

## Involving Students in Governance

November 2004

700 Broadway, Suite 1200 • Denver, CO 80203-3460 • 303.299.3600 • Fax 303.296.8332 • www.ecs.org

### Introduction

Although the vast majority of K-12 teaching in the United States takes place in classrooms, children learn from peers, their parents and other adults, and they learn in and out of school. Recognizing the value of experiential learning, high schools often place students in internships or provide job-shadowing opportunities in the community. Science teachers involve students in local environmental projects such as water or soil testing. Civics teachers encourage students to attend city council meetings to learn about local politics. And nearly every high school offers students opportunities to participate in vocational student organizations, student government, team sports and other extracurricular activities aimed at giving students opportunities to learn, and apply their learning, outside the classroom.

Most state and local school systems include language in their mission or vision statements about cultivating active, involved community members and future leaders. The extracurricular activities mentioned above can provide many opportunities for leadership training, with student government probably the most clearly aimed at fostering student leadership. And civics or government courses can certainly provide opportunities for students to learn – and in some cases observe directly – how politics and government work. Yet the widely held belief that a quality education should include real-world experiences rarely leads school systems to involve students in governance and policymaking. Students are rarely involved in decisions about school or district programming, state or district graduation requirements, faculty hiring, teacher licensing or even the

lunch menu – decisions that clearly affect them.

Many policymakers might argue that educational governance should be left to adults. But if the mission statements of many state and district boards of education are any indication, education is as much about fostering citizenship as it is about preparing students for college and the workplace. The skills of citizenship – including leadership and informed decisionmaking – must be learned. Involving students in governance is one way to provide opportunities for students to acquire and practice these skills. And while there are challenges for leaders to consider in bringing students into the decisionmaking process, there also are important benefits for the students, the community and the policymaking body itself.

This policy brief presents some of these benefits, with examples from across the country. Discussion also centers on the challenges of involving young people in governance and a set of questions for state and local policymakers to consider. The conclusion provides recommendations for those considering this strategy and the useful resources helps you locate additional information on this issue.

**The skills of citizenship – including leadership and informed decision-making – must be learned. Involving students in governance is one way to provide opportunities for students to acquire and practice these skills.**

### Why involve students in governance?

Most secondary schools offer students the opportunity to participate in some sort of student government. And where student government was once restricted mostly to a few popular students elected by their peers, many schools now offer the opportunity for any student to participate. This is sometimes done through a student government course, in which students learn leadership and decisionmaking skills.

Some principals and superintendents have created student advisory groups with which they meet regularly. These groups offer the administrator an opportunity to explain policies and decisions to students, to hear directly from students about their concerns and to seek their insights. Some school boards devote a portion of their meetings to reports from students. Most administrators and board members report these arrangements are generally positive for students and board members, and are helpful in making policy decisions.

Yet none of these models really involves students in school or district policymaking. While students may be able to offer advice to principals, superintendents and board members, it is ultimately the adults who make the decisions about the issues that really matter.

Decisionmakers at the school, district and state levels might respond that children and teens do not have the maturity or breadth of experience to fully comprehend school budgets, staffing, instruction, facilities and legal matters that must be addressed by education leaders, and that involving young people would only slow things down.

It is true that involving students in the process may initially require extra time for both adults and students to become comfortable. But with proper training and some patience by adult policymakers, students are often able to contribute a great deal. In some cases the dynamic within a policymaking body may be changed for the better by the presence of

**"For our nation's public schools to continue their vital role in our democracy, we need to develop our students' commitment to and understanding of that role.**

**These young citizens will eventually elect our replacements on school boards, as well as make critical decisions regarding the funding and purposes of public schools." (Morales and Pickeral 2004)**

students, since members may feel obliged to be less confrontational, to articulate their arguments about the issues more clearly and to come to agreement through honest deliberation.

Larry Davis, executive director of the Washington State Board of Education, says students offer adult board members an immediate understanding of how a particular decision will affect students. According to Bill Keys, school board president for the Madison Metropolitan School District in Wisconsin, this takes much of the guesswork out of policy-making, especially for those board members who may not have much experience working directly with students.

There are other potential benefits of student involvement in governance to various stakeholders (Mantooth n.d. (a) and Zeldin, et. al 2000).

#### **Benefits to student decisionmakers:**

- Development of leadership and public-speaking skills, dependability and responsibility
- Better understanding of public policy and democratic processes
- Exposure to diverse people, ideas and situations
- Availability of more resources, support and role models
- Increased self-esteem, sense of personal control and identity.

#### **Benefits to adult decisionmakers:**

- More confidence working with and relating to youth
- Better understanding of the needs and concerns of youth, and increased sensitivity to programming issues within the organization

- Increased energy and commitment to the organization
- Stronger sense of connectedness to the community.

#### **Benefits to organizations and their governing bodies:**

- Increased clarity and focus on organizational mission
- More connected and responsive to youth, resulting in better programming
- More inclusive and representative, leading to better programming
- More attractive to funders.

Adolescents often complain that adults do not take their concerns seriously. While this may be true in some cases, young people often make this assumption even when their preferred policy option is rejected for legitimate reasons. Giving student representatives a place at the table and a genuine role in decisionmaking – and developing a process to ensure they accurately represent the concerns of their constituents – may help convince skeptical students that their voices are being heard by policymakers even when they do not get exactly what they want.

Another group that benefits from student involvement is the community as a whole. Young people who participate in governance learn leadership skills, develop habits of civic participation and become fluent in policymaking. Through experiences such as these, they are poised to become the next leaders in their communities. And even students who do not serve in leadership positions may become less cynical about politics if their very first experiences with representative democracy are positive.

Finally, involving students in policymaking may be one way to both ensure the long-term success of educational systems and preserve the legacy of current members. Students who participate in governance while attending school under the policies they help create and support can provide an important perspective on the efficacy of those policies and can help ensure more effective policies in the future. In addition, these students may be more likely to run for the school board when they become eligible to do so. What they learn from education leaders and policymakers with whom they work now will inform their decisions as future policymakers.

## **What do we mean by student involvement?**

**W**hile little research exists on student involvement in school governance, there is significant literature on youth involvement in the governance of other types of organizations – typically those that serve youth. While community-based youth service providers are not subject to the same level of government oversight as public education, they can offer important lessons to schools, districts and states considering how best to involve students in decisionmaking.

Because they constantly struggle for funds to hire and retain staff, small youth service agencies often must rely on young people to help maintain the day-to-day operation of their programs. Because they see the development of leadership skills as an important component of youth development, these providers routinely create opportunities for youth leadership within the programs they offer and involve young people in programming decisions. In addition, foundations and other funders of youth programs have begun to require that

applicants demonstrate youth involvement in the development of funding proposals, and in overseeing and implementing the programs supported by whatever funding is awarded.

From youth involvement in operations, program design and fundraising, it is a short step to involving young people in planning and governance. The youth development field, as a result, has a history of involving students in decisionmaking that may be instructive. The quality of youth participation, however, varies. In some cases, young people are full partners with adults, offering ideas, discussing issues and working side by side with their adult colleagues. In others, youth act primarily as “window dressing” to make the organization more attractive to funders. Most models of youth engagement, however, fall somewhere between these two extremes. Figure 1 shows a typology representing one view of youth-adult partnerships in governance, with models deemed least inclusive and supportive of youth leadership at the bottom, and the best, most equitable models at the top.

While state law will determine the extent to which a district or state may involve students in actual policymaking, most of the differences in the levels of student involvement described in Figure 1 have to do with the comfort level of the adults involved. The quality of student participation depends, to a great extent, on the support given to the students by the adults, and the extent to which the students feel their contributions are valued by those adults. When young people are given opportunities to participate, they can surprise us with

their maturity, acuity and wisdom. Yet like any of us, they also need the support and affirmation of mentors and role models.

### Figure 1: Ladder of Youth Participation

- **Youth-adult shared decisions:** Youth and adults offer and accept each other’s ideas, and young people’s input on decisions is as valued as that of the adults.
- **Adult-initiated, shared decisions with youth:** Projects or programs are initiated by adults but decisionmaking is shared with youth.
- **Consulted and informed:** Youth give advice, but decisions are made by adults. Youth are informed about how their input will be used and the outcomes of the decisions made by adults.
- **Assigned but informed:** Youth are assigned specific roles and informed about how and why they are being involved.
- **Tokenism:** Young people appear to have a voice, but in fact they have little choice about their roles and responsibilities.
- **Decoration:** Youth are given symbolic but ultimately meaningless roles to make the organizations look good.
- **Manipulation:** Adults use youth to support causes and pretend the causes are inspired by youth.

(Adapted from Hart 1992)

## Student involvement in district governance

One arena in which students are rarely involved in a substantive way – and one that affects them most directly – is school and district governance. On the one hand, it is not surprising that students are not more involved in decisions about such mundane topics as budgets, insurance and facilities. For example, college student Shreya Mehta, a 2004 graduate of Irvington High School in Fremont, California, worked on several political campaigns, interned with a state assemblyman during high school and plans to major in political science in college. Yet Shreya describes the only school board meeting she ever attended as “pretty boring.”

But not all students share Shreya’s sentiments. Danielle Kimble, another member of the class of 2004 from Charlevoix, Michigan, attended many school board and township board meetings during high school. Danielle participated in a signature drive to keep Wal-Mart out of her small town and worked with fellow students to get the state Legislature to adopt a law restricting the number of passengers that may ride with a driver holding only a learner’s permit. Danielle says, “Local government intrigues me . . . immensely! They make decisions constantly that affect my life.

Another reason school boards do not involve students more often in decisionmaking is that under state law they are usually ineligible for public office. Yet many districts have found ways to include youth voices. The policy of the board of the Teton County School District #1 in Jackson, Wyoming, for example, states that student board members “shall not have

an official vote in Board matters, but shall be entitled to an unofficial vote recorded in the minutes.” The board of the Cumberland County School System, in Crossville, Tennessee, includes student members in the official roll call, invites students to participate in all discussions and gives student members an “honorary vote” that is not counted in the official tally.

Under Maryland state law, county boards of education may allow students to vote on some matters. In Baltimore County, for example, the student board member may vote on all matters except those relating to suspension or dismissal of teachers, principals and other professional personnel; collective bargaining; capital and operating budgets; school closings, reopenings and boundaries; and special education placement appeals.

A number of other states and territories explicitly provide for student membership in local school boards through state law (though none requires it), including Montana, Nebraska, New York, Puerto Rico, Utah and Virginia.

As described above, some districts seek student input through less direct means than seating students at the table with the school board such as student reports to the board and advisory groups to the superintendent. Some districts include students on curriculum committees, site-based management teams and even hiring committees. John Day, a veteran teacher at Greely High School in Cumberland, Maine, was a member of a hiring committee that included students. “I

remember sitting there, looking at a 9th grader, thinking that 'You have the same vote for staff that I have.' That's amazing."

Since most boards do not allow students to vote, many adult school board members believe the importance of students' participation lies in their contributions to board deliberations. Kim Goossens, a board member for the Garfield Re-2 School District in Rifle, Colorado, believes students' presence at her

board's meetings helps keep conversations on track and more respectful. "We try to have the kind of meetings we're expected to be having, and should be having." Goossens and the other board members and staff interviewed for this paper agreed the most important consequence of student involvement is that it helps boards stay focused on the students they serve.

## Student involvement in state policymaking

**T**hough there are clearly many more opportunities for student involvement in decisionmaking at the school district and building level, a few states have established formal mechanisms for soliciting student voice on educational issues. A number of states provide for student representation on their respective state boards of education, and some have developed other strategies to secure student input on education and other areas in which young people have a stake.

Alaska, California, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Maryland, New Jersey, Tennessee and Washington all maintain student positions on their state boards of education. A typical example is Washington, where the state board has maintained nonvoting student positions for 27 years, according to executive director Larry Davis. There are two student positions on the board, and student board members are selected by the all-student board of directors of the Washington Association of Student Councils. Once selected, a student board member begins a two-year term in his or her junior year. The terms of the student board members are staggered, with the senior student serving as a mentor to the junior member. Davis is enthusiastic in his support for student involvement saying, "They're a constant reminder of why we're in this business."

The board of the District of Columbia Public Schools includes two student members, elected by the citywide Student Advisory Council and confirmed by the board. As members of any board committee, student members "have the right to vote, to make a quorum, and to participate as fully as any other member of the committee" (5 DC ADC s 116). Student votes during meetings of "the committee of the whole," however, are counted only for purposes of establishing a voting record and do not become part of the official vote.

Maryland's state board includes one student member, but in this case the governor selects one of two students nominated by the Maryland Association of Student Councils. The student board member is allowed to participate in executive sessions, but may not vote on dismissal or disciplinary action involving personnel, on budgets or on appeals under certain sections of the state education code.

Some states include students in state policymaking in other ways. Oregon's Youth Advisory Team, described above, is one example. A quick search of state codes provides three other examples of bodies that require student members, though there are probably many others: the California Child Nutrition Advisory Council, the New Hampshire Health Education Review Committee and the New Jersey

Commission on Environmental Education. Not coincidentally, the work of these entities concerns education and children's issues.

### Oregon State Superintendent's Youth Advisory Team

Oregon's State Board of Education does not have a student member. Yet Oregon offers a wonderful example of the seriousness with which students are willing to approach important governance issues when given the opportunity, and the high-quality work they are capable of producing. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Susan Castillo has established a Youth Advisory Team (YAT), with which she and her staff meet four times per school year. The YAT is made up of 20-25 students, 8th grade through college freshmen.

Prior to YAT meetings, members are sent relevant information and readings on the issues to be considered. At the meetings, YAT members hear from expert guests and are asked to make recommendations. In the past two years, the YAT has addressed issues such as high school reform and Oregon's Certificate of Advanced Mastery, changes in graduation requirements to better prepare students for college and work, and school safety. YAT has made recommendations on all these topics to the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), and the department publishes reports on the YAT meetings and recommendations, as well as the steps the department is taking to follow up on YAT recommendations.

In February 2004, for example, YAT considered the issue of school and district consolidation. The group heard from the administrator for the Oregon House Education Committee, the administrator for the State Board of Education and other ODE staff. Students learned about district mergers in Oregon and Arkansas, and about the effects on school districts of a property tax bill passed in the early 1990s and Oregon's 21st-Century Schools Act. The YAT recommended the development of a set of questions to be considered in making a consolidation decision (such as whether current course offerings are limited by the district's size, and the distance students would have to travel in a consolidated district). The students also suggested that students' current academic achievement be considered. According to the YAT report on this meeting, the state superintendent asked that the Legislature, the governor's office and the State Board of Higher Education consider the YAT recommendations, and the Senate Education Committee did indeed consider the issue and the YAT recommendations.

For more information on YAT, see [www.ode.state.or.us/superintendent/yat](http://www.ode.state.or.us/superintendent/yat).

## Discussion

In a few states, student board members are allowed to vote on certain matters. In most, however, students' status as minors means that boards and other policymaking bodies have had to find other ways to elicit student voices on important policy issues and decisions. A few have settled on some form of unofficial vote, while for others students' most important contribution comes during board deliberations. In some cases, board policy limits students' ability to influence the board's deliberations. For example, board policy for the Gibbon-Fairfax-Winthrop Schools, in Minnesota, states that student board members do "not have the right to vote or make or second a motion." Other districts seek to actively encourage student participation. The board bylaws of the Davenport Community Schools, in Iowa, give student members "the privilege of submitting items for discussion on the board agenda except those items relating to personnel."

One issue boards need to consider, then, is their real purpose for involving students in governance, and whether their policies actually accomplish that purpose. An approach in which students come to meetings but are not allowed to initiate discussion on the issues that are important to them (or those they represent) falls near the bottom of the Ladder of Youth Participation in Figure 1. Such an approach is not likely to engage students fully. If a board genuinely seeks to design policy that is responsive to students' needs, it must create a process that encourages student input.

Another issue to consider is that of board diversity and representativeness. The students who are appointed or elected to school boards are likely to be the most motivated, high-achieving members of the student body. In a few places, attempts have been made to reach beyond the typical student leaders and involve a more diverse set of students in decisionmaking. Tennessee state law, for example, requires that if a school board includes student members, it must include four students, two of whom are enrolled in the college track and two in the technology track. The Davenport school board includes a student member from each of the district's three high schools and a special education student position, which rotates among the high schools.

One related finding, though anecdotal, is that for many of the state and district boards examined here student representatives are the only nonwhite members. Because the population of U.S. schools is becoming increasingly diverse, it is important that boards reflect this diversity. Students of any background must believe that leadership opportunities are open to them both now and when they are adults. Thus processes for student involvement that are fair and equitable can serve as strategies for making boards and other governing bodies more representative, and for cultivating leaders from minority communities.

Like any other innovation, student involvement in governance is more likely to be sustained if there is a policy in place to support it. But the specifics of the policy are critical. The policy of the Garfield Re-2 School District, for example, describes

the rationale and goals for student participation in the district's board of education, the duties of the student representative, length of terms and voting restrictions, and the Student Ambassador program. But the policy does not spell out how the district will support the student representative. As a result, Kim Goossens, the board member responsible for getting the policy adopted, spends a significant amount of her own time providing support for student board members and the Student Ambassador Program. Goossens enjoys working with the students, but when she was ill recently, she says the program "stumbled." She has asked other board members for help, but worries the program is not sustainable.

### Selection or Election of Student Representatives?

Policies designed to include representatives from certain student subgroups (e.g., special education, vocational track) do not necessarily mean student decisionmakers truly represent their constituents' interests. In some cases students are elected, and so are, theoretically, answerable to the students they represent. In Madison, Wisconsin, for example, the student representative to the board is one component of a two-part system designed to represent students' interests to the board. Any Madison high school student may run for a regular or alternate position on the board. A candidate forum is held for all students, and the candidates tour all the district's high schools, giving speeches and answering students' questions prior to a districtwide election.

The second part of Madison's system is the Madison Student Senate (MSS), which operates as a medium for communication between students and the school board. Members of the MSS include eight representatives from each high school, the student board member and alternate, and the losing candidates from the final election for the board. MSS members report to their respective student councils and fellow students. The alternate student board member is the MSS chair. Student groups may present information or concerns to the MSS, and the student board member may share these concerns with the school board as appropriate.

The student representative to the Madison school board receives one pass/fail credit for participation, with the school board determining whether to pass or fail the student. The student representative to the board may be impeached by a two-thirds vote of both the MSS and the school board.

In other cases, student representatives are not directly elected, but students are involved in the selection process. In Maryland, for example, student applicants for the state board of education are interviewed by officers of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MASC), the current student member of the board and an adviser. Five candidates are selected to address about 800 students at the MASC Legislative Session and answer questions. Students attending the session cast ballots and select two finalists, and the governor selects one of the finalists to serve on the board.

By contrast, staff for the Washington State Board of Education provide support to student board members, briefing them prior to meetings and answering questions afterward if necessary. Larry Davis, executive director of the board, schedules a home visit each year with the new student member and his or her parents, and encourages student members to ask questions whenever they need help. In addition, the board's strategy of having an older, second-year student member mentor the first-year student member reduces the burden on staff and adult board members while also providing an opportunity for the elder student to be an "expert." The result, says Davis, is that while first-year student members do not contribute a great deal to board deliberations, by the second year they are very involved and contribute a great deal.

The student board member policy of the Teton County School District in Wyoming spells out a similar mentoring system. Student board members also are required to meet with the superintendent on a regular basis to discuss school board agenda items and matters to be discussed with the Student Impact Committee, which is comprised of students from the district's middle and high schools. Finally, new student board members must participate in board orientation and training throughout their first month on the board. By including these provisions in district policy, the board ensures student members will continue to be supported without placing a burden on a single board member.

## Questions for policymakers

**B**efore deciding to involve students in governance, boards and other governing bodies must assess their priorities and clarify their mission. For a variety of reasons, schools are focused more than ever before on improving the academic achievement of all students, especially in the areas of literacy, math and science. For many districts and states, the pressure to demonstrate constant improvement in these areas is intense. As such, many boards may find it difficult to justify what they perceive as the added responsibility of cultivating young leaders.

Most policymakers and education leaders would probably agree that one of the essential functions of public education in the United States is the preparation of citizens who understand and exercise their rights and responsibilities, and who are capable of participating in their own governance. Involving students in educational governance can be an effective way to serve this function. But policymakers must determine whether they have the commitment and capacity to involve students in a meaningful and productive way. A poorly designed program that does not effectively engage student representatives, or causes them to feel their contributions are not taken seriously (such as the approaches described at the lower end of the Ladder of Youth Participation in Figure 1), may actually increase student cynicism.

For those education leaders seeking to contribute to the civic mission of education by providing opportunities for students to participate in decisions about their own education, the following questions should be considered.

1. Does the state or district mission include the preparation of democratic citizens? Do policymakers believe it is their role to support this mission?
2. Are policymakers willing to adjust their culture and procedures to make youth feel welcome and supported? Are they willing to discuss student input on the merits, even when it conflicts with their own views?
3. What are the legal restrictions on student involvement in policymaking? If students may not vote, are there other ways policymakers can include student voices in decisionmaking?
4. Is creating student positions on the board of education the best approach? Would another model involving more students, such as an advisory group, provide students as valuable an experience in genuine decisionmaking?
5. What kind of training will student decisionmakers need to serve effectively? What kind of training will adult decisionmakers need to support student decisionmakers and get the most out of student involvement?
6. Will meetings be scheduled at times and locations that will allow student representatives to participate?
7. Does the policy provide students with the support they need to be successful (such as training, staff support, mentor(s) and formal and informal opportunities to ask questions and communicate with their adult colleagues)?
8. Does the policy ensure student representatives accurately reflect the interests and concerns of the student body, and effectively communicate policymakers' decisions to the student body?

## Conclusion

**A**ll board members and staff interviewed for this paper were positive about their experiences involving students in decisionmaking. When asked specifically whether student involvement changed the dynamics of board meetings and deliberation, these education leaders responded that students' presence, in fact, improved board meetings by giving members a clearer understanding of the effects of their policy decisions on students, by helping focus the conversation and by reminding board members to behave in a respectful way.

Including students in governance provides opportunities to learn many of the essential skills of citizenship such as researching an issue, asking probing questions, developing and defending a position, negotiating, discussing and debating. Through participation in educational governance, students learn that public policy is made by the public, and that as citizens – even after they leave school – they have the skills, the knowledge and the right to participate in developing the policies that govern their lives.

Because of their history of involving youth in leadership and decisionmaking, professionals in the youth development field can serve as important partners for educators and policymakers in designing and supporting student leadership opportunities. Strong partnerships between education policymakers, teachers and community-based youth service providers can ensure programs designed to involve students in educational governance are well designed, are linked to classroom-based civics instruction, and students receive ongoing support and opportunities for reflection on the leadership lessons they learn.

While further study is needed to fully understand the effects on policy of different levels of student participation in policymaking, existing research on youth participation in the governance of youth-serving agencies indicates that greater involvement is better for youth, for the governing body and for the organization. Those already engaging students in decisionmaking appear to support this finding. Thus, if one of the goals of public education in a democracy is to prepare citizens to participate in their own governance, it seems logical that classroom-based civic education should be augmented with opportunities for young citizens to develop the competencies and practice the skills needed for effective participation.

## Resources

### Publications

Bernard, H. (n.d.). *The Power of an Untapped Resource: Exploring Youth Representation on Your Board or Committee*. Juneau, AK: Association of Alaska School Boards. [www.aasb.org/publications/untapped\\_resource.pdf](http://www.aasb.org/publications/untapped_resource.pdf).

Fletcher, A. (n.d.). *Total Infusion: District Scores 100% on Student Involvement in Decision-Making*. [www.soundout.org/features/annearundel.html](http://www.soundout.org/features/annearundel.html).

Hart, R.A. (1992). *Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

Jacobson, L. (2004). "Students Bring Youthful Perspective to State Ed. Boards." *Education Week*, January 21, 2004. [www.edweek.org/ew/story.cfm?slug=19Politics.h23&](http://www.edweek.org/ew/story.cfm?slug=19Politics.h23&)

Kersten, B. (2004). "Responsible Party." *Teacher Magazine* 15(4): 18-22. [www.teachermagazine.org/tmstory.cfm?slug=04Party.h15](http://www.teachermagazine.org/tmstory.cfm?slug=04Party.h15).

MacGregor, M. (2001). "Engaging Emerging Leaders: Working with Young and Nontraditional Student Leaders." *Leadership for Student Activities*. [www.nasc.us/leadershipmag/1203\\_emerging\\_leaders.cfm](http://www.nasc.us/leadershipmag/1203_emerging_leaders.cfm).

Mantooth, L.J. (n.d.). (a) *Youth in Governance: A Guide for Involving Youth as Decision Makers on Boards and Committees* and (b) *Youth in Governance: How To Be a Decision Maker in Your Community*. Agricultural Extension Service, The University of Tennessee. [www.utextension.utk.edu/4H/ythgov/resources.htm](http://www.utextension.utk.edu/4H/ythgov/resources.htm).

Marques, E.C. (1999). *Youth Involvement in Policy-Making: Lessons from Ontario School Boards*. Ottawa, ON (Canada): Institute on Governance. [www.iog.ca/publications/policybrief5.pdf](http://www.iog.ca/publications/policybrief5.pdf).

Morales, J. and T. Pickeral (2004). "Guest Viewpoint: Citizenship Education Should Be a Critical Focus of Public Schools." *School Board News*, August 3, 2004. [www.nsba.org/site/doc\\_sbn\\_issue.asp?TRACKID=&VID=55&CID=682&DID=34237](http://www.nsba.org/site/doc_sbn_issue.asp?TRACKID=&VID=55&CID=682&DID=34237).

Project 540 (2004). *Students Turning into Citizens: Lessons Learned from Project 540*. Providence, RI: Providence College.

Young, K.S. and J. Sazama (1999). *14 Points: Successfully Involving Youth in Decision Making*. Somerville, MA: Youth on Board. [www.youthonboard.org/publications.htm](http://www.youthonboard.org/publications.htm).

Zeldin, S., A.K. McDaniel, D. Topitzes and M. Calvert (2000). *Youth in Decision-Making: A Study on the Impacts of Youth on Adults and Organizations*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Extension. [www.atthetable.org/images/Details/03130216081398\\_YouthinDecisionMakingReportRevised9-01.pdf](http://www.atthetable.org/images/Details/03130216081398_YouthinDecisionMakingReportRevised9-01.pdf).

### Organizations

At The Table, [www.atthetable.org](http://www.atthetable.org).

The Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, [www.theinnovationcenter.org](http://www.theinnovationcenter.org).

Youth on Board, [www.youthonboard.org](http://www.youthonboard.org).

### Sample District Policies

Culver City Unified School District, Culver City, CA. Board Bylaw 9150, *Student Board Members*, [www.ccusd.k12.ca.us/Board/Policies/9000/9150bb.htm](http://www.ccusd.k12.ca.us/Board/Policies/9000/9150bb.htm).

Davenport Community Schools, Davenport, IA. Board Policy 901.6, *Student Board of Directors*, [www.davenport.k12.ia.us/schoolboard/bpolicy/901.asp#901.6](http://www.davenport.k12.ia.us/schoolboard/bpolicy/901.asp#901.6).

Gibbon-Fairfax-Winthrop Schools, Winthrop, MN. Policy 2.18, *Student Representative on the School Board*, [www.gfw.k12.mn.us/board/GFW%20Policy%20Handbook.pdf](http://www.gfw.k12.mn.us/board/GFW%20Policy%20Handbook.pdf)

Madison Metropolitan School District, Madison, WI. Board of Education Policy 4501, *Student Representation on School Board*, [www.madison.k12.wi.us/policies/4501.htm](http://www.madison.k12.wi.us/policies/4501.htm). Overview: [www.madison.k12.wi.us/topics/senate/](http://www.madison.k12.wi.us/topics/senate/).

Milwaukee Public Schools, Milwaukee, WI. Administrative Policy 8.18, *Student Involvement in Decision Making*, [www2.milwaukee.k12.wi.us/governance/rulespol/policies/PDF/CH08/8\\_18.pdf](http://www2.milwaukee.k12.wi.us/governance/rulespol/policies/PDF/CH08/8_18.pdf).

Prince George's County Public Schools, Upper Marlboro, MD. Board Bylaw 9271, *Individual Members: Student Board Member*, [www.pgcps.org/~board/policy/9000bylawsofthe\\_/bylaw9271studen/office2k/office2k.htm](http://www.pgcps.org/~board/policy/9000bylawsofthe_/bylaw9271studen/office2k/office2k.htm).

Teton County School District #1, Jackson, WY. *Student School Board Member Job Description*, [www.tcsd.org/Board/Student\\_Board\\_Info/Student\\_BOE\\_Job\\_Description.pdf](http://www.tcsd.org/Board/Student_Board_Info/Student_BOE_Job_Description.pdf).

### Sample State Policies

California Education Code 33000.5: *Appointment of student members to State Board of Education*; and 35012: *Board members; number, election and terms; pupil members*.

California Government Code 3540-3549.3: *Meeting and Negotiating in Public Educational Employment*.

Code of District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Title 5, Chapter 1, § 116: *Student Member of the Board*.

Consolidated Laws of New York (Education Law), Chapter 16, Title II, Article 35, § 1702: *Board of education; election; terms of office*.

Tennessee Code, Title 49, Chapter 2, Part 2, § 202: *Boards of Education – Members and Meetings*.

---

*Jeffery J. Miller is a Denver-based educational consultant and writer, and a former policy analyst with the Education Commission of the States – National Center for Learning and Citizenship. He can be reached at 303.377.0509 or [JefferyJMiller@yahoo.com](mailto:JefferyJMiller@yahoo.com).*



### The Education Commission of the States (ECS) National Center for Learning and Citizenship (NCLC)

The ECS National Center for Learning and Citizenship (NCLC) assists state and district policymakers and educators developing policies that support K-12 school-based service-learning opportunities. These educational experiences help students acquire the skills, values, knowledge and practice necessary to be effective citizens. The NCLC identifies and analyzes policies and practices that support effective citizenship education, creates and disseminates publications for education stakeholders, and convenes meetings to develop a collective voice for citizenship education and civic mission of schools. NCLC also encourages policy support and system structures to integrate service-learning into schools and communities. For more information, contact Terry Pickeral, NCLC executive director, 303.299.3636 or visit [www.ecs.org/nclc](http://www.ecs.org/nclc).



© 2004 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). All rights reserved. The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit, nationwide organization that helps state leaders shape education policy. Copies of this policy brief are available for \$5 plus postage and handling from the Education Commission of the States Distribution Center, 700 Broadway, Suite 1200, Denver, CO 80203-3460; 303.299.3692. Ask for No. SL-04-05.

ECS encourages its readers to share our information with others. To request permission to reprint or excerpt some of our material, please contact the ECS Communications Department at 303.299.3628 or e-mail [ecs@ecs.org](mailto:ecs@ecs.org).

### ***Helping State Leaders Shape Education Policy***

Education Commission of the States  
700 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80203-3460

Nonprofit Org. U.S. POSTAGE PAID Denver, Colorado Permit No. 153
--