election.</p> <p>Board members can complete this program any time during the full term of office.</p> <p>Those members elected or appointed</p> <p>(<u>table continues</u>)</p>

State	Requirements
Tennessee	<p data-bbox="777 359 1446 644">to school boards after July 1, 1997, must complete an orientation session. This is the first mandated training for South Carolina board members.</p> <p data-bbox="777 683 1406 842">Board members have one year after taking office to complete the training.</p> <p data-bbox="777 878 1390 1164">Every member of a local board of education shall participate in seven hours of training provided by the School Board Training Academy.</p> <p data-bbox="777 1200 1390 1421">New school board members must complete one of the <u>Basic Core Modules</u> within the first year of service.</p> <p data-bbox="777 1457 1430 1617">Board members must complete the four <u>Basic Core Modules</u> within the first four years.</p> <p data-bbox="777 1653 1446 1813">The <u>Basic Core Modules</u> consist of:  (a) school board policy, (b) board and superintendent relations,</p> <p data-bbox="1127 1849 1446 1876">(table continues)</p>

State	Requirements
Texas	<p data-bbox="781 357 1390 453">board advocacy for children, and (d) vision for excellence.</p> <p data-bbox="781 489 1446 776">The <u>Elective Module</u> consists of four training sessions:(a) school law, (b) school finance, (c) school community relations, and (d) school improvement.</p> <p data-bbox="781 812 1446 1100">Each new board member must participate in a local district orientation session within 60 days before or after the board member's election or appointment.</p> <p data-bbox="781 1136 1446 1359">Before January 1, each sitting board member shall receive a three hour basic orientation to the <u>Texas Education Code</u>.</p> <p data-bbox="781 1395 1446 1683">The entire board shall annually participate with their district superintendent in a three hour team building session facilitated by the Education Service Center.</p> <p data-bbox="781 1719 1446 1815">In a board member's first year of service, he or she shall receive at</p> <p data-bbox="1130 1851 1446 1879">(table continues)</p>

State	Requirements
Virginia	<p>least 10 hours of continuing education in fulfillment of assessed needs.</p> <p>Following a board member's first year of service, he or she shall receive at least five hours of continuing education annually in fulfillment of assessed needs.</p> <p>The State Department of Education does not require a specific number of hours. The code states that local schools shall require its members to participate annually in in-service programs on: (a) issues with personnel, (b) curriculum, and (c) current issues in education.</p>
West Virginia	<p>School board members must possess a high school diploma or a general education development diploma.</p> <p>No board member may assume the duties of board member unless he or she first attends and completes a course of orientation relating to</p>

(table continues)

State	Requirements
	<p>boardsmanship and governance effectiveness.</p> <p>All members shall annually receive seven hours of training in areas relating to boardsmanship and governance effectiveness.</p>

Note. Underlined words are the names of training programs.

Table 2 revealed that 8 of the 10 associations require a specified number of hours of training ranging from a low of three hours to a maximum of 15 hours. South Carolina was the only state that did not require the entire board to participate in some form of training. An analysis of the requirements for the 10 states with training laws found that 4 of the 10 states have an established course of training for the board members.

Table 3 showed that the 10 states with required training laws offered 11 topics for board member participation. There were similar findings in Table 3 as compared to Table 1, with school law, school finance, and roles and responsibilities ranking as the top three topics in both tables.

### Results of Research Question 3

Research question 3 was: What states have training

Table 3

Topics Presented by States with Required Training Laws

Training Topic	<u>n</u>	% with required training laws (10)
School Finance	5	50%
School Law	4	40%
Roles and Responsibilities	2	20%
Community Relations	2	20%

Note. Topics being presented by more than one association were included in this table.

programs specifically designed for newly elected board members? Table 4 reveals that 18 states currently offer new board member training programs. Of those 18 states, nine state associations have voluntary programs and nine states require, by law, new members to participate in training programs.

Fourteen state associations did not mention new board member training as a topic being offered to their members. The evaluation of training requirements in research question 3 showed that Mississippi was the only state with requirement laws that did not offer a training session for new board members.



Table 4

States with New School Board Member Training Programs

Voluntary Training	Required Training
California	Georgia
Connecticut	Kentucky
Illinois	North Carolina
Iowa	Oklahoma
Maine	South Carolina
Maryland	Tennessee
Minnesota	Texas
Oregon	Virginia
Washington	West Virginia

## Chapter 5

### Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the training topics offered to newly elected and incumbent school board members by state school boards associations. Materials were evaluated to determine what states have laws requiring board training.

The research questions were:

1. What are the topics offered by state school boards associations for school board member training?
2. What states have laws requiring individual school board members to participate in training programs, and what are those requirements?
3. What states have training programs specifically designed for newly elected board members?

A letter was sent to all 50 state school boards associations requesting information on their training programs, as well as any legal requirements that existed for board member training. The researcher found that most state associations were reluctant to provide the necessary material. Only 19 states supplied requested information from the initial request. Thirteen states were then located on the internet to secure the necessary information. The researcher failed to obtain information from 18 state associations. The data were then formulated into tables to determine frequency and percentages for analysis.

Results for research question 1 indicated that all state school boards associations offer a board training program. Based on the data in Table 1 (see Table 1), there are 17 different topics addressed by state associations. School law was the most widely presented topic being offered by 69% of the respondents. The statistics also revealed that school board members in 66% of the state associations received training in school finance.

Results for research question 2 showed that only 10 of the 32 responding states felt that mandatory training of board members was necessary. Analysis of information revealed a wide range in the number of hours required to complete training. Each state also allowed a considerable amount of time for members to fulfill their training requirements.

Results for research question 3 revealed that 18 state associations (56%) have a training program specifically designed for newly elected board members. Nine of those states (28%) have laws requiring newly elected members to take part in training programs.

### Conclusions

It was concluded from research question 1 that state school boards associations consider board member training a key function of their organization. This conclusion was based on the fact that every association evaluated offered multiple topics for individual board member training. The results in Table 1 showed that there are 17 different topics

being presented for board training. With this many topics being presented, it was concluded that board training covers a very diverse amount of subject matter. It was also concluded from the results that an understanding of school law and finance, the most widely presented topics by state school boards associations, contributes to the overall training of board members.

It was concluded from research question 2 that state lawmakers do not consider board training to be a critical procedure in the field of education. Just 10 of the 32 responding states have laws requiring board members to participate in training programs. If gaining an understanding of how the school system works is important, we need more than a voluntary training program for board members.

It was concluded from research question 3 that state associations consider other training topics such as school law, school finance, and school board members' roles and responsibilities to be of greater or equal importance to that of training for new members. If new board member training had been included in Table 1, training for new board members would have tied for third with 56% of the associations presenting training to their members. With only 56% of associations offering new member workshops, the researcher also concluded that orientation to boardmanship must be the responsibility of the local school district.

### Recommendations

In the researchers' opinion, if the citizens of Illinois intend to have school board members that are capable of performing the duties expected of them, an ongoing training program must be incorporated. In order to achieve this goal, the state must make board member training mandatory.

The first recommendation is for the legislature of Illinois to enact a law requiring board members to participate in a structured program during their tenure in office. The law should require the creation of a School Board Member Training Academy, similar to the Illinois Administrators' Academy for superintendents and principals. The Academy should present a three-level training program to meet the following recommendations:

1. Newly elected school board members must participate in an eight hour training program to be completed within 60 days of being seated on the board.

2. During the first year of board service the member must complete eight hours of training in a Basic Core Program consisting of the following four topics: (a) school law, (b) school finances, (c) school board meeting procedures, and (d) school board members' roles and responsibilities.

3. During the final three years of the board members' term, they must participate in an eight hour Elective Program consisting of the following four topics: (a) public

relations, (b) superintendent-board relations, (c) collective bargaining, and (d) curriculum and instruction.

The researcher recommends that Illinois establish a second phase to the mandatory training program. The second phase would require that all school boards participate in a board evaluation program facilitated by a representative of the Illinois Association of School Boards. This evaluation must take place every two years. The process would allow boards to identify their strengths and weaknesses in terms of operations and procedure.

A follow-up study of board members that have participated in the School Board Member Training Academy should be surveyed at the end of their four-year term. The study would focus on members' perceptions as to the effectiveness of the academy, as well as recommended changes that need to be implemented into the training program.

## References

Campbell, D. W., & Greene, D. (1994). Defining the leadership role of the school boards in the 21<sup>s t</sup> century. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 391-395.

Cassel, J. J. (1995). New board/old board: Transition without trauma. Illinois School Board Journal, 63(5), 2-6.

Coogle, F. (1996). Community leadership for schools. (Available from the Kentucky School Boards Association, 260 Democrat Drive, Frankfort, KY 40601)

Egelston, D. L., & Egelston, R. L. (1995, October). How knowledgeable are New York state school board members about their role, responsibilities, and scope of authority? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, NY.

Funk, K. F., & Funk, R. S. (1992). Illuminate your board. The American School Board Journal, 179(6), 16-18.

Georgia School Boards Association. (1996). What school board members must know. (Available from the Georgia School Boards Association, 5120 Sugarloaf Parkway, Lawrenceville, GA 30243)

Hayden, J. G. (1992). Bright ideas for board training. The American School Board Journal, 179,(6), 19-20.

Illinois Association of School Boards. (1997). Historical comparisons: Member turnover on Illinois school boards at biennial elections. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.iasb.com/files/issues9.htm>

Mississippi School Boards Association. (1996). A report on the Mississippi school board training program. (Available from the Mississippi School Boards Association, P. O. Box 203, Clinton, MS 39060-0203)

North Carolina School Boards Association. (1998). Board development. [On-line]. Available:  
<http://www.ncsba.org/dev.html>

Oklahoma State School Boards Association. (1997). School board member training requirements. (Available from Oklahoma State School Boards Association, 2801 North Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4223)

Petronis, J., Hall, R. F., & Pierson, M. E. (1996). Mandatory school board training: An idea whose time has come (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 400 625)

Pierson, M. E. & Hall, R. F. (1992). Should training be mandatory for school board members? Illinois School Board Journal, 60(1), 29-30.

Smoley, E. R., Jr. (1996, September). School board development: Needs and opportunities. (Available from the National Center for Nonprofit Boards, Suite 510, 2000 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036-4907)

South Carolina School Boards Association. (1998). Member Services. [On-line]. Available:  
<http://www.scsba.org/2.ASP>

Tennessee Department of Education. (1996) School Board Academy Catalogue. (Available from the SBA/Tennessee Department of Education, C/O Tennessee School Boards



Association, 1130 Nelson Merry St., Nashville, TN 37203-2808)

Texas Association of School Boards. (1998). Continuing Education Law. [On-line]. Available:  
<http://www.tasb.org/AboutUs/law.html>

Virginia School Boards Association. (1998). Training and professional development. [On-line]. Available:  
<http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504?000+cod+22.1-253.13C5>

West Publishing Company. (1996). The school code of Illinois. (Available from the Illinois Association of School Boards, 430 East Vine Street, Springfield, IL 62703)

West Virginia School Board Association. (1997) School laws of West Virginia. (Available from the West Virginia School Boards Association, P. O. Box 1008, Charleston, WV 25324)

## Appendix A

## Materials Request Letter

David Jordan  
Rt. 4 Box 580  
Mt. Vernon, Il 62864

Dr. David L. Keller  
Kentucky School Board Association  
260 Democrat Drive  
Frankfort, KY 40601-9214

Dear Dr. Keller,

My name is David Jordan. I'm working on my Specialist Degree in Educational Administration at Eastern Illinois University in Charleston, Illinois. The subject of my field study is Identification of Training Needs for School Board Members. I would appreciate any materials that you can share with me pertaining to this subject, such as types of workshops offered to new members, subject areas covered in your workshops, possibly a copy of the manual used by your facilitator, or at least a copy of the Table of Contents. I'm willing to reimburse your office for any expense involved in delivering this material to me. I would appreciate receiving this information by the middle of March if feasible with your office staff.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 618-279-7211 through the day or 618-244-0837 in the evening. The Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration at Eastern Illinois University is Dr. Beverly Findley, and my Field Experience Supervisor is Dr. David Bartz. Both may be reached at 217-581-2919 if you have any concerns about my involvement in this project.

Thank you,

David Jordan

## Appendix B

## Frequency Table

Topic	Tally	New Member	State
Finance	IIII,IIII,IIII,IIII,I =21	IIII,IIII,IIII,III =18	CA
Policy Development	IIII,IIII,IIII = 14		CO
Roles & Responsibilities	IIII,IIII,IIII,III = 18		GA
Conducting Meetings	IIII,IIII, = 10		IA
Superintendents Relations	IIII,IIII,III = 13		IL
School Law	IIII,IIII,IIII,IIII,II = 22		KY
Self-Evaluation	IIII,IIII,I = 11		ME
Instruction & Curriculum	IIII,IIII,I = 11		MA
Public Relations	IIII,IIII,IIII,I = 16		MN
Collective Bargaining	IIII,IIII,II = 12		NC
Goal Setting/Vision	IIII,IIII,I = 11		OK
Ethics	IIII,I = 6		OR
President	IIII,I = 6		SC
Candidates	IIII,I = 6		TN
Personnel	IIII,I = 6		TX
Strategic Planning	IIII/ = 5		VA
Conflict Resolution	IIII = 4		WA
			WV

Required training topics	Tally	Required by	State
School Finance	IIII/=5	Law	
School Law	IIII=4	IIII,IIII/, =10	GA
Role and Responsibilities	II=2		KY
Policy	I=1		MS
Community Relations	II=2		NC
Advocacy	I=1		OK
Vision	I=1		SC
School Improvement	I=1		TN
Personnel	I=1		TX
Curriculum	I=1		VA
Current Issues	I=1		WV