THE PROBLEM: LOW-ACHIEVING DISTRICTS AND LOW-PERFORMING BOARDS

DAVID E. LEE
University of Southern Mississippi
DANIEL W. EADENS
Northern Arizona University

Effective school districts maintain superintendent and school board collegiality which can foster success and connectedness among members. Delagardelle and Alsbury (2008) found that superintendents and board members are not consistent in their perceptions about the work the board does, and Glass (2007) found that states do not require boards to undergo evaluation for effectiveness. In the current study, 115 board meetings were observed using the School Board Video Project (SBVP) survey, which was created in 2012 by researchers to uncover school board meetings' effectiveness. MANOVA, Univariate ANOVA, and Pearson Chi-Square test results revealed significant differences between low-, medium-, and high-performing districts' school board meetings. Evidence indicated that low-performing districts' board meetings were: less orderly; had less time spent on student achievement; lacked respectful and attentive engagement across speakers; had board meeting members who seemed to advance their own agenda; had less effective working relationships among the governance team; had fewer board members who relied on the superintendent for advice and input; had one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking excessive time during meetings; and did not focus on policy items as much as high- and medium-performing school districts. The research concluded that more school board members from low-performing districts needed training to improve their effectiveness. Furthermore, highly refined and target-enhanced school board training programs might lead to lasting governance success and more effective teaming that could improve district, and ultimately, student achievement.

Background

In his study, Hess (2002) found that the mean length of board service was 6.7 years. Often, the constant turnover damages local school systems' likelihood to progress academically and professionally. For a school district to be most successful, superintendents must work intimately with their school boards. According to Hess (2002):

> The three most critical factors in evaluating superintendent performance are the board-superintendent relationship, the morale of school system employees, and the safety of district students. The emphasis placed on the board-superintendent relationship reflects the importance of a well-functioning leadership team to effective governance and administration. (p. 4)

However, current school board literature decries a growing disconnect between superintendents and school boards, with a direct correlation between high-quality school board behavior and school board success. School boards consist of both appointed and elected local community members who only receive small amounts of professional training with the expectation of professional governance for the school district. Furthermore, boards typically encounter little to no accountability for this academic achievement.

School boards have been virtually overlooked from recent sweeping accountability movements such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Expectations of school districts, individual schools, teachers, and administrators are high these days. However, those who potentially most affect the quality of a school system in regard to policy seem almost ignored. Unfortunately, sometimes school boards actually hinder progress and become barriers, thus preventing meaningful school change in a district. This could relate to board members' political and personal agendas or because collectively, as a governance team, members are ineffective at knowing and selecting the high-quality decisions or actions. The research herein reveals and uncovers key information that shows that the vast majority of school boards in low-performing school systems spend little time on instructional issues or plans for relevant academic district improvement.

Training Issues

Administrators, faculty, and staff are required to participate in numerous hours or days of annual professional development to maintain and hone their skills and keep abreast of changes that enable them to provide outstanding service to students. Likewise, nearly every state requires school board members to obtain limited training. However, this training typically deals with issues surrounding school law and school finance. Often neglected are the real keys to effective school board training that would actually empower boards to facilitate their districts toward achieving significant and measurable academic growth. Board members rarely play a large role in ensuring that high-quality instruction actually occurs throughout a district, hence not leading to continuous student learning. Additionally, school boards often approve spending and resource allocation. Unfortunately, many times, these resources are not distributed or allocated wisely enough to effectively enhance student learning, growth, or academic development.

Reform

During recent decades, major education reform efforts such as Goals 2000, No Child Left Behind, and the Common Core State Standards have made their way through national, state, and local school governments. Accountability policies have been specific and focused on most internal constituencies in schools; however, they appear to have overlooked a key group—school boards. Many assert that greater accountability for school boards is warranted. A 2007 conference of researchers and policymakers examined contemporary issues that confront school boards along with literature that addresses boards' performance. One of the conclusions regarding the nation's nearly 15,000 school boards is that research about their work and effectiveness is significantly limited (Viadero, 2007). Today, few disagree that the job of school boards is being redefined by current changes taking place at the national, state, and local levels.

The widely publicized difficulties of the Clayton County, Georgia, school board in early 2008 provide graphic illustrations of negative board behavior; problems included accusations of staff mistreatment, micromanagement of district administrative affairs, and violations of state ethics laws (Stover, 2009). The negative behavior of some school boards is credited with creating high turnover among superintendents and other administrators. It is further credited with producing skepticism about elected bodies that have historically been considered cornerstones of local democracy. Controversies like the ones in Clayton County have "raised fundamental questions about the role of local governance" (Stover, 2009, p. 18).

The perceived ineffectiveness of boards of education has prompted some policymakers to take steps to constrain the local boards' jurisdiction. Concerted lobbying by boards and their association can halt initiatives. Mayoral takeovers of schools in a number of urban centers have dramatically reduced local boards' jurisdiction in these districts. The public's support for such takeovers increased significantly between 2006 and 2007, with 39 percent of Americans indicating that they would support such governance changes in communities with large percentages of struggling students (Rose & Gallup, 2007). What is missing from the literature on school boards is research that captures, in a systematic and comprehensive manner, the opinions of the public concerning school board performance. Although abundant anecdotal and editorial accounts detail the nature and sources of the public's angst toward school boards in specific communities where controversies have occurred, empirical research-based studies are limited.

More systematic examination of board member perspectives on their own performance is limited.

French, Peevely, and Stanley (2008) found that board members believed that their school boards are effective governing entities. Several studies profile disagreement between board and constituent perspectives on board performance. Delagardelle and Alsbury (2008) found that superintendents and board members are not consistent in their perceptions about the work done by the board; members believed that they spent more time on their responsibilities than superintendents believed that they spent. Although approximately two-thirds of superintendents, state association directors, and chief state school officers believe that the contemporary school board governance model needs reforming, 74 percent of board chairpersons saw no problem with the existing model (Glass, 2001). Another study found that superintendents had lower expectations for their boards dealing with their responsibilities than did the members of the board (Delagardelle & Maxson, 2004). Glass (2007) found that a majority of superintendents believe that the performances of the boards on which they serve need significant improvement.

Self-Evaluation

Some of the reasons for this dissonance in beliefs about board performance may arise from the many boards' failure to actually examine their work through consistent, well-designed self-evaluation processes. Hess (2002) found that roughly half of school boards reported that they evaluate themselves annually and that about 20 percent never evaluate their own work. A more recent study by Glass (2007) found that states do not require boards to undergo evaluation for effectiveness. Only 24 percent of superintendents reported that their boards engaged in formal self-evaluation, and about two-thirds of superintendents indicated that the boards for which they work do not engage in any type of evaluation.

The work of local boards of education can be varied and complex. The literature on board responsibilities and state standards for boards provides extensive detail on the practices in which boards should engage. These are aspirational roles that school board associations, and even state governments, often develop; adopt; and recommend to local boards as guides for training, effective practice, and board evaluation. Researchers and governance experts likewise outline desirable behavior for boards. For example, Goodman and Zimmer-

man (2000) suggested that vision, structure, accountability, advocacy, and unity should be a local board's foundation for continuous development and self-evaluation. Board presidents report that their boards spend significant time on complaints related to taxes, athletics, teachers, and test scores (Glass, 2001). Delagardelle (2006) found that 56 percent of the time in board meetings was spent on administrative matters, while only 3 percent was spent on policy development. Delagardelle and Alsbury (2008) described traditional board roles such as financing schools and dealing with constituent interests and concerns but asserted that boards need to adopt leadership roles that more directly address improved student achievement. Lee (2012) said, "the role of 'leader' today is evolving due to accountability, community demands, and changing attitudes about what people expect from leaders, and most leaders are not adapting" and "leadership has changed, but somebody forgot to tell the leaders" (p.1).

Although it is not news that many of Mississippi's school districts consistently rank near the bottom in core areas on state standardized achievements tests, it is disconcerting that tantamount to those dismal scores, 59 out of 163 Mississippi school boards rated their own board members' perception of effectiveness in performance as highly effective (Lee & Stedrak, 2013). Some of these districts were dangerously near conservatorship (state takeover) by the academic score thresholds. Research shows that positive school board behavior and district test scores are positively correlated (Lorentzen, 2013). This proposed training will effectively shift mental paradigms of school boards with a new dynamic mentoring approach.

Training Needs

School board members from across the United States need to be better trained. Many only receive six hours of training per year. Hess (2002) stated, "approximately one in five board members would like to receive training in the following substantive or strategic areas: student achievement issues, planning and budget/resource allocation, community collaborations/ partnerships, and community engagement" (p. 4). If board members from low-performing school systems display behavior that is not conducive to high-quality leadership and student learning, training may help. In the governance team, politics and personal agendas become

apparent. These barriers should be eliminated if board behavior is to change and board members are to be effective and productive, as they could be. The United States lags behind the rest of the world in academic achievement, and test scores are at an all-time low. Many school districts have pockets of excellence where one or two schools do well in a system, but that is not enough. Boards are guardians against complacency and must take charge in leading for excellence.

Board Leadership

A school district's primary policymakers are the school board members. If the superintendents recommend policy that aids student achievement, boards have the power to approve it. If the superintendents do not recommend policies that result in student achievement, then boards should demand it. An effective training program should encompass the structure and development of clear and meaningfully effective policies. Ineffective boards rarely, if at all, spend sufficient time on policy development. Sometimes board members approve only what has not worked year after year. An effective school board training that mentors trainees to become leaders, shows exactly how to demand high quality from the staff, and shows how to set benchmarks for excellence would thereby enhance student achievement.

Not surprisingly, when school boards aren't organized and don't focus on what matters most, it can lead to ineffectiveness. It takes time for a leader to make the changes necessary to move the system forward, but, as previously mentioned, a school superintendent's average tenure is less than three years. This presents a dilemma: Unfortunately, some boards might be too quick to eliminate administrators and superintendents when achievement does not occur at fast enough rates. Because clear change and evidence of achievement growth may take years to permeate and appear, boards may do better to delay eliminating superintendents so quickly. To more fully understand what occurs in school board meetings and the professional practice between superintendents and school board members, this study examined 115 school boards throughout the United States.

Method and Analysis

Instrumentation and Sample

Based on an extensive literature review viewing numerous other similar type of surveys; involvement as a board member; experience as a superintendent; work on a governance team; and scholarship, teaching, and service efforts in higher education, the researchers created the School Board Video Project Survey (SBVPS), shown in Appendix A. The survey has 10 questions, some of which have up to three subcomponents. The majority of the questions use a five-point Likert scale, however, some of the questions require fill-in-the-blank, open-ended responses.

After thorough training of the SBVPS instrument's correct reliable usage, an experienced team of professors, principals, and full- and part-time PhD educational leadership graduate students from the University of Southern Mississippi piloted effectively using the SBVPS. As a result, a few minor changes were prepared to clarify sentence structure of the SBVPS's questions. The SBVPS was successfully tested for inter-rater reliability among respondents viewing the same recorded school board meeting videos. Some surveys were conducted in face-to-face school board meetings, but this information was not used in the inter-rater reliability check because, ultimately, the SBVPS would be conducted online, not in person.

Once the SBVPS was determined reliable and valid, respondents used it to collect data. Using G-power analysis, the minimum number required for reliable-sized effects was n > 104. The ANOVA needed 65 per group for a moderate effect and the MANOVA needed 80. For more than a six-month period, respondents randomly selected and self-assigned themselves to view multiple school board meetings from across the United States using the same coding methods for which they were originally trained. Using the SBVPS, respondents observed a grand total of 117 online school board meetings from across the nation. The school board meetings were randomly chosen from across the country and the states we sampled from are listed in Appendix B. Each state maintains its own unique system of comparing its districts to illustrate effectiveness. For the purposes of this study, High-performing districts were listed in the top one-third of each state with regard to overall performance. Districts listed as medium- and low-per-

forming were the districts in each state performing at the middle or lower tertiary, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

Because two surveys were incomplete, data results from only 115 of the surveys were used for analysis. Surveys were coded by two independent individuals to reduce bias and error while protecting the reliability and validity. The researchers used a systematic coding procedure with member checking and peer debriefing. Data were accurately reduced into a conventional Excel spreadsheet and, subsequently, data was reconstructed by developing categories within the findings. In the conclusion, it was connected to the existing literature.

ANOVA, MANOVA, and Pearson Chi-Square tests were applied to the data results. Descriptive statistics, multiple comparisons, and crosstabs were examined. As a result, this study revealed significant differences between low-, medium-, and high-performing districts' school board meetings. These outcomes indicate interesting and important results that should lead to more in-depth research, empirical study, and analysis. The questions from the survey that yielded statistically significant differences are listed below, otherwise, if not listed below, there was no statistical significance.

Because there were eight dependent variables, a MANOVA was performed. Results indicated statistical significance: $F(16, 212) = 3.91$, $p < .001$, effect size of partial eta2 = .228, Pillai's Trace = .456. Because the MANOVA was statistically significant, follow-up Univariate with F-tests at an alpha level of $.05/8 = .006$ were used.

Table 1 (page 6) illustrates the results of the first question, Q1: "Orderly meetings," sought to designate if the board meetings appeared orderly or not; it yielded statistically significant results.

A follow-up Univariate ANOVA yielded significance: $F (2, 112) = 22.156$, $p < .001$. Based on respondents' observation of high-, medium-, and low-performing districts' board meetings, there is a statistically significant difference between the high- and medium-performing boards' meeting mean 4.32 (SD .69) and 4.33 (SD .62) compared to the low-performing districts' board meeting mean 3.02 (SD 1.44). This could indicate that perception of low-performing districts' board meetings are less orderly than the high- and medium-performing districts' board meetings. Because there is limited time during school board meetings and much to do, every moment counts, which is similar to basic scientific management. Data here suggest a trend that lower-performing district board meetings are less orderly. Less order could mean more disorder or wasted time. At the very least, this could indicate ineffectiveness at the highest levels of management in a school district and possible waste of time and public dollars. If the low-performing districts' boards had more training on leading organized meetings skills, it might lead to a first step in changing actions and, ultimately, perceptions.

The next question that indicated a statistically significant difference in means, was Q3a: "On a scale of 1–5, how much time was spent on student achievement?" ANOVA results from Table 1, $F (2, 112) = 7.729$, $p = .001$, lists statistically significant differences in responses between high and medium 2.82 (SD 1.26) and 2.21 (SD .97) means as opposed to the lower mean 1.83 (SD 1.13) of the low-performing districts' board meeting. This could indicate that respondents observed less time being spent on student achievement during the board meetings of low-performing districts. The possible ramifications of this could be wide reaching, especially in this age of accountability, with districts focusing on annual yearly progress of academic achievement because of NCLB legislation and scrutiny from state departments of education. The low-performing district board members might need to seek training to remediate task-accomplishing leadership skills.

Question Q4c asked, "Did the board listen respectfully and attentively to the person speaking?" ANOVA results from Table 1, $F (2, 112) = 15.738$, $p < .001$, are statistically significant; respondent means for high- and medium-performing districts' board meetings were 4.42 (SD .89) and 4.18 (SD .93), respectively. However, the low-performing districts' board meeting mean was only 2.94 (SD 1.73); a statistically significantly difference. This signposts that respondents observed low-performing districts' board members not listening respectfully and attentively to the person speaking as much as with the high- and medium-performing districts. In today's tech-savvy world, there is much multitasking. However, if high-ranking officials, such as school board members, in low-performing districts were perceived as inattentive, it would probably be disappointing and disrespectful to many in the community, to say the least. If this perception is accurate, low-performing district

Table 1: SBVP Significant Results by High-, Medium-, and Low-Performing School District ANOVAs						
Survey Question	**District's Performance**	**n**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**F**	**Sig.**
Q1: Orderly meeting	1.00 high	45	4.32	.69	22.156	$p<.001$
	2.00 medium	34	4.33	.62		
	3.00 low	36	3.02	1.44		
	Total	115	3.92	1.14		
Q3a: On a scale of 1–5, how much time was spent on student achievement?	1.00 high	45	2.82	1.26	7.729	$p=.001$
	2.00 medium	34	2.21	.97		
	3.00 low	36	1.83	1.13		
	Total	115	2.33	1.21		
Q4c: Community input: Did the board listen respectfully and attentively to the person speaking?	1.00 high	45	4.42	.89	15.738	$p<.001$
	2.00 medium	34	4.18	.93		
	3.00 low	36	2.94	1.73		
	Total	115	3.89	1.38		
Q8: Did any member seem to advance their own agenda (like grandstanding and wanting to look good in public)?	1.00 high	45	1.73	1.19	17.842	$p<.001$
	2.00 medium	34	1.79	1.29		
	3.00 low	36	3.50	1.82		
	Total	115	2.30	1.65		
Q10a: Did board members/superintendent seem to have a good working relationship? Was there evidence of collaboration between the superintendent and board members...?	1.00 high	45	3.96	.99	12.805	$p<.001$
	2.00 medium	34	3.94	.98		
	3.00 low	36	2.86	1.22		
	Total	115	3.61	1.17		

boards would clearly need more training for listening skills.

The next question was Q8: "Did any member seem to advance their own agenda (like grandstanding and wanting to look good in public)?" ANOVA results were F (2, 112) = 17.842, p < .001, and were statistically significant. Observers responded with a much higher mean, 3.50 (SD 1.82), for the low-performing districts, when contrasted with the high- and medium-performing districts (1.73 [SD 1.19] and 1.79 [SD 1.29]). Based on the results, respondents indicated that that they perceived low-performing districts' board meeting members as seeming to advance their own agenda more than the high- and medium-perform-

ing districts' board meetings. If school board members are consistently perceived as advancing their own agenda, over time, this might lead to public distrust and worse allegations. Again, low-performing district board members could remediate facilitative leadership skills with the right training.

The last statistically significant question using ANOVA was Q10a: "Did board members and the superintendent seem to have a good working relationship?" and "Was there evidence of collaboration between the superintendent and board members?" This question yielded the following statistically significant results: F (2, 112) = 12.805, p < .001. Respondents' overall

means for the high- and medium-performing district board meetings were 3.96 (SD .99) and 3.94 (SD .98), respectively. The low-performing district board meetings' overall mean score was only 2.86 (SD 1.22), statistically significantly different. This leads the researchers to consider board members and superintendents seem to have a good working relationship in high- and medium-performing districts. Conversely, this also indicates that in low-performing districts' board members, there seems to be less good working relationships. Having a good working relationship and collaboration among governance team members might be very important if they are to be effective. Even the contrary perceptions could be damaging. Because these perceptions were obvious to the observers, most likely, others might have the same perception. If this is at all accurate, then low-performing districts' board members could use more relationship-building training, collaboration training, and communication skills training.

Among further comparisons, additional indications of significance are more evident and clear with the Pearson Chi-Square results below (Table 2 page 7; Tables 3, 4, & 5 page 8).

Chi-Square

Q4a: "Community input: Did anyone speak other than board members or the superintendent?" results present statistical significance using Pearson Chi-Square (N=115, df = 2) = 9.617, p < .001. Of those surveyed, the vast majority of respondents indicated "yes" to this question for (95.6 percent) of high- and (86.1 percent) of low-performing districts' school board meetings, as illustrated in Table 2. Likewise, the majority (70.6 percent) of medium-performing districts' board meetings were rated "yes" as well, but at a much smaller percentage indicating a difference. More research is needed to ascertain why there is significance between these three.

Q5a: "Board member behavior: Did any one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking a lot of time?" Results were statistically significant; as shown by Pearson Chi-Square (N=115, df = 2) = 23.013, p < .001. Table 3 illustrates that 77.8 percent and 76.5 percent of respondents signified "no" to this question for the majority of high and medium board meetings, respectively. Conversely, the majority (58.3 percent) of respondents indicated "yes" for the low-performing districts' board meetings when asked did any one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking a lot of time. This data suggests there is a clear difference. When an individual capitalizes on the majority of a board meeting, it could mean there is much less time for others to possibly affect change, accomplish tasks, vote, and so on.

Q5c: "Board Member Behavior: Did the meeting flow well (agenda followed, well organized, easy to follow, etc.)?" Results were statistically significant using Pearson Chi-Square (N=115, df = 2) = 38.231, p < .001. Essentially, respondents rated the vast majority (93.3 percent and 94.1 percent) of high and medium board meetings as, "flowing well." Yet, respondents indicated that the majority (58.3 percent) of low-performing districts' board meetings did not flow well, hence Table 4. When meetings do not flow well, it might have to do with too many disruptions or distractions and could

Table 2: SBVP Question 4 Results Indicating Significance of the Medium-Performing School District Chi-Square

			ranking			Total
			1.00 high	2.00 medium	3.00 low	
Q4a Community input: Did anyone speak other than board members or the superintendent?	1 yes	Count	43	24	31	98
		% within ranking	95.6%	70.6%	86.1%	85.2%
	2 no	Count	2	10	5	17
		% within ranking	4.4%	29.4%	13.9%	14.8%
Total		Count	45	34	36	115
		% within ranking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3: SBVP Question 5a Results Indicating Significance of the Low-Performing School District
Chi-Square

			ranking			Total
			1.00 high	2.00 medium	3.00 low	
Q5a Board member behavior: Did any one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking a lot of time?	1 yes	Count	10	8	25	43
		% within ranking	22.2%	23.5%	69.4%	37.4%
	2 no	Count	35	26	11	72
		% within ranking	77.8%	76.5%	30.6%	62.6%
Total		Count	45	34	36	115
		% within ranking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4: SBVP Question 5c Results Indicating Significance of the Low-Performing School District
Chi-Square

			ranking			Total
			1.00 high	2.00 medium	3.00 low	
Q5c Board Member Behavior: Did the meeting flow well? (agenda followed, well organized, easy to follow, etc.)	1 yes	Count	42	32	15	89
		% within ranking	93.3%	94.1%	41.7%	77.4%
	2 no	Count	3	2	21	26
		% within ranking	6.7%	5.9%	58.3%	22.6%
Total		Count	45	34	36	115
		% within ranking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5: SBVP Question 7 Results Indicating Significance of the Low-Performing School District
Chi-Square

			ranking			Total
			1.00 high	2.00 medium	3.00 low	
Q7 Did the board act on policy items?	1 yes	Count	26	22	13	61
		% within ranking	57.8%	64.7%	36.1%	53.0%
	2 no	Count	19	12	23	54
		% within ranking	42.2%	35.3%	63.9%	47.0%
Total		Count	45	34	36	115
		% within ranking	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

result in much less time for school board members to be effective.

Q7: "Did the board act on policy items?" Using Pearson Chi-Square (N=115, df = 2) = 6.405, p < .05, results were also statistically significant. Based on their observations appearing in Table 5, respondents selected "yes" in regard to the majority of boards acting on policy; that is, 57.8 percent of high- and 64.7 percent of the medium-performing districts. In contrast, respondents designated "no" to the majority (63.9 percent) of low-performing districts' board acting on policy items at the school board meetings. School boards are the official policymaking and changing groups. If boards do not spend adequate time acting on policies, they could be deemed less effective, which could result in much less time for board members to be effective.

Summary

In summary, ANOVA and Chi-Square results revealed significant differences between low-, medium-, and high-performing districts' school board meetings. Over half a year, respondents observed 115 board meetings using the SBVP survey. Evidence indicates that respondents observing low-performing districts' board meetings perceived them as less orderly; having less time spent on student achievement; not listening respectfully and attentively to the person speaking; having board meeting members seeming to advance their own agenda; having seemingly less good working relationships among the governance team; having less board members relying on the superintendent for advice/input; having one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking a lot of time; and perceiving them as not acting on policy items as much as high- and medium-performing school districts.

Implications

These outcomes indicate interesting and important results that should lead to more in-depth research, empirical study, and analysis. Shockingly, school board members in many states are only mandated six hours of training annually. In this No Child Left Behind era of accountability, it might be hard to believe that the many low-performing school board members, with such few hours of mandatory training, are left in charge at the highest levels in school districts. In some states, school boards are ultimately responsible for rating superintendents

with years of experience and graduate degrees, are responsible for the largest decisions of entire districts, and are responsible for overseeing millions of public dollars. From an anthropological perspective, some might say the very notion of this kind of a check and balance system, without extensive training, is ridiculous. Nevertheless, more training is clearly needed, especially for low-performing districts' school board members, if higher academic achievement outcomes are expected.

Recommendations for the Field

School board members, especially those from low-performing school districts, need to be the participants of a highly refined and target-enhanced school board member training program. Such training programs could lead to lasting governance team success with superintendents in tandem with school board members and more effective governance that influences school districts and, ultimately, student achievement. After all, these board members are the policymaking practitioners who operate at the school district level and are responsible for affecting policy or practice in their respective districts. Not only do we owe it to them, we owe it to our students.

References

Alsbury, T. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the influence on student achievement: An application of the dissatisfaction theory. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 7*(2), 202–229.

Delagardelle, M. (2006). Roles and responsibilities of local school board members in relation to student achievement. Des Moines: Iowa State University.

Delagardelle, M., & Alsbury, T. (2008). School board member beliefs influencing their role for the improvement of student learning. In review.

Delagardelle, M., & Maxson, C. (2004). The perceptions of regional and local board members in Iowa about their roles and responsibilities in relation to student achievement. Iowa Association of School Boards 2004 Annual Convention. Des Moines, IA.

French, P., Peevely, G., & Stanley, R. (2008). Measuring perceived school board effectiveness in Tennessee: The latest survey results. *International Journal of Public Administration, 31*(2), 211–243.

Glass, T. (2001). *The board president's view.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Glass. T. (2007). Superintendent evaluation: What AASA's study discovered. *The School Administrator, 64*(6), 24–28.

Goodman, R., & Zimmerman, W. (2000). Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Hess, F. (2002). School boards at the dawn of the 21st century: Conditions and challenges of district governance. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

Lee, D.E. (2012, May) Starpower secrets. The role of leader is evolving, but most leaders are not adapting. *School Board Journal.* American School.

Lorentzen, I. J. (2013), The relationship between school board governance behaviors and student achievement. Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers. Paper 1387.

Rose, L., & Gallup, A. (2007). *The 39th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa International. Retrieved from http://www.pdkmembers.org/members_online/publications/e-GALLUP/kpoll_pdfs/pdkpol-l39_2007.pdf (9-1-09)

Samuels, C. (2010, December 3). Survey: Urban superintendents are staying on the job longer. *Education Week.* Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/District_Dossier/2010/12/urban_superintendents_showing.html

Stover, D. (2009). Out of control: A school board's self-destructive path to failure offers others some valuable lessons. *American School Board Journal, 196*(3), 14–18.

Viadero, D. (2007, September 26). School boards' effect on student learning gets new attention. *Education Week, 27*(5), 1, 16.

Appendix A

School Board Video Project Survey

Name of School District:_____ Date:_____

Directions: **Please review the entire video. Indicate your perceptions based on the questions below. Feel free to add remarks that can further clarify the effectiveness.**

1.   Does the meeting appear orderly with attention on agenda?
   a.   The members are paying attention to each other.
         (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very much)
   b.   Some members are talking out of turn or engaging side conversations while board business is being conducted.
         (Constantly)   1   2   3   4   5   (Not at all)
   c.   The president/chair seemed to be in charge of the meeting.
         (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Total control)

2.   Where did the board spend the majority of their time?
   ●   Were instructional issues mentioned during the meeting?
         (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very much)
   ●   What consumed most of the time during the meeting?_____
         _____

3.   On a scale of 1–5, how much time was spent on student achievement?
         (None)   1   2   3   4   5   (Majority of Meeting)
   ●   Was accountability mentioned, such as common core?
         (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Often)

4.   Community input:
   ●   Did anyone speak other than board members or the superintendent?
         Yes_____   No_____
   ●   If so, what was the topic?_____
         _____
   ●   Did the board listen respectfully and attentively to the person speaking?
         (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very attentive)
         Explain:_____

5.   Board member behavior:
   ●   Did any one member, other than the board president, stand out for taking a lot of time?
         Yes_____   No_____
   ●   If yes, please describe:_____
         _____
   ●   Did the meeting flow well? (agenda followed, well organized, easy to follow, etc.)
         Yes_____   No_____

6.   Things that stood out as being excessive or a waste of time:
   ●   _____
   ●   _____
   ●   _____

7.   Did the board act on policy items?
   Yes_____   No_____

8.   Did any member seem to advance their own agenda (like grandstanding and wanting to look good in public)?
   (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very much)

9   Was the meeting conducted in a business-like manner?
   (Not at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Always)

10.   Did board members/superintendent seem to have a good working relationship?
   a.   Was there evidence of collaboration between the superintendent and board members?
         (None at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very much)
   b.   Did board members rely on superintendent for advice/input?
         (None at all)   1   2   3   4   5   (Very much)
   c.   Based on your observation, who appeared in control of the meeting?
         Board members_____   Superintendent_____

Appendix B

Note that the links were active when the research was conducted however may have changed over time.

Alabama
https://www.alsde.edu/general/AlabamaEducationReportCard.pdf

Arkansas
http://normessasweb.uark.edu/schoolperformance/beta/strc/index

Arizona
http://www10.ade.az.gov/ReportCard/Districts.aspx

California
http://www3.cde.ca.gov/sarcupdate/clink.aspx

Florida
http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/default.asp?report=RC

Georgia
http://www.gaosa.org/FindASchool.aspx?PageReq=106&StateId=ALL

Idaho
http://www.sde.idaho.gov/reportcard/

Illinois
http://www.isbe.state.il.us/assessment/report_card.htm

Indiana
http://www.doe.in.gov/improvement/accountability/f-accountability

Iowa
http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=670

Kansas
http://svapp15586.ksde.org/rcard/searchpage.aspx

Louisiana
http://www.louisianabelieves.com/data/reportcards/

Michigan
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html

Minnesota
http://w20.education.state.mn.us/MDEAnalytics/Data.jsp

Mississippi
http://ors.mde.k12.ms.us/report/report2012.aspx

New York
https://reportcards.nysed.gov

North Carolina
http://www.ncreportcards.org/src/

Ohio
http://ilrc.ode.state.oh.us

Oklahoma
http://ok.gov/sde/f-grading-system

Oregon
http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/results/?id=116

Tennessee
http://www.tn.gov/education/reportcard/

Texas
http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/

Virginia
https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard/

Washington
http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/summary.aspx?year=2011-12

Wisconsin
https://apps2.dpi.wi.gov/sdpr/spr.action